

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION****Executive****4 September 2023**

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	Officer Responsible	Reason Not Included with Original Agenda
6.	(Pages 1472 - 2157)	Cherwell Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation Appendices 5c and 5d	Assistant Director Planning and Development	Published as a supplement due to size of documents

*If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Democratic and Elections [democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk), 01295 221534*

This page is intentionally left blank

# **Consultation Statement Appendices 11 - 21**

# **Appendix 11**

## **Record of Posts on**

### **Social Media**

# 1. Facebook

## Post One

Page 1474



**Cherwell District Council**  
8 September 2021 · 🌐

🏡 You will soon be able to have your say to help shape policies on the future development of homes, workplaces, and infrastructure in north Oxfordshire.

Our Local Plan is the key document that guides development in the district. Work is underway to create a new plan, covering the period to 2040.

On Monday, the council Executive endorsed an options paper that will be the basis of a consultation that opens at the end of the month.

It doesn't propose new sites for development. Instead it asks you to have your say on what the themes of future policies should be.

Creating a new Local Plan is a chance to design policies on the climate emergency, healthy lifestyles, biodiversity, town centres, and rural housing.

Read more here [www.cherwell.gov.uk/optionspaper](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/optionspaper)



### Performance for your post

---

**6,319** People Reached

---

**23** Likes, Comments & Shares ⓘ

<b>18</b> Likes	<b>9</b> On Post	<b>9</b> On Shares
<b>2</b> Comments	<b>2</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
<b>3</b> Shares	<b>3</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares

---

**191** Post Clicks

<b>13</b> Photo views	<b>25</b> Link clicks	<b>153</b> Other Clicks ⓘ
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

---

**NEGATIVE FEEDBACK**

<b>0</b> Hide post	<b>1</b> Hide all posts
<b>0</b> Report as spam	<b>0</b> Unlike Page

---

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts

Post 2



Cherwell District Council

29 September 2021 · ⚙️

The big issues and choices that will shape north Oxfordshire for years to come have been sketched out in a key document, ready for residents to have their say.

A consultation on our Local Plan options paper has started today. It's a chance to voice your views on a vision of the future of the district and is part of the process of writing a new Local Plan.

Find out more [www.cherwell.gov.uk/lpchoices](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/lpchoices)

Cherwell Local Plan Review

**Planning for Cherwell**

*Tell us what you think.*



5,918

People reached

209

Engagements

Boost post

Performance for your post

5,918 People Reached

25 Reactions, comments & shares ⓘ

7 Like	1 On post	6 On shares
-----------	--------------	----------------

1 Angry	1 On post	0 On shares
------------	--------------	----------------

5 Comments	2 On Post	3 On Shares
---------------	--------------	----------------

12 Shares	10 On Post	2 On Shares
--------------	---------------	----------------

184 Post Clicks

14 Photo views	83 Link clicks	87 Other Clicks ⓘ
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

0 Hide post      0 Hide all posts

0 Report as spam      0 Unlike Page

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts

## Post three



**Cherwell District Council**  
11 October 2021 · 🌐

Lots of you had your say about the future of our high streets as part of our previous Local Plan consultation.

Choices we make about what town centre buildings can be used for could influence this, as we prepare our next Local Plan.

Do you think we should protect key shopping areas in our town centres, or should we maximise the flexibility that is available to us and allow different types of development?... [See more](#)



**1,799** People reached

**30** Engagements

[Boost post](#)

### Performance for your post

**1,799** People Reached

**2** Likes, Comments & Shares ⓘ

<b>1</b> Likes	<b>1</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
----------------	------------------	--------------------

<b>1</b> Comments	<b>1</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
-------------------	------------------	--------------------

<b>0</b> Shares	<b>0</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
-----------------	------------------	--------------------

**28** Post Clicks

<b>1</b> Photo views	<b>19</b> Link clicks	<b>8</b> Other Clicks ⓘ
----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

#### NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

<b>0</b> Hide post	<b>0</b> Hide all posts
<b>0</b> Report as spam	<b>0</b> Unlike Page

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts

## Post four

**Cherwell District Council** 21 October 2021 · 🌐

As we develop a new Local Plan, key choices we make about employment sites could shape future job prospects in our area. We'd like to hear your views.

Compared to the rest of Oxfordshire, we have a high number of jobs in retail, leisure and hospitality.

In our previous Local Plan consultation, people said that agriculture and tourism should be recognised as key parts of the local economy. They also asked for policies to promote training, apprenticeships, more skilled jobs an ... [See more](#)



### Performance for your post

---

**3,386** People Reached

---

**12** Likes, Comments & Shares ⓘ

<b>4</b> Likes	<b>4</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
<b>7</b> Comments	<b>5</b> On Post	<b>2</b> On Shares
<b>1</b> Shares	<b>1</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares

---

**61** Post Clicks

<b>5</b> Photo views	<b>5</b> Link clicks	<b>51</b> Other Clicks ⓘ
-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

---

**NEGATIVE FEEDBACK**

<b>0</b> Hide post	<b>0</b> Hide all posts
<b>0</b> Report as spam	<b>0</b> Unlike Page

---

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts



## Post five



**Cherwell District Council**  
25 October 2021 · 🌐

🌍 In 2019 we declared a Climate Emergency and pledged to be carbon neutral by 2030.

The environment is therefore a key theme of the new Local Plan we are writing.

In our previous Local Plan consultation, people shared their views on tree planting, retaining green spaces, generating clean energy and how we may encourage retrofitting of existing housing stock.

Our current Local Plan consultation calls for your views on topics including:

- If we should set sustainable design and construction standards above those required by central government
- Sustainable energy generation
- The design and location of EV charging points

Have your say at <https://letstalk.cherwell.gov.uk/cherwell-local-plan-review>

For more info on the Local Plan consultation, visit [www.cherwell.gov.uk/lpchoices](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/lpchoices)



### Performance for your post

**3,821** People Reached

**14** Reactions, comments & shares ⓘ

<b>4</b> 👍 Like	<b>4</b> On post	<b>0</b> On shares
--------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

<b>2</b> ❤️ Love	<b>2</b> On post	<b>0</b> On shares
---------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

<b>7</b> Comments	<b>7</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
----------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

<b>1</b> Shares	<b>1</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
--------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

**107** Post Clicks

<b>6</b> Photo views	<b>16</b> Link clicks	<b>85</b> Other Clicks ⓘ
-------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

#### NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

**0** Hide post      **0** Hide all posts

**0** Report as spam      **0** Unlike Page

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts

## Post six



**Cherwell District Council**  
1 November 2021 · 🌐

A Local Plan can help shape how much housing development is directed at rural areas - and we are currently calling for views to help us shape our new plan.

Government policy requires us to promote sustainable development of new housing, especially where it will support local services and rural communities.

In our previous Local Plan consultation, people expressed different views about how housing should be allocated in rural areas. But they tended to agree that a review of how villages are categorised for development was needed.

Do you think we should:

- 1) Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs, or
- 2) direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs?

The consultation closes on 10 November and is a chance to have your say on this and a number of other topics.

Have your say on these and much more at  
<https://letstalk.cherwell.gov.uk/cherwell-local-plan-review>



### Performance for your post

**2,545** People Reached

**13** Reactions, comments & shares ⓘ

<b>6</b> Like	<b>2</b> On post	<b>4</b> On shares
------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

<b>1</b> Love	<b>0</b> On post	<b>1</b> On shares
------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

<b>0</b> Comments	<b>0</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
----------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

<b>6</b> Shares	<b>6</b> On Post	<b>0</b> On Shares
--------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

**73** Post Clicks

<b>4</b> Photo views	<b>13</b> Link clicks	<b>56</b> Other Clicks ⓘ
-------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

#### NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

<b>0</b> Hide post	<b>0</b> Hide all posts
<b>0</b> Report as spam	<b>0</b> Unlike Page

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts

Post seven

 **Cherwell District Council**  
6 November 2021 · 🌐

🗨️ There are just a few days left to have your say on the big issues that will shape the future of Cherwell district, as an important stage of consultation on our new Local Plan draws to a close.

The plan will include a vision for the future as well as policies to guide the development of homes, workplaces, green spaces, and infrastructure. Members of the public are invited to have their say on an options paper before 11.59pm on Wednesday 10 November 2021.

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

---

Cherwell Local Plan Review  
**Planning for Cherwell**

*Tell us what you think.*



Performance for your post

2,240 People Reached

13 Likes, Comments & Shares ⓘ

5 Likes	4 On Post	1 On Shares
3 Comments	3 On Post	0 On Shares
5 Shares	5 On Post	0 On Shares

66 Post Clicks

5 Photo views	24 Link clicks	37 Other Clicks ⓘ
---------------	----------------	-------------------

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

0 Hide post	0 Hide all posts
0 Report as spam	0 Unlike Page

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts

Post eight



**Cherwell District Council**

9 November 2021 · 🌐

⋮

A final reminder that the current stage of consultation on our new Local Plan closes tomorrow (11.59pm on Wednesday 10 November).

Councillor Colin Clarke, Lead Member for Planning, said: "We are consulting on an options paper that lays out the big choices that we will have to make when we write our next Local Plan. That plan will be a cornerstone of local policy, setting out where future new homes and infrastructure may be built, and defining key elements of our response to the climate emergency and COVID."

[Read more www.cherwell.gov.uk/LPConsultationClosing](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/LPConsultationClosing)

Cherwell Local Plan Review

# Planning for Cherwell



Tell us what you think.

**Performance for your post**

**2,161** People Reached

**9** Likes, Comments & Shares ⓘ

<b>3</b> Likes	<b>1</b> On Post	<b>2</b> On Shares
<b>2</b> Comments	<b>0</b> On Post	<b>2</b> On Shares
<b>4</b> Shares	<b>3</b> On Post	<b>1</b> On Shares

**41** Post Clicks

<b>2</b> Photo views	<b>19</b> Link clicks	<b>20</b> Other Clicks ⓘ
-------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

**NEGATIVE FEEDBACK**

<b>0</b> Hide post	<b>0</b> Hide all posts
<b>0</b> Report as spam	<b>0</b> Unlike Page

Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts

## 2. Twitter

### Post one

 **Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Sep 8, 2021

 **ALT**  As work on a new Local Plan continues, residents will soon be able to have their say to help shape policies on the future development of homes, workplaces, and infrastructure in Cherwell.  
...

 2       1       1

Impressions ⓘ

**1,049**


Engagements ⓘ


**29**

Detail expands ⓘ

**10**

## Post two

 **Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Sep 29, 2021



The big issues and choices that will shape north Oxfordshire for years to come have been sketched out in our Local Plan options paper, ready for residents to have their say.

Find out more [cherwell.gov.uk/lpchoices](https://cherwell.gov.uk/lpchoices)

 3

 2

 1

Impressions ⓘ

**885**

Engagements ⓘ

**24**

Detail expands ⓘ

**5**

Post three

 **Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Oct 11, 2021



As we prepare our next Local Plan, choices we make about what town centre buildings can be used for could influence the future of our high streets.

Should we protect key shopping areas, or should we allow ...

  
1

  
1

  
0

Impressions ⓘ  
**464**

Engagements ⓘ  
**14**

Detail expands ⓘ  
**1**

Post four



**Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Oct 21, 2021



Where do you think employment land should be focused to deliver the jobs needed in Cherwell? Should these sites be for certain types of jobs, or provide a mix?

As we develop a new Local Plan, you can have your say on ...



0



0



0

Impressions ⓘ

**398**

Engagements ⓘ

**5**

Detail expands ⓘ

**0**



Post five


 **Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Oct 25, 2021




 The environment will be a key theme of our next Local Plan. We are currently consulting and keen to hear your views on topics including

- Design and construction standards ...

 2

 0

 1

Impressions ⓘ

**502**

Engagements ⓘ

**12**

Detail expands ⓘ

**6**

Post six



**Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Nov 1, 2021



A Local Plan can help shape how much housing development is directed at rural areas - and we are currently calling for your views.

Our Local Plan consultation closes on 10 November and is ...



0



1



0

Impressions ⓘ

**623**

Engagements ⓘ

**23**

Detail expands ⓘ

**7**

Post seven

 **Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Nov 6, 2021



 There are just a few days left to have your say on the big issues that will shape the future of the district, as the current stage of consultation on our new Local Plan draws to a close.  
...

 1

 4

 0

Impressions ⓘ

**815**


Engagements ⓘ

**24**

Detail expands ⓘ

**9**


Post eight

 **Cherwell District Council** @Cherwellcouncil · Nov 9, 2021




A final reminder that the current stage of consultation on our new Local Plan closes tomorrow (11.59pm on Wednesday 10 November).

[Read more cherwell.gov.uk/LPConsultation...](https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/LPConsultation...)

 0

 0

 0

Impressions ⓘ

**506**

Engagements ⓘ

**7**

Detail expands ⓘ

**2**

**Appendix 12**  
**Cherwell News Email**  
**Bulletin (09-09-2021)**

**From:** [Internal Communications](#)  
**To:** [BL/CDC All Staff](#); [CSH DL All Staff](#)  
**Subject:** Cherwell News this week  
**Date:** 09 September 2021 16:26:52

---

## Cherwell News

Dear colleague

In case you missed them, all the latest news articles can be viewed on [Cherwell news](#).

News articles posted so far this week;

[World Suicide Prevention Day - 10 September](#)

Look after your mental health

[Welcome back to the Bicester Festival!](#)

The curtain is about to go up on the fourth annual Bicester Festival.

[Microsoft Office upgrade and improvements](#)

A Microsoft Office update will be downloaded to all computers over the next week.

[Help shape district's future](#)

You will soon be able to have your say to help shape policies on the future development of homes, workplaces, and infrastructure in Cherwell.

[Reset September](#)

If you want to make a new fitness routine stick, September is 'the' month to do it.

[County libraries set to return to pre-pandemic opening hours](#)

Evening and Saturday opening hours can now be restored.

[Music sessions for children set to launch across Oxfordshire](#)

Children aged six to 13 will soon be able to join in musical groups in a series of new sessions at venues across the county on Saturday mornings.

[Today is Colour Blind Awareness Day](#)

Did you know that colour-blindness affects one in 12 men and one in 200 women ?

All news articles are uploaded to Cherwell News as they come in, so take the time to keep visiting the page to find out what's new.

If you think we've missed something that you feel your colleagues would like to hear about [let us know](#).

To see what news has been issued externally this week visit our [website](#).

### What's on and what's coming up next week;

Monday: [Virtual choir at 12 pm](#)

Wednesday: [Mindfulness Meditation at 12:30 pm](#)

Thursday: [See it, Report it Briefing at 1 pm](#) (book your place now), [How to use the new Equalities and Climate Impact Assessments \(ECIAs\) template at 1:30 pm](#) and [Lightning Talk hosted by digital GIS solutions at 2 pm](#).

Click on the [events calendar](#) to find out more.

The calendar is regularly updated so keep checking in to see if there is anything that you would like to take part in.

If you have something coming up and would like us to post an event for you please [contact us](#).

### Lightning Talks

Last week our Healthy Place Shaping Team hosted a Lightning Talk. The 20 minute Lightning Talks are designed to help break down the silos and connect teams and services across us and the county council. If you would like to view the latest talk or have missed any, you can view them on the [intranet](#).

### Cherwell Link

The next edition of Cherwell Link will be out soon so if you haven't already, [sign up](#) to have your copy sent to your inbox.

We are always looking to include your stories, we've had some really great contributions so please keep them coming — could be a service update, promotion of an event or just a good story to tell. If you have news to share with our residents please contact the [communications team](#).

Reminder - If you have any questions regarding coronavirus, visit coronavirus frequently asked questions on the [intranet](#) and for any IT issues, contact the ICT Service Desk.

Regards

Internal Communications Team

Internal Communications

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

**Appendix 13**  
**Cherwell News Email**  
**Bulletin (30-09-2021)**



**From:** [Internal Communications](#)  
**To:** [BU, ODC, All Staff; CSN DL All Staff](#)  
**Subject:** Cherwell News this week  
**Date:** 30 September 2021 16:18:30

---

## Cherwell News

Dear colleague

In case you missed them, all the latest news articles can be viewed on [Cherwell news](#).

News articles posted so far this week;

[Let's talk Cherwell](#)

Launch of new digital consultation and engagement platform

[National Customer Service Week](#)

From 4 to 8 October 2021

[Coming soon! A new look iTrent](#)

A new look iTrent ESS (Employee Self Service)

[Call for views on choices to shape Cherwell's future](#)

Local Plan Options Paper is now open for consultation

[Start saving, start moving this Stoptober](#)

Advice and support to help you

[Amazon wish-list for specific donations to help Afghan guests](#)

Asylum Welcome supports refugees and asylum seekers in Oxford and Oxfordshire

[Safeguarding update - survey feedback](#)

Survey feedback and response

All news articles are uploaded to Cherwell News as they come in, so take the time to keep visiting the page to find out what's new.

If you think we've missed something that you feel your colleagues would like to hear about [let us know](#).

To see what news has been issued externally this week visit our [website](#).

### What's on and what's coming up next week;

Monday: [Virtual choir at 12 pm](#)

Tuesday: [Introduction to Very Brief Advice: 30 seconds to save a life at 1 pm to 2 pm](#)

Wednesday: [Mindfulness Meditation at 12:30 pm](#)

Thursday: [All staff briefing at 11 am to 12 pm](#).

Click on the [events calendar](#) to find out more.

The calendar is regularly updated so keep checking in to see if there is anything that you would like to take part in.

If you have something coming up and would like us to post an event for you please [contact us](#).

### Staff briefing – 7 October 11:00 am to 12:00 pm

We will be using a hybrid approach for this session and will be using the council chamber for staff who wish to attend in person.

Due to social distancing rules, there are only 26 spaces available in the chamber so if you would like a place [reserve your place](#) as soon as possible.

Alternatively you can join via MS Teams remotely: [Book your place](#).

Do **not** attend the council chamber unless a place has been booked, as you will be turned away due to social distancing rules.

### Cherwell Link

The next edition of Cherwell Link will be out soon so if you haven't already, [sign up](#) to have your copy sent to your inbox.

We are always looking to include your stories, we've had some really great contributions so please keep them coming — could be a service update, promotion of an event or just a good story to tell. If you have news to share with our residents please contact the [communications team](#).

Reminder - If you have any questions regarding coronavirus, visit coronavirus frequently asked questions on the [intranet](#) and for any IT issues, contact the ICT Service Desk.

Regards

Internal Communications Team

Internal Communications

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

**Appendix 14**  
**Article Published on the**  
**Staff Intranet (08-09-2021)**

# Help shape district's future

Home Latest news **Help shape district's future**

You will soon be able to have your say to help shape policies on the future development of homes, workplaces, and infrastructure in Cherwell.

**Published:** Wednesday, 8th September 2021

Our adopted Local Plan is the key document that guides development in the district. Work is underway to create a new plan, covering the period to 2040.

At a meeting on Monday 6 September, our Executive gave the green light to an options paper, which will be going out for public consultation from 29 September.



The options paper doesn't propose new sites for development or set targets for the number of homes that may be needed. Instead, it asks people to have their say on what the key themes of future planning policies should be.

Our current Local Plan is now five years old and there is a new national and local context emerging. The Local Plan review is a chance to develop new policies for matters including: the climate emergency; creating a built environment that promotes healthy lifestyles; achieving net increases in biodiversity; supporting town centres; and rural housing.

The new Local Plan is intended to be a key strategy to drive the district's recovery from pandemic

paper includes a place-based discussion for Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington, Upper Heyford and the rural areas.

The consultation will start on 29 September and run for six weeks.

Read more on our [website](#).

## News RSS feed

### News in 2022

January

### Archives by year

[2022](#) [2021](#) [2020](#) [2019](#) [2018](#)

### Share this page



**Appendix 15**  
**Article Published on the Staff**  
**Intranet (29-09-2021)**

## Call for views on choices to shape Cherwell's future

Home > Latest news > Call for views on choices to shape Cherwell's future

Local Plan Options Paper is now open for consultation

**Published:** Wednesday, 29th September 2021

The big issues and choices that will shape north Oxfordshire for years to come have been sketched out in a key document, ready for residents to have their say.



Our Local Plan options paper goes out for public consultation today, Wednesday, 29 September.

It is a chance for people to voice their views on a vision of the future of the district and is part of the process of writing a new Local Plan.

The plan will,

- address needs and opportunities for the future
- set a base for conserving and enhancing the environment and mitigating and adapting to climate change
- support well designed and healthy places

The paper is open for comments until 10 November 2021.

We want to hear people's views on:

- the draft vision for the future and how this could be delivered
- proposed options for new planning policies
- local profiles for Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington, Upper Heyford and our rural areas, as a way of promoting discussion of their futures.

Residents, businesses, and other local stakeholders can all have their say through our new consultation platform at [letstalk.cherwell.gov.uk/cherwell-local-plan-review](https://letstalk.cherwell.gov.uk/cherwell-local-plan-review)

News RSS feed

News in 2021

- January
- February
- March
- April
- May
- June
- July

- August
- September
- October

Archives by year

- 2021    2019
- 2020    2018

Share this page



**Appendix 16**  
**Update from Yvonne**  
**Email (10-09-2021)**



**From:** [Yvonne Rees](#)  
**To:** [DL CDC All Staff](#)  
**Cc:** [Yvonne Rees](#); [Middleton, Kerry - Chief Executive's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Boy how can it almost be mid-sept? Note to self - start thinking about my Halloween costume! Update from Yvonne  
**Date:** 10 September 2021 10:14:36  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)

---

## Latest update from Yvonne

Dear all

Please keep safe and well and, as always, thank you for everything you do.

With best wishes

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yvonne Rees', with a stylized, cursive font.

Yvonne Rees  
Chief Executive

**COVID-19 public health information and  
advice**

### **Call for views to help shape district's future**

People will soon be able to have their say to help shape policies on the future development of homes, workplaces, and infrastructure in north Oxfordshire. Our adopted Local Plan is the key document that guides development in the district. Work is underway to create a new plan, covering the period to 2040. At a meeting earlier this week, our Executive gave the green light to an options paper, which will be going out for public consultation from 29 September. The options paper proposes a place and people-based vision for the district, with a focus on developing a sustainable local economy, meeting the climate change challenge, and healthy place shaping and also includes a place-based discussion for Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington, Upper Heyford and the rural areas. You can [read more about this story](#) on our website.

**Appendix 17**  
**Update from Yvonne**  
**Email (01-10-2021)**

**From:** [Yvonne Rees](#)  
**To:** [DL CDC All Staff](#); [CSN DL All Staff](#)  
**Cc:** [Middleton, Kerry - Chief Executive's Office](#); [Yvonne Rees](#)  
**Subject:** Update from Yvonne  
**Date:** 01 October 2021 08:42:05  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)

---

## Latest update from Yvonne

Dear all

Please keep safe and well and, as always, thank you for everything you do.

With best wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Yvonne Rees'.

Yvonne Rees  
Chief Executive

## Other news ...

### **Call for views on choices to shape Cherwell's future**

The big issues and choices that will shape our district for years to come have been sketched out in a key document, ready for everyone to have their say. Our Local Plan options paper went out for public consultation on Wednesday 29 September. It is a chance for people to voice their views on a vision of the future of the district and is part of the process of writing a new Local Plan. The plan will address needs and opportunities for the future. It will set a base for conserving and enhancing the environment and mitigating and adapting to climate change as well as supporting well designed and healthy places. Residents, businesses, and other local stakeholders can all [have their say](#) through our new digital consultation and engagement platform, Let's Talk Cherwell. You can [read more](#) about this on our website.

**Appendix 18**  
**Update from Yvonne**  
**Email (04-11-2021)**



**From:** [Yvonne Rees](#)  
**To:** [DL CDC All Staff](#); [CSN DL All Staff](#)  
**Cc:** [Yvonne Rees](#); [Middleton, Kerry - Chief Executive's Office](#)  
**Subject:** My blue legs are back - a chilly Yvonne on the way to the gym at 6am!  
**Date:** 04 November 2021 18:56:43  
**Attachments:** [image004.png](#)

---

## Latest update from Yvonne

Dear all

Keep safe and well and, as always, thank you for everything you do.

With best wishes



Yvonne Rees  
Chief Executive

## News in brief

### **Final few days to take part in current local plan consultation**

We are reminding residents to have their say on the big issues that will shape the future of our district, as an important stage of consultation on our new local plan draws to a close. The plan will include a vision for the future as well as policies to guide the development of homes, workplaces, green spaces and infrastructure. [You are invited to have your say](#) on an options paper before 11.59pm on Wednesday 10 November.

**Appendix 19**  
**Cherwell Parish Bulletin**  
**Email (22-02-2021)**

**From:** Kevin Larner <[Kevin.Larner@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Kevin.Larner@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 22 February 2021 12:53

**To:** DL CDC Members <[Members@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Members@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)>; DL CDC CEDR <[dlcdccedr@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:dlcdccedr@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Cherwell Parish Bulletin\_22 February 2021

Dear Councillors and CEDR Members

Please see below Steve Jordan's fortnightly Parish Bulletin, which will be sent out later today to all Cherwell Parishes.

Best regards

Kevin

**Kevin Larner**

**Healthy Communities Manager**

Communities / Wellbeing / Cherwell District Council

Direct Dial 01295 221706 / [Kevin.larner@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:Kevin.larner@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk) Twitter: @Cherwellcouncil



**Cherwell**

DISTRICT COUNCIL  
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE



**To: All Cherwell Town Councils, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings – 22 February 2021**

Dear Colleagues

Please find below my update on a range of issues that will be of interest to you or your residents.

As ever, we rely on you to **forward this update to your councillors** and encourage them to disseminate it to any group or individual in your parish who might benefit from the information.

There are three requests in this week's bulletin for you to feed back to us about priorities for your communities. Please do take the opportunities to tell us about your COMF spending plans, your village facilities and your climate emergency ambitions.

Best regards

Steve Jorden

Corporate Director for Commercial Development, Assets and Investment, CDC and OCC

## Containing Outbreak Management Fund – Your Money, Your Move.

Each of the 79 parishes in Cherwell has now received a notification of its 'COMF' allocation and details of how to request payment.

Please think creatively about how you could make best use of your funding, and engage with the groups and organisations that are supporting your residents or providing local facilities.

Due to Government time limits on this funding, we need your payment requests **no later than 26 March** (once paid out though, you can use it to carry out your actions over the course of the 2021/22 financial year).

If you have any queries or want to discuss ideas, please get in touch with Lydia Avann via [parishes@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:parishes@cherwell-dc.gov.uk) or 01295 221861

## Local Plan Review – Village Services Questionnaire

Last week each parish will have received a Village Services Questionnaire from our Planning Policy team. It is the next stage of the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 and follows on from last Summer's Community Involvement Paper consultation.

It is important that planning policy is based on up to date information. This questionnaire is a fact-finding exercise about the facilities, opportunities and constraints in each village.

Responses are required **by 31 March**. If you have any queries please contact Yuen Wong ([yuen.wong@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:yuen.wong@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)) or the Planning Policy Team ([planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)).

## Climate Emergency Survey – Interviewees Required

Cherwell District Council has commissioned 6 degrees Student Consultancy to conduct a piece of work looking at the attitudes, ambitions and challenges of parish councils around the climate emergency.

We are keen to interview parish councillors to understand these topics in greater detail from a parish perspective. Your views will help shape a report from the student consultants which will also include a number of case studies on different actions parish councils and similar organisations have taken.

If you are interested and have availability over the next few weeks please contact Sam Thomas, Climate Action Officer [sam.thomas@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:sam.thomas@cherwell-dc.gov.uk) to arrange a telephone meeting.

## Covid-19 – Local Infection Rates and Shielding List Expansion

In Cherwell there were 124 new cases in the seven days up to 12 February, a 44 per cent decrease from 223 the previous week. This is equivalent to a weekly rate of 82.4 per 100,000 residents. This is the first time the weekly rate has dropped below 100 since early December. You can access a [COVID-19 dashboard](#) on the county council's website for daily COVID-19 statistics.

Last week the government announced a national expansion of the number of individuals being asked to shield because they are considered Clinically Extremely Vulnerable (CEV) to COVID-19. This follows the development of a new model at Oxford University which looks in detail at the medical and demographic factors of those previously most affected by the pandemic. These individuals will now be prioritised for vaccination alongside those already considered CEV and will be eligible for statutory sick pay and prioritisation for online shopping slots.

## Elections 2021 – Call for Support

Preparations are well underway for the elections that will take place in Cherwell on 6 May 2021. Ensuring the whole process is safe for our staff, electors and candidates is at the forefront of our planning.

We need extra staff to work at polling stations and at the count. Information about rates of pay and how to apply is available on the CDC website: [Elections Staffing](#)

We would be extremely grateful if you can share this opportunity as widely as possible.

## Local Digital Mapping and Data Resources

The [‘My Neighbourhood’](#) page on CDC’s website provides all sorts of useful mapping and information, including planning history and conservation areas, planning policies, listed buildings, tree preservation orders, councillors and local services.

Newly added is the Cherwell Story Map, our visual and interactive tool showing what is going on in local communities around health and physical activity. The map will be one of the tools helping us to understand communities better, so that collectively with local residents we can plan for a healthy future and ensure communities thrive.

## CDC Council and Committee Meetings

Virtual meetings currently scheduled for the coming month are:

- Full Council at 6.30pm on Monday 22 February
- Executive Committee at 6.30pm on Monday 01 March
- Budget Planning Committee at 6.30pm on Tuesday 09 March
- Planning Committee at 4.00pm on Thursday 11 March
- Overview & Scrutiny Committee at 6.30pm on Tuesday 16 March
- Accounts, Audit & Risk Committee at 6.30pm on Wednesday 17 March

To view a CDC council meeting– go to the [Browse Meetings Page](#) of our website, select the relevant committee and the meeting date. Click on “View the webcast” on the agenda webpage.

## Staying Up To Date

For the latest information about the council's response to Covid-19 regularly check your emails, visit the [council website](#) and follow our social media accounts.

*This is a briefing emailed to all Cherwell Parishes*



This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..



**Appendix 20**  
**Cherwell Parish Bulletin**  
**Email (23-08-2021)**

**To: All Cherwell Town Councils, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings – 23 August 2021**

Dear Colleagues

Please find below the latest update on issues that will be of interest to you or your residents. This time around, most of the items are about current or forthcoming planning consultations.

As ever, please do forward this update to your councillors and encourage them to forward to any group or individual who might benefit from the information.

The next scheduled Parish Bulletin will be on 27 September.

Best regards

Claire Taylor

**Corporate Director – Customers, Organisational Development and Resources**

Cherwell District Council

[claire.taylor@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:claire.taylor@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

Direct Dial: 0300 0030113

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

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](https://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @cherwellcouncil

**For information on COVID- 19 visit [www.gov.uk/coronavirus](http://www.gov.uk/coronavirus)**



## Progress on Cherwell Local Plan Review

As you may have heard at the Parish Briefings earlier in the summer, the second stage of consultation on the Cherwell Local Plan Review is the 'Options Paper'. The Options Paper is currently scheduled to go to Executive for approval on the 6<sup>th</sup> September, the agenda being made public a week before the meeting.

Subject to member approval, the Planning Policy Team will be in touch in the next couple of weeks regarding arrangements for consultation, including briefings for town and parish councils. It is hoped that one of these will take place before the start of formal consultation.

## Development Briefs – Sites near Yarnton and Kidlington

A focused consultation is currently underway seeking views on two development briefs for two sites in the south of the district.

The two sites are known as Land West of Yarnton and Land at Stratfield Farm, Kidlington. Development Briefs are documents that set design principles and guidelines for new development and include illustrative layouts. The development briefs will be used to inform future applications on these sites and will be used by the council as an important reference when it considers those applications.

The two sites are allocated for development in the Partial Review of the Local Plan. The start of consultation had been delayed to allow for the decision to be issued by the courts that had been made in respect to the Partial Review. This was issued on the 30 July 2021.

There are 4 further briefs in the south of the district that will be consulted on over the autumn and winter.

The consultation runs between the 11 August and 22 September 2021 covering a period of 6 weeks. Further details about the consultation and copies of the briefs are available via <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/planningpolicyconsultation>

## Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Consultation

Comments are being sought on a consultation document containing policy options for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.

The consultation is grouped under five themes: addressing climate change; improving environmental quality; creating strong and healthy communities; planning for sustainable travel and connectivity; and creating jobs and providing homes. The document is also seeking views on spatial strategy options- how much development is needed countywide and how should it be distributed?

The Oxfordshire Plan team are holding a series of webinars (starting on 25 August) to present the consultation paper and provide the opportunity for questions. The consultation period extends to Friday 8<sup>th</sup> October and further details can be accessed on <https://www.oxfordshireopenthought.org/>

# Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) Consultation

The last day of the six week Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) consultation will be Tuesday 31 August.

OxIS provides a framework for Oxfordshire County Council, Oxfordshire's five planning authorities and key partners to establish strategic infrastructure investment priorities as well as potential opportunities for funding and delivery.

There are five themes - environment, health, place-shaping, productivity and connectivity

There are clear links to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050, with OxIS setting out how to prioritise and deliver against the important infrastructure strand of the Oxfordshire Plan. Partners and the public are encouraged to take part in both consultations.

The consultation can be accessed via:

<https://www.oxfordshireopenthought.org/oxfordshire-infrastructure-strategy-oxis>

## Covid-19 Local Infection Rates & Testing

In Cherwell, there were 437 cases in the seven days up to 13 August, an increase from 348 new cases in the previous week. This is equivalent to a weekly rate of 290.4 per 100,000 residents.

For Cherwell, this week cases in the over 60s have increased to 41 cases (up from 29 in the previous week). You can view the latest figures on the county council's [COVID-19 dashboard](#).

If you have COVID-19 symptoms, you must self-isolate immediately and [book a symptomatic \(PCR\) test](#) at one of Oxfordshire's five symptomatic testing sites as soon as possible. Do not attend a symptom-free site or use a lateral flow device. More information is available on OCC's [symptom testing pages](#).

## CDC Council and Committee Meetings

Meetings currently scheduled for the coming month are:

- Executive Committee at 6.30pm on Monday 06 September
- Overview & Scrutiny Committee at 6.30pm on Tuesday 07 September
- Planning Committee at 4.00pm on Thursday 09 September
- Budget Planning Committee at 6.30pm on Tuesday 14 September
- Accounts, Audit and Risk Committee at 6.30pm on Wednesday 22 September

To view a CDC council meeting– go to the [Browse Meetings Page](#) of our website, select the relevant committee and the meeting date. Click on “View the webcast” on the agenda webpage.

## Staying Up To Date

For the latest information about the council’s response to Covid-19 regularly check your emails, visit the [council website](#) and follow our social media accounts.

*This is a briefing emailed to all Cherwell Parishes*



Natalie Sanchez  
**Healthy Communities Partner**  
**Community Services**  
**Cherwell District Council**  
DD: 01295 221584  
Email: [natalie.sanchez@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:natalie.sanchez@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

Cherwell District Council, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury OX15 4AA  
W: [www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk) F: [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](https://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil) T: @Cherwellcouncil



This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail (and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action.

# **Appendix 21**

## **Representations Proposing Sites**

Rep No.	Site Name	Parish	Area Size (ha)	Promoter	Promoted Use(s)	New (inc parcels of overall existing HELAA sites) / Update	
LPR-B-053	Land connecting Chapmans Lane and St Thomas Street, Deddington	Deddington	1	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd for WS Deeley and son	Housing	New HELAA457	
LPR-B-053	Land north east of Chapmans Lane, Deddington	Deddington	1	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd for WS Deeley and son	Housing	New HELAA458	
LPR-B-053	Land east of Hall Personal Training, Clifton Road, Deddington	Deddington	1	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd for WS Deeley and son	Housing	New HELAA459	
LPR-B-193	Land at Fulwell Road, Finmere	Finmere	0.6	ID Planning for NYC Estates Ltd	Housing	Update HELAA415	
LPR-B-290	Land to the south of Langford Lane, Kidlington	Kidlington	8.3	Savills for Oxford Technology Park	Employment	Update HELAA336	
LPR-B-290	The Piggeries and associated land, Langford Lane, Kidlington	Kidlington	6	Savills for Oxford Technology Park	Community / leisure	Update HELAA448	
LPR-B-314	Land at Home Farm, Clifton, Deddington	Deddington	1.96	Ridge and Patners for M & G Real Estate	Housing	Update HELAA114	
LPR-B-314	Land at Wimborn Close, Deddington	Deddington	1.86	Ridge and Patners for M & G Real Estate	Housing	Update HELAA116	
LPR-B-314	Land off Duns Tew Road, Hempton, Deddington	Deddington	2.24	Ridge and Patners for M & G Real Estate	Housing	Update HELAA137	
LPR-B-314	Land to the rear of The Grove, Deddington	Deddington	8.4	Ridge and Patners for M & G Real Estate	Housing / community	Update HELAA455	
LPR-B-314	Land south of The Lane, Hempton, Deddington	Deddington	0.47	Ridge and Patners for M & G Real Estate	Housing	Update HELAA456	
LPR-B-323	14-16 Woodstock Road, Yarnton	Yarnton	2.5	Edgars for Mr & Mrs Tomes	Housing	Update HELAA342	
LPR-B-331	Land north of Rau Court, Caversfield	Caversfield	2.9	Oxford & Country Planning for Mewslade	Housing	Update HELAA108	
LPR-B-331	Land south of Springfield Road, Caversfield	Caversfield	1.4	Oxford & Country Planning for Mewslade	Housing	New HELAA460	
LPR-B-331	Garage court off Springfield Road, Caversfield	Caversfield	0.07	Oxford & Country Planning for Mewslade	Recreation	New	Invalid - does not meet size requirement
LPR-B-331	Garage court off Woodcote Road, Caversfield	Caversfield	0.06	Oxford & Country Planning for Mewslade	Recreation	New	Invalid - does not meet size requirement
LPR-B-331	Land off Woodcote Road, Caversfield	Caversfield	0.06	Oxford & Country Planning for Mewslade	Access or open space	New	Invalid - does not meet size requirement
LPR-B-344	Heyford Park	Heyford Park	Not provided	Pegasus for Dorchester & New College	Housing	New HELAA461	
LPR-B-369	Land east of Adderbury	Adderbury	59.95	Savills for Hallam Land Management Ltd	Housing	Update HELAA403	
LPR-B-479	Land east of Heyford Road, Kirtlington	Kirtlington	0.65	Abbeymill Homes	Housing	Update HELAA319	
LPR-B-479	Land south of Main Street, Fringford	Fringford	0.52	Abbeymill Homes	Housing	New HELAA462	
LPR-B-479	Land west of Main Street, Fringford	Fringford	0.37	Abbeymill Homes	Housing	New HELAA463	
LPR-B-479	Land East of Barford Road, Bloxham	Bloxham	1.7	Abbeymill Homes	Housing	New HELAA464	
LPR-B-481	Land at Loop Farm, Woodstock Road, Wolvercote	Gosford and Water Eaton	23	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Mixed	New HELAA465	
LPR-B-494	Land at south east Bicester	Bicester	75	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Housing / community	Update HELAA422	
LPR-B-523	Land east of Oxford Road, North Oxford	Gosford and Water Eaton	75	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Housing	New HELAA466	
LPR-B-534	Land east of South Newington Road, Bloxham	Bloxham	7.75	Define for William Davies Homes	Housing	New HELAA467	
LPR-B-543	Land to the west of Hook Norton Road, Sibford Ferris	Sibford Ferris	6.8	Land & Partners for Mr & Mrs Bishop	Housing	Update HELAA321	
LPR-B-544	Land south west of Adderbury	Adderbury	65	Rosconn Strategic Land for HRN Stilgoe	Housing	New HELAA468	
LPR-B-545	Land north and south of Milton Road, Bloxham	Bloxham	17.65	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey UK Limited	Housing	Update HELAA100	
LPR-B-546	Land north of The Moors, Kidlington	Kidlington	21.5	The Bulford Trust	Mixed	Update HELAA152	
LPR-B-547	Land north of Broughton Road, Banbury	Banbury	7.5	Savills for Lone Star Land	Housing	New HELAA469	
LPR-B-547	Land at Bretch Hill, Balmoral Avenue, Banbury	Banbury	3.15	Savills for Lone Star Land	Housing	Update HELAA035	
LPR-B-551	Land at Banbury Road, Deddington	Deddington	Not provided	Wood Group for Bloor Homes	Housing	Update HELAA323	
LPR-B-563	Land south of Green Lane, Chesterton	Chesterton	14.8	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Housing	Update HELAA359	
LPR-B-567	Land at Withycombe Farm, Bretch Hill, Banbury	Banbury	13.75	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Housing	Update HELAA027	
LPR-B-568	BSA Sports Facility, Akeman Street, Chesterton	Chesterton	24.7	Barton Willmore for Bicester Sports Association	Leisure	Update HELAA349	
LPR-B-572	Land to the west of the M40 and north of the A34, Weston on the Green	Weston on the Green	70	Fisher German for Mr N Godwin and Mr and Ms P Beecroft	Mixed	Update HELAA392	
LPR-B-573	Land adjoining Judges, Wardington	Wardington	10.8	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard Tuthill	Housing	Update HELAA400	
LPR-B-573	Land off The Greensward, Wardington	Wardington	4.6	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard Tuthill	Housing	Update HELAA401	
LPR-B-575	Land between the M40/A41 and Graven Hill, south of Bicester	Wendlebury / Merton	238.5	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Housing / mixed	New HELAA470	
LPR-B-579	Land off Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden - Parcel 1	Blackthorn	3.45	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Housing	Update HELAA406	
LPR-B-579	Land off Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden - Parcel 2	Blackthorn	2.8	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Housing	Update HELAA407	
LPR-B-580	Land to the west of Fringford, Fringford	Fringford	0.9	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Housing	Update HELAA399	
LPR-B-580	Land to the north of Epwell Road, Shutford	Shutford	3	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Housing	Update HELAA202	



LPR-B-581	Land at North East Bicester	Bicester	191	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Housing / commercial / mixed	Update HELAA337	
LPR-B-581	Land north of Launton	Launton	6.4	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Housing	Update HELAA449	
LPR-B-594	Land north of The Bourne, Hook Norton	Hook Norton	4.9	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Housing	Update HELAA139	
LPR-B-598	Land off Stocking Lane, Shenington	Shenington with Alkerton	2.8	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Housing	Update HELAA421	
LPR-B-600	Land to the east of Claydon Road, Cropredy	Cropredy	10.9	Carter Jonas for Obsidian Strategic	Housing / mixed	Update HELAA388	
LPR-B-614	Farmstead at Manor Farm, North Street, Islip	Islip	1.37	Lichfields for The Church Commissioners for England	Housing	New HELAA471	
LPR-B-614	Land at Manor Farm, Lower Street, Islip	Islip	0.1	Lichfields for The Church Commissioners for England	Housing	New HELAA472	Invalid - does not meet size threshold
LPR-B-616	Land off Tadmerton Road, Bloxham A	Bloxham	3	Gladman	Housing	New HELAA475	
LPR-B-616	Land off Tadmerton Road, Bloxham B	Bloxham	9.8	Gladman	Housing	New HELAA474	
LPR-B-616	Gladman land interests in Arncott	Arncott	Not provided	Gladman	Housing / mixed	New HELAA473	
LPR-B-618	Land north of Inkerman Farm, Souldern	Souldern	10.2	Acorus for Philip Hazell	Housing	New HELAA476	
LPR-B-622	Land at Crowmarsh Farm, Bicester Road, Bucknell	Bucknell	78.2	Mark and Susan Gammond	Mixed	New HELAA477	
LPR-B-631	Land at Crockwell House Farm, Great Bourton	Bourton	2.59	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Housing	New HELAA478	
LPR-B-638	Land north of Station Road, Launton	Launton	5.7	Savills for Richborough Estates	Mixed	Update HELAA179	
LPR-B-640	Land to the south east of Woodstock	Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp	49	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Mixed	Update HELAA329	
LPR-B-640	Land to the north of Webbs Way, Kidlington	Kidlington	9.8	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Housing	Update HELAA168	
LPR-B-640	Land to the west of Banbury Road, Adderbury	Adderbury	14.2	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Housing	Update HELAA007	
LPR-B-641	Land north of Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden	Ambrosden	17	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land Management Ltd	Housing	New HELAA479	
LPR-B-641	North West Bicester (east) - Land north west of Lords Lane, Bicester	Bicester	130	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land Management Ltd	Housing	New HELAA480	
LPR-B-645	Land at Junction 11 M40, Banbury	Banbury	75	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Employment	New HELAA481	
LPR-B-648	Land north of Merton Road, Ambrosden	Ambrosden	7.3	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Housing	Update HELAA376	
LPR-B-648	Land south of Park Farm Close, Ambrosden	Ambrosden	1.4	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Housing	Update HELAA016	
LPR-B-651	Land at Grimsbury Reservoir Water Treatment Works, Banbury	Banbury	37.9	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Employment	New HELAA482	
LPR-B-651	Land at Buckingham Road, Bicester	Bicester	1.5	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Housing	New HELAA483	
LPR-B-651	Thames Water Kidlington Depot, Kidlington	Kidlington	3.4	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Employment	Update HELAA171	
LPR-B-651	Former Lagoon at Banbury Sewerage Treatment Works,	Banbury	Not provided	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Not provided	Update HELAA381	
LPR-B-651	Land at Bretch Hill Reservoir, Bretch Hill, Banbury	Banbury	0.311	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Not provided	Update HELAA382	
LPR-B-652	Shipton Quarry, Shipton on Cherwell	Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp	200	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Mixed	New HELAA484	
LPR-B-656	London Oxford Airport, Langford Lane, Kidlington	Kidlington	206	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd	Commercial, C1, C2	Update HELAA162	
LPR-B-657	Frieze Farm, North Oxford	Kidlington	Not provided	Turnberry for Exeter College	Not provided	Update HELAA425	
LPR-B-660	Hanwell Rise, Land at Hardwick Hill, Southam Road, Banbury	Banbury	15.8	Thakeham Homes Ltd	Housing	Update HELAA387	
LPR-B-678	Land off Bloxham Road, Milcombe	Milcombe	6.04	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Housing	Update HELAA186	
LPR-B-683	Land at North West Bicester	Bicester	22.48	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Housing	New HELAA485	
LPR-B-710	Land at Junction 10 M40, Ardley	Stoke Lyne	19.8	Greystoke CB	Employment	New HELAA486	
LPR-B-711	Land north of Green Lane and east of The Hale, Chesterton	Chesterton	3.09	Carter Jonas	Housing	New HELAA487	
LPR-B-831	Land to the east of Warwick Road, Banbury	Banbury	12.45	Turley for Vistry Group	Housing	New HELAA488	
LPR-B-832	Land at M40 Junction 11, Nethercote, Banbury	Banbury	47.8	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Employment	New HELAA489	
LPR-B-832	Land south west of Graven Hill, Bicester	Merton	38.8	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Housing / mixed	New HELAA490	

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 22

Representation Number	Respondent	Question or Option Number	Comments
LPR-B-001	Eric Baldwin	General	Is there any point as you have not listened to the residents in Begbroke and the surrounding area and are clearly in the pockets of Oxford University colleges who wish to sell land.
LPR-B-002	Michael Davy	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Requirement should be introduced for all new developments, residential and commercial to incorporate PV panels on the roofs.
LPR-B-002	Michael Davy	Bloxham	Comments relate to Bloxham. Air quality has deteriorated due to increased traffic movements following large scale development, including a noticeable increase in traffic through the village. To mitigate climate impact we need to radically re-think the way in which we live. Banbury town centre is in dire need of regeneration. Decisions to grant the Gateway retail park has negatively impacted the town centre. It would be beneficial for local communities to benefit directly from the allocation of Section 106 funds rather than them being redirected to other areas.
LPR-B-002	Michael Davy	Option 30	future developments should be concentrated in urban areas and not in rural areas which do not have the infrastructure to support an increase in population. Development on previously occupied sites, such as Upper Heyford, should also be supported but with the proviso that the infrastructure must be developed to meet the increased need.
LPR-B-003	David Rogers	Option 1	The plan should support OCCG to develop a plan suitable to ensure delivery of new primary care infrastructure. Recent developments in the council area have not included primary care contributions. A safe and suitable cycle route from Oxford to Banbury should be considered. Queries plans for managing surface water flooding and to mitigate climate change to manage cumulative surface water.
LPR-B-004	Bioscan	LPR-A-017	comments relate to land adjoining Charbridge Lane, SE Bicester, primarily the southern parcel of land. The site is unsuitable for built development due to its high nature conservation importance as part of the Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and its inclusion within the River Ray Conservation Target Area (CTA). The site lends itself very well to the delivery of biodiversity enhancements required as a consequence of development elsewhere. This might be other development land owned by the promoter, or as a repository for the delivery of biodiversity enhancements in order for other developments in the District to be able to deliver 'net gain'. This provides a much more appropriate means to secure the appropriate management and future security of this part of the Local Wildlife Site than sacrificing around half of it to residential development. Securing the future of this part of the Local Wildlife would enable it to continue to form an essential part of the corridor of protected green infrastructure of high wildlife and potential amenity value that runs along the southern side of the railway, extending eastwards from Bicester to connect with the constellation of high value nature conservation sites and BBOWT reserves in the Upper Ray catchment. On a more strategic level, the incongruity of any housing scheme here in the context of the direction of travel of surrounding green infrastructure and masterplanning, and the weighty policy constraints against any such idea, militate against any development and, crucially there is in any event no need for any such enabling development
LPR-B-005	King's Sutton Parish Council	Option 30	Concerns regarding level of additional traffic generated. Coalescence of Banbury and the surrounding villages should be avoided to allow villages to retain individual identities. Ensure necessary infrastructure is in place to cope with new housing
LPR-B-006	Lawrence Putt	LPR-A-049	proposed development site at LPR-A-049 is full of natural wildlife including wild birds, rabbits, squirrels, bats and muntjacs. Risk of flooding from existing fields which currently flood. Increased use of the Woodlands estate for car parking to access the local school as a result of more housing. Negative Impact upon existing walking routes and views. Additional pollution
LPR-B-006	Lawrence Putt	Option 30	New housing developments should be considered as "standalone" sites, not on the doorsteps of existing housing and should not compromise existing natural environment, views and walks.
LPR-B-007	Lenka Sherry-Sole	Bloxham	Comments relate to Bloxham. Consideration needs to be given to additional shops and schools if the village is to expand; existing schooling capacity issues. The high street is dangerous and walking to the local school is dangerous. Would prefer no further housing in the village as the village vibe diminishes with each new estate built.
LPR-B-008	Alistair Johnson	Bloxham	Comments relate to Bloxham. the resources inc schools and doctors are already at full capacity. Any future development of the village needs to take in to account these facilities. Further the road network through the village is already congested. Does Bloxham need a bypass or improvements to the A361? Also Milton road has become a rat run and needs improvements to reduce cars speeding as they enter and leave the village

LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	LPR-A-045	Considered by the community to be unnecessary, disproportionate, undesirable and unsustainable. They would undermine the housing strategy in the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, which seeks to distribute new housing to the most sustainable locations with regards to public services and facilities, transport and employment. It also undermines the Oxford 2050 policies which focus on the 5 themes of addressing climate change, improving environmental quality, creating strong and healthy communities, planning for sustainable travel and connectivity and creating jobs while providing homes. All of the sites being put forward are on excellent agricultural land located with far reaching views close to the AONB. This land should be protected and preserved for agricultural purposes. The historic character of the area and its historic sensitivity should be protected. Any further development would have further negative visual impact on the rural character and appearance of the locality and cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, open rural countryside and rural edge of village setting, failing to reinforce local distinctiveness. Existing infrastructure is at its limit with limited potential for expansion. Extension beyond the built limits of the village on a greenfield site. The sewage, water and power are aged and have had issues coping with current volumes in recent years. The ability of the foul and waste water system to handle an increase in volume could impact the service provided to all residents
LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	LPR-A-068	Considered by the community to be unnecessary, disproportionate, undesirable and unsustainable. They would undermine the housing strategy in the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, which seeks to distribute new housing to the most sustainable locations with regards to public services and facilities, transport and employment. It also undermines the Oxford 2050 policies which focus on the 5 themes of addressing climate change, improving environmental quality, creating strong and healthy communities, planning for sustainable travel and connectivity and creating jobs while providing homes. All of the sites being put forward are on excellent agricultural land located with far reaching views close to the AONB. This land should be protected and preserved for agricultural purposes. The historic character of the area and its historic sensitivity should be protected. Any further development would have further negative visual impact on the rural character and appearance of the locality and cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, open rural countryside and rural edge of village setting, failing to reinforce local distinctiveness. Existing infrastructure is at its limit with limited potential for expansion. Extension beyond the built limits of the village on a greenfield site. The sewage, water and power are aged and have had issues coping with current volumes in recent years. The ability of the foul and waste water system to handle an increase in volume could impact the service provided to all residents. Site is totally disproportionate in relation to the size of our village and for all the points mentioned above should not be included in the next local plan as a potential site.
LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	LPR-A-139	Propose that this site is removed and allocated as green space for the community. Considered by the community to be unnecessary, disproportionate, undesirable and unsustainable. They would undermine the housing strategy in the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, which seeks to distribute new housing to the most sustainable locations with regards to public services and facilities, transport and employment. It also undermines the Oxford 2050 policies which focus on the 5 themes of addressing climate change, improving environmental quality, creating strong and healthy communities, planning for sustainable travel and connectivity and creating jobs while providing homes. All of the sites being put forward are on excellent agricultural land located with far reaching views close to the AONB. This land should be protected and preserved for agricultural purposes. The historic character of the area and its historic sensitivity should be protected. Any further development would have further negative visual impact on the rural character and appearance of the locality and cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, open rural countryside and rural edge of village setting, failing to reinforce local distinctiveness.
LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	Sibford Ferris	Bus services were further reduced in Oct 2021, with the service having more than halved in recent years. Existing service is not convenient and routes are limited. The road conditions are bad and roads are so narrow that pavements cannot be provided. There is limited street lighting. Due to a lack of local facilities and services, the private car is often the only option. Due to steep hills and road full of potholes cycling is only for the courageous few. Roads are dangerous due to parked cars and lack of pavements. Support development that is in urban areas on brown field sites. Adding more good agricultural land will not encourage developers to complete urban developments
LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris	Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower wish to seek reclassification to two separate villages regarding planning status. We have separate Parish councils and the community is separated by 1 mile and a steep valley, narrow and in parts without pavements. The classification as a category A village is not appropriate and the facilities and job opportunities are severely limited. A recent planning inspector for the Hook Norton Appeal case stated "Given the spread of services across each settlement it is unlikely that the development of any site around the Sibfords would readily enable access by sustainable transport modes. This is an argument against the inclusion of the Sibfords as a Category A village but is not a matter before me in this Appeal." The current Category A village is not a true reflection of our community and its facilities. Expect this to be revised through the new local plan
LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	We strongly urge that a new clear policy on how the impact of excessive traffic is assessed in rural areas where development is being proposed. This policy needs to be revised and legally defined to protect small villages on unsuitable minor roads to be protected from speculative developments that have little regard inappropriate and excessive traffic and the impact that has on the community physically, mentally and emotionally.
LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	Option 32	no.2 Giving additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling. Travel is not sustainable and job opportunities severely limited, if any at all. Air quality and noise pollution due to the large number of privately owned cars is already impacting the village and will be made worse by the construction and work vehicles for the major development being constructed from 2022 by Gade homes on the Hook Norton road site.
LPR-B-009	Sibford Ferris Parish Council	Option 30	no.1 Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. The population is only 470 in Sibford Ferris. We would like to question how active applications on the housing register with preferences to living in Sibford Ferris are used to determine local needs? Local needs in Sibford Ferris have already been exceeded with Gade homes building 25 new homes with 9 affordable, shared ownership, housing association properties. We would like to question why Homes with permission at 31 March 2021 in rural areas are N/A on the above chart (Table 1 from page 18 of the local plan review document)?

LPR-B-010	Andrew Lawson	Chesterton	Comments refer to Little Chesterton. looking carefully at the shaded areas surrounding us every field appears to be chosen for future development no indication as to whether residential or commercial. Effectively our hamlet has been thrown under a bus. I am indignant and I would object, however having witnessed the debacle of the Great Wolf development and shortly the Bicester Sports Association expansion nothing surprises me, but I see little point in objecting as local democracy has all but vanished in the face of government policies.
LPR-B-011	James O'Neill-Brande	LPR-A-068	Comments relate to Sibfords. Goes against climate aspirations, government policy re no building on green fields and against the ability for current infrastructure to cope with further development. Site is within an AONB. Negative impact upon Grade II Listed building (Little London) which sits to the front of the site. Sibfords is not suitable for further development with lack of infrastructure and sustainable development, and will be exceptionally harmful to the environment and climate. No further planning applications for housing in Sibford Gower or Sibford Ferris.
LPR-B-012	Gerard Flynn	Bloxham	Comments relate to Bloxham. Previous expansions have resulted in some cost to the inhabitants, more traffic, extra pressure on local services, loss of Green Belt and erosion of village identity. Bloxham has contributed enough new-build housing, over the past decade. Any further development would lead to further destruction of the precious Green Belt and overload local services and infrastructure. The proposed building on these green spaces, adjacent to the village, will remove important wildlife habitats and damage the rural environment irrevocably. This type of development is <b>certainly not sustainable, as defined by the CDC in the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan, Nov 2015.</b>
LPR-B-013	Nick Allen	Hanwell	Comments relate to Hanwell. Further development at Banbury will bring development closer to Hanwell. Will remove wildlife. Conflicts with Cherwell's core strategy as merging villages in to Banbury will not maintain its rural character. Proposals will destroy the local identity of Hanwell. Additional strain on existing infrastructure, further worsening the already terrible congestion around the town and to the M40. Any development that merges a village into a town cannot possibly enhance the setting of the village. The draft plan directly and completely destroys the open and agricultural setting and identity of Hanwell village.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Bloxham	Will resist developments within the Parish Boundary or nearby which: narrows the gap between Bloxham and other communities; impacts negatively on Bloxham's current spatial 'feel' as set out in the Neighbourhood Development Plan; expands the accepted built-up boundary of Bloxham; will have a detrimental impact on infrastructure especially schools, shopping facilities and transport routes; is larger than developments since 2015 (95 houses); on a greenfield site; and, seeks development in key 'Valued Landscapes. We strongly recommend specific discussions on the issue of <b>coalescence with the relevant local councils to develop a co-ordinated approach to these 'Valued Landscapes.</b>
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 1	Welcomes the general direction of the key themes in the local plan and the approach being taken to secure sustainability.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 1	Generally good. This could be strengthened by something about interrelationships. What is Cherwell's distinctive contribution to Oxfordshire and the region, including the OxfordCambridge Arc? What can be said about the interrelationship of settlements and their diverse and distinctive contributions to the District? This would recognise the need to ensure an approach to future development <b>which reflects this issue.</b>
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 2	Broadly welcome as a balanced suite of objectives.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 3	We would suggest No. 5. The first four options should form the hierarchy for employment land development as they seem to be in the right order. So sites should be sought at main urban centres, then significant transport interchanges, then other previously developed land, finally at the larger villages
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 4	Our preference would be for a different way of looking at this issue: development outside existing settlement boundaries should be resisted; mixed use sites should be adopted where possible, however this should specifically exclude leisure and retail; and, there should be a clear push towards their renewal and out of town retail and leisure should be resisted.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Supporting	Attention should be given to developing diverse and sustainable employment opportunities in order to secure a wide spectrum from 'entry' level <b>employment through to very high quality jobs, with the aim of providing a clear career future for the workforce</b>
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 5	Rather than trying to write a policy which seeks to anticipate what development should be encouraged across the district, is there not scope to <b>consider each town (and village) centre on its merits and have a flexible plan for each, then explore specific local gaps'</b>
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Supporting our Town	Village retail development or expansion needs to be carefully balanced against parking etc. as in most villages, especially the larger ones, this is a problem.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 6	Our preference would be for No. 1, it would at least raise the starting point of negotiations with developers. While recognising the need for affordable housing, Bloxham has grown by around 20% since 2015, whilst Cherwell District as a whole has seen an increase of around 10% in households in the same period. It considers that, for any future potential development to be acceptable, opportunities to strengthen Bloxham must clearly outweigh risks <b>to its character, sustainability and viability as a community and place.</b>
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 7	It would seem to be better to seek different levels in different locations, perhaps driven by local plans and existing levels in particular places.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 8	We prefer No. 1 as otherwise private rental housing would fall out of this requirement.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	Possibly, but this needs careful consideration in relation to housing density pressures, as mentioned by CPRE.

LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 9	Unsure what the advantage is in a separate policy over and above the new buildings regulations standards. This needs to be explained. It would seem sensible to have some clear policies as suggested on conversion of rural buildings, modular housing, retail to housing conversions, housing in multiple occupation etc
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	It would seem sensible to have some clear policies as suggested on conversion of rural buildings, modular housing, retail to housing conversions, housing in multiple occupation etc.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 10	Why is a choice required? Whatever standards are set they should be defensible at any planning appeal, straightforward for developers to understand and anticipate, and if locally defined, straightforward to develop and administer. So it would seem sensible to opt for No. 1 and/or 2 but retain the right to flexibility for any special local issues.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	This section seems to conflate 'legacy' properties with buildings that have historic/heritage importance. It would seem sensible to develop a set of categories and then have policies for each, including bespoke policies for specific buildings. Heating type and provision is likely to be a huge problem for all existing buildings both in terms of requirements and financing. Special provision will need to be made for Listed Buildings, electric vehicle charging provision likewise.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 11	Surely this should be both/and rather than either or? Identify potential sites and then the suitability of the type of renewable energy proposed, and assess any proposals for non-identified sites on the same basis.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We need to ensure that there is a requirement to provide electric car charging infrastructure generally and in particular to take the opportunity to provide it in all new builds, not just the parking area mentioned in NPPF.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	We would like to see Green Belt status for key rural areas surrounding Banbury and Bicester, but understand the difficulties in doing this. Instead, we propose securing 'Valued Landscape' status for these and have proposed four for Bloxham.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 12	This seems to be a false "either/or" choice. It would be better if it were seen to be a hierarchy of solutions, with offset payments only used as a last resort.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 13	No. 2 would seem to be the most sensible if the plan's objectives are to be secured.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 14	No. 1 seems to seek to impose planners' and developers' preconceptions on play, with attendant high maintenance requirements. It would seem better to ensure an emergent approach such as No. 3. A more flexible approach would seem a good idea, rather than the blanket approach of planting a standard play area in each new development without assessing other factors in the area
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 15	Suggest both No. 2 and 3 provided that it is possible to avoid long 'commutes' to hubs. It may require a mixed approach depending on viability and maintenance questions.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	In addition to those already mentioned in our Neighbourhood Plan, we would also highlight the Weavers fields area between Wellington Park and The Mill Trading Estate.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	It is good to see that CDC produced an SPD to give further detail on what constitutes 'good design' – it is a laudable aim but it is hard to see how it can be achieved without detailed criteria. Beauty is of course a subjective requirement but even so is, we would suggest, incompatible with, for example, the homes and developments built in Bloxham by Bloors and Millers or by Bloor homes in Chipping Norton. They nod to local characteristics, but are they beautiful? From the evidence we have seen Developers' principal interest is in mass housing provision, not aesthetics. How is beauty to be assessed and enforced?
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Agree that 20 minute neighbourhood is desirable, and that a key feature of Bloxham is that it is one and should remain so.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	General approach is agreed, with the added point that congestion is a contributing factor to emissions problems. Not sure that the principle of reducing the need to travel should be any different for rural areas, however perhaps time taken rather than distance travel would be a better measure of impact. Measures might include further public transport improvements, especially those off A361, clubs/sharing and voluntary driver schemes.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 16	These are not mutually exclusive and seem to be sensible elements of a future strategy, with the additional point that some developments may tip a local area into requiring a step change in provision, for example relating to bandwidth thresholds or the viability of different forms of digital infrastructure, and any conditions should reflect this.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	It will be interesting to see the LTP4 next year as it seems that CDC will use that to inform some policies.

LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 17	It would seem sensible to review and update the methodology in line with the vision and objectives of the local plan, so choose No. 1 over 2. No. 3 and 4 are not alternatives to 1 & 2. They are not mutually exclusive and it would seem sensible to consider both
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Delivering infrastructure	There seems to be an omission of anything relating to primary care, hospital and other health provision. This seems to be an important gap and should be addressed. Emerging proposals relating to the Horton Hospital, and the requirements of further developments will need to be monitored carefully
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 18	Further urban extensions into open countryside should be avoided and the current hierarchy and integrity of settlements maintained. This relationship is as much part of the history of the place as individual heritage assets. Depending on the approach to 19 this might require a limit to development. The travel hierarchy, focusing on an existing or new development, rather than Banbury is not desirable. It would be better to work to secure improved environmental, economic and social viability and sustainability of Banbury itself, within a clearly defined boundary.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 19	Development around Banbury has clearly been defined at least partly by the line of the M40 and the boundary with Northamptonshire, which is understandable, however this has arguably forced development further to the West, North and South of the centre. Accordingly sites to the East of the motorway should be actively considered. This might require amendment to the County and District boundary in order to address longer term planning and management issues.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes. Views of St Mary's Church should be protected along with the market place and Parson's street area, Horse Fair, South Bar Street.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 20	Our preference would be No. 1.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 21	This should be considered in the light of the Canalside's future role in relation to the rest of the town centre. Any development should help support the viability of the existing shopping areas, this could involve a combination of all three, depending on the mix of development in this site and elsewhere. It should not be considered as a separate entity.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 30	This should be a bottom-up exercise depending on local circumstances. This should probably be based on an assumption that development should be limited to local housing need, unless otherwise stated. For example a settlement might have direct housing need, but may welcome further housing provision to secure the future of, or introduce, much needed local services or infrastructure. So careful communication and negotiation with local communities, and cross-border cooperation, will be required before a District-wide picture could be produced.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 31	It would seem sensible to use a combination of both. Our approach to the proposed options sites sets criteria based on our neighbourhood plan and assesses each site on that basis.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 32	A settlement hierarchy could be useful, but depends on the categories used. A factor could be the relationship between each settlement and others, with the total 'weight' on facilities considered. So for us that might include Milcombe, South Newington, Wigginton, Milton etc. The methodology would be key. We think this is worth discussion during the development of any policy. Is what is needed a classification system rather than a hierarchy? For example, two villages might have similar facilities but one may be very stretched while the other may have capacity. Yet in a hierarchy they might be assigned the same level, based on population and the facilities available
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Settlement	Settlement boundaries they should be defined, if they reflect the Neighbourhood Plan and improve on it with further specific consultation.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 33	Probably best to consider a combination of the two, to allow for good opportunities that tie in with the plan's vision and objectives, but we would want to discuss how that would work in practice.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Option 34	Not sure these are mutually exclusive. It would be sensible to look at how both can be achieved in line with the points about Green Belt above. We would identify the following as 'Valued landscapes' in and around Bloxham: Sor Brook Valley; Slade Nature Reserve; Hobb Hill and its setting; and, land around Coates Spinney (North of Milton Road and close to St Mary's Church).
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Help with facilitation to revise our Neighbourhood Plan would be much appreciated.

LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	Parish Profile - Bloxham	<p>For all of the maps it would have been better to circulate these with aspects of the key policies maps from the existing local plan showing all currently approved sites, and not just those that have been built-out, in order to be able to assess the cumulative impact of new developments. Employment: There are no comments on employment in the profile which seems strange, for example Bloxham School is a significant local employer and there is a wide range of businesses in the village, ranging from those at Bloxham Mill to a large number of small/working from homebased businesses. It would have been helpful for the demographic information to show the current number of households in Bloxham. This would place the 232 completed dwellings since 2015 in context (17% of the 1350 noted in the Oxfordshire district data site, or a 21% increase on household numbers from 2015).</p> <p>Noted and welcomed comment relating to Ell's lane/Bloxham Grove and the Sor Brook Valley. This concern should also be extended specifically to other key green corridors/'Valued Landscapes' including Hobbs Hill and the Coates Spinney Valley to the East of St Mary's Church/North of Milton Road. page 4/5 of profile Odd not to mention Bloxham School on this list, or anywhere in the profile as a major property owner and Bloxham's largest employer. Ell's Lane Nursery should also be included as a facility/employer. It is also worth noting that unlike many other villages, Bloxham has no allotments and thus lacks an important, if small scale, contributor to good health and low food miles, any new development should be required to help facilitate this provision.page 6 of profile</p> <p>Wording of first bullet point of constraints needs checking, including river naming. Is it Sor Brook on both tributaries? Noted need to avoid development at or near the Slade Nature Reserve. Also to note range of bat species year-round in the area as well as swifts Wording of opportunities section needs checking. We continue to endorse the comment re: development management companies and green spaceWe have developed some thoughts on principles to adopt for this and about how to test each of the sites as set out in the plan, including those relevant ones in other parishes. All of them present challenges. If all were accepted they would represent around a doubling of Bloxham's population, but any response would need to be based on a careful assessments on each site on its merits and risks. We therefore need to think about underlying principles and criteria for a good assessment. responses provided have been based on the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan. Criteria for comments/assessment include community identity &amp; proportionality. Commentary provided in relation to the potential housing allocations including Bloxhams percentage share and a pro rata housing requirements estimates table. The figures show that even if Bloxham is required to take a prorata allocation, only 5% of the current proposed sites' total area would be needed at the lowest estimate. Even at the highest estimate just 19% of the proposed sites' total area would be required. The proposals for up to 2300 further houses on sites between Bloxham and other centres would put significant strain on the village and the surrounding area for the reasons described in our assessment.</p>
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-049	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - strongly object
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-052	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - strongly object
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-067	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - potentially acceptable.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-070	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - object, significant issues at Ell's Lane junction
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-075	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - strongly object
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-094	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - strongly object
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-100	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - strongly object
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-115	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Attractive on surface but object as counter to NP infill policy BL2 (usual upper limit of 5)
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-151	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - strongly object
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-116	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Strongly object: The map for Banbury shows only the existing developments, not those that are in the process of being built. These two proposals would further undermine the dwindling space between Banbury and Bloxham significantly continuing the trend towards coalescence, increase congestion and have an impact on the viability of the Sor Valley as a 'Valued Landscape' and green corridor between settlements.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-185	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Strongly object: The map for Banbury shows only the existing developments, not those that are in the process of being built. These two proposals would further undermine the dwindling space between Banbury and Bloxham significantly continuing the trend towards coalescence, increase congestion and have an impact on the viability of the Sor Valley as a 'Valued Landscape' and green corridor between settlements.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-156	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Object: These three proposals, together with the significant proposals to the East of Adderbury would continue the trend towards coalescence, increase congestion and have an impact on the viability of the Sor Valley as a 'Valued Landscape' and green corridor between settlements.



LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-258	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Object: These three proposals, together with the significant proposals to the East of Adderbury would continue the trend towards coalescence, increase congestion and have an impact on the viability of the Sor Valley as a 'Valued Landscape' and green corridor between settlements.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-091	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Object: These three proposals, together with the significant proposals to the East of Adderbury would continue the trend towards coalescence, increase congestion and have an impact on the viability of the Sor Valley as a 'Valued Landscape' and green corridor between settlements.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-137	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Strongly object: These three proposals are a step change and start a new trend towards coalescence between Bloxham and Milcombe. Taken together, and given Milcombe's comparatively smaller range of facilities, they could lead to over 500 new households seeing Bloxham as a natural 'centre' and the most direct route to Banbury and the main roads north and south, worsening an already challenging situation.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-158	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Strongly object: These three proposals are a step change and start a new trend towards coalescence between Bloxham and Milcombe. Taken together, and given Milcombe's comparatively smaller range of facilities, they could lead to over 500 new households seeing Bloxham as a natural 'centre' and the most direct route to Banbury and the main roads north and south, worsening an already challenging situation.
LPR-B-014	Bloxham Parish Council	LPR-A-231	acceptability criteria table submitted - concludes - Strongly object: These three proposals are a step change and start a new trend towards coalescence between Bloxham and Milcombe. Taken together, and given Milcombe's comparatively smaller range of facilities, they could lead to over 500 new households seeing Bloxham as a natural 'centre' and the most direct route to Banbury and the main roads north and south, worsening an already challenging situation.
LPR-B-015	Briony Franklin	LPR-A-045	larger volume of vehicles competing for space on the very narrow country roads. Bus services are sparse, making private transport the only option for villagers travelling to work. Main Street Sibford Ferris is so narrow as to be single track in places. Pedestrians are already at risk because the width of the road doesn't allow for pavements. Children have to be driven to Sibford Gower primary school because walking to school has become an increasingly dangerous option. Small villages like both the Sibfords need protecting from developments that endanger the lives of their inhabitants & the rural environment, while concreting over good agricultural land. increased level of pollution from traffic, plus an infrastructure (water, electricity, sewage) that will be overwhelmed by a considerable increase in the population. Development should be rejected.
LPR-B-015	Briony Franklin	LPR-A-068	larger volume of vehicles competing for space on the very narrow country roads. Bus services are sparse, making private transport the only option for villagers travelling to work. Main Street Sibford Ferris is so narrow as to be single track in places. Pedestrians are already at risk because the width of the road doesn't allow for pavements. Children have to be driven to Sibford Gower primary school because walking to school has become an increasingly dangerous option. Small villages like both the Sibfords need protecting from developments that endanger the lives of their inhabitants & the rural environment, while concreting over good agricultural land. increased level of pollution from traffic, plus an infrastructure (water, electricity, sewage) that will be overwhelmed by a considerable increase in the population. Development should be rejected.
LPR-B-015	Briony Franklin	LPR-A-139	larger volume of vehicles competing for space on the very narrow country roads. Bus services are sparse, making private transport the only option for villagers travelling to work. Main Street Sibford Ferris is so narrow as to be single track in places. Pedestrians are already at risk because the width of the road doesn't allow for pavements. Children have to be driven to Sibford Gower primary school because walking to school has become an increasingly dangerous option. Small villages like both the Sibfords need protecting from developments that endanger the lives of their inhabitants & the rural environment, while concreting over good agricultural land. increased level of pollution from traffic, plus an infrastructure (water, electricity, sewage) that will be overwhelmed by a considerable increase in the population. Development should be rejected.
LPR-B-016	Chris Franklin	LPR-A-045	Strongly object - entirely unjustified by any local need. Village is already congested, narrow roads inadequate for more traffic, bus service is virtually non-existent, private cars only means of travel. This site is a speculative and totally unnecessary extension to the already agreed (and much disliked) 25 home development on the Hook Norton Road. As above there is no need for additional housing in the village. Will generate more unnecessary traffic congestion in a location where additional housing is not required. The access onto the Hook Norton road, near the entrance to the Friends School, will be very dangerous with the likely massive increase in vehicle traffic. located on good agricultural land.
LPR-B-016	Chris Franklin	LPR-A-068	Strongly object - entirely unjustified by any local need. Village is already congested, narrow roads inadequate for more traffic, bus service is virtually non-existent, private cars only means of travel. This site lies outside the existing limits of the village. It is on good agricultural land. There is absolutely no need for additional housing in Sibford Ferris. The entrance to the village from Banbury is down a hill towards the village; any access would be dangerous.
LPR-B-016	Chris Franklin	LPR-A-139	Strongly object - entirely unjustified by any local need. Village is already congested, narrow roads inadequate for more traffic, bus service is virtually non-existent, private cars only means of travel. There is no identified need in the village for additional houses in this location. Access can only be via the new development onto the Hook Norton Road. Woodway Road is far too narrow to allow any additional vehicle access. It would mean more traffic / congestion on the Hook Norton Road. The land is good agricultural land. Any additional development will overload the facilities and infrastructure of the village.

LPR-B-017	Robin Grimston	Sibford Ferris	CDC is inviting supply of sites ahead of clarifying the demand for housing. The current published housing requirement is 22,840 homes for the period 2011 – 2031, amended only by the additional requirement to accommodate some Oxford City overspill housing. The latter is all to be accommodated in the parts of Cherwell District that are as close to Oxford City as possible. The Annual Monitoring Review of 2020 (AMR) records that 1,887 will have been completed in the rural villages by March 2021 with the final 347 (of which the 25 in Sibford Ferris are part) being completed by March 2024. The conclusion to be drawn is that there is no requirement for additional housing in the rural villages of Cherwell District, beyond Windfalls, before 2031. The adopted LP says that “...this local plan has a strong urban focus which seeks to direct housing towards Bicester and Banbury.” To meet this objective CDC needs to focus on Banbury and Bicester which does not square with calling for more sites in the rural villages. The sites being offered in Sibford Ferris have been offered before. The Cherwell District Council Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment February 2018 (HELAA) made the following comments on the Sibford Ferris sites. HELAA classified the Land at Folly Farm as unsuitable for development. The existing development along the land to the West of the Hook Norton of 25 houses will have exceeded the HELAA recommendation and this development will have rendered unnecessary the Woodway Road site. Following the recommendations of HELAA no further development should be considered for Sibford Ferris. the proposed Sibfords sites are least suitable locations in the whole of the district in terms of landscape value, agricultural value, lack of infrastructure, distance from main roads and places of employment.
LPR-B-018	Richard Bailey	LPR-A-231	Site regularly floods, development would result in flooding at neighbouring properties. Field contains rising springs and two footpaths. Greater Crested Newt occupy the field and stream. Vehicular access is not suitable for the development. Council should consider planting trees on the Fern Hill Field to protect the existing footpaths and offset CO2 created by the current Oak Farm development. photo of GCN provided with rep.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Deddington	Deddington Parish Council would like to establish very clearly that Deddington should not be classified as a Growth zone. The historic nature of the medieval village, the Scheduled Ancient Monument the extensive Conservation Area and the high number of listed buildings, the surrounding landscape, all combine to make the parish better suited as a “Protected Area”
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 2	Key objectives 10-19 are very laudable but there is very little specific detail on how these will be achieved. Questions raised: 1) Can consideration be made to providing a safe and suitable cycle route from Deddington to Banbury? (and to Oxford)? 2) What are the plans for managing surface water flooding? This issue will affect us all. The existing infrastructure was designed to standards that are no longer relevant. 3) What are your plans to manage the cumulative surface water that is collected by SuDS features (protecting the local estate) and then discharged into our waterways which flood areas downstream? Can consideration be given to accumulating developer contributions towards strategic flood defences? 4) What are your plans to protect existing homes from surface water flooding when the antiquated surface water drains are insufficient?
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 2	Key objective 28 - In this connection we consider S106 contributions are very important, and those concerning developer contributions towards Primary Care are of particular concern. There have been a number of recent developments in the Cherwell District Council area where Section 106 agreements have included no request from OCCG for a primary care contribution (e.g Salt Way, Longford Park, Hanwell Fields, Wolvercote). Is there any way that OCC and CDC could support OCCG to develop a plan suitable to deliver new primary care infrastructure as a part of the 2050 and ARC plans?
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 3	Favour no.2 with the aim of trying to wean people away from travelling by car.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 6	House prices are so disproportionately high in Cherwell’s villages that developers should still be able to make sustainable profits with a higher percentage of affordable homes. More homes that young people can afford should help keep villages alive and vibrant. In Deddington and probably other villages there is an unusually high proportion of over 65-year-olds.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 7	Favour no.2. Is there a misprint here? Should it be “30% affordable homes to buy” – ie, First Home and shared ownership? In Deddington, as we have ascertained from housing needs assessments, there is a possibly greater need for affordable homes to purchase than to rent. People are unable to get on to the CDC housing register but cannot afford the market rate for houses and flats in their home village. We would suggest 50% of affordable homes to purchase – in line with government policy – and we would prefer (insist on) some kind of mechanism that prevents them being sold thereafter at a market rate.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 8	Favour No.1. All new dwellings should at least meet national space standards. People paying top dollar for first homes should not be obliged to settle for homes with poky little rooms and no storage space.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	Yes, modern, alternative, stylish methods of construction should be encouraged, especially if they produce better insulated and more affordable homes.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 14	No.2 and No.3
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 15	Favour No.3. Some kind of sports provision should be available nearby where people live. Certainly Certainly not the 2nd option, whereby people would have to travel from the villages to the towns to play a game of football
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 16	Favour No.1 With more people working from home and the possibility of small workshops in rural areas, digital infrastructure and future proofing is essential. It should also have the crucial side benefit of reducing travel, congestion, pollution
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 18	Neither No.1 or No.3) seem very appealing, but preferable to No.2

LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Provide the information they need to create a viable plan – eg a target figure of the number of dwellings they should be aiming for, and what infrastructure will be needed.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 30	Favour No.1. Adding substantially more development in the rural areas would change the character of the whole district for the worse. Villages that CDC has hitherto striven to preserve would be over-extended, spoiling their beauty and rural identity. Most of the existing working population of, say, Deddington, currently commute to work by car. Focusing development in rural areas would add greatly to congestion and pollution – the very things CDC hopes to reduce in prioritising combatting climate change.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 31	Favour No.2. Many rural communities have completed or are currently working on neighbourhood plans which include sustainability studies on specific sites and housing needs assessments, indicating the type and numbers of housing needed. Neighbourhood planning teams have much closer understanding of their communities’ preferences and other local issues than the district council. It would be a slap in the face to neighbourhood planners and parish councils to impose district council choices on the villages. It would also be contrary to government strategy of encouraging local people to take local decisions.
LPR-B-019	Deddington Parish Council	Option 32	Favour No.2. In the interests of minimising pollution created by commuting and in the interests of work/life balance for the working population, accessibility of settlements to urban centres should be paramount.
LPR-B-020	Jules Cook	LPR-A-178	Development will have an enormous impact on wildlife. Building all of the LPR A-178, LPR- A-156, LPR-A- 081, LPR-A-002 and LPR-A- 156 will effectively turn Twyford into one massive, horrible estate. It will impact negatively on everything that currently gives the area charm and makes it a desirable place to live. The amenities in the area cannot sustain this sort of growth. Objects in the strongest possible terms to LPR-A-178.
LPR-B-020	Jules Cook	LPR-A-156	Development will have an enormous impact on wildlife. Building all of the LPR A-178, LPR- A-156, LPR-A- 081, LPR-A-002 and LPR-A- 156 will effectively turn Twyford into one massive, horrible estate. It will impact negatively on everything that currently gives the area charm and makes it a desirable place to live. The amenities in the area cannot sustain this sort of growth.
LPR-B-020	Jules Cook	LPR-A-081	Development will have an enormous impact on wildlife. Building all of the LPR A-178, LPR- A-156, LPR-A- 081, LPR-A-002 and LPR-A- 156 will effectively turn Twyford into one massive, horrible estate. It will impact negatively on everything that currently gives the area charm and makes it a desirable place to live. The amenities in the area cannot sustain this sort of growth.
LPR-B-020	Jules Cook	LPR-A-002	Development will have an enormous impact on wildlife. Building all of the LPR A-178, LPR- A-156, LPR-A- 081, LPR-A-002 and LPR-A- 156 will effectively turn Twyford into one massive, horrible estate. It will impact negatively on everything that currently gives the area charm and makes it a desirable place to live. The amenities in the area cannot sustain this sort of growth.
LPR-B-020	Sue Willis	Adderbury	Comments relate to Adderbury. Key concern relates to traffic resulting from the doubling the size of the village. Exiting respondents driveway is already difficult, increase in traffic from Adderbury sites and Bodicote's 850 homes will add to the difficult situation. Village is in danger of becoming part of Banbury and losing identity. No plans to bypass Banbury so traffic will be unbearable. Environmental impact will be huge; need to protect beautiful natural areas. Infrastructure not in place to accommodate doubling the size of the village
LPR-B-022	Catriona Reid	LPR-A-152	Extremely concerned about development of this site. Development would leave just metres between the edge of the conservation area down Gullicote Lane and track, which would not allow for any significant natural border as exists with the trees which hide the Banbury 5/Hanwell Chase development. Higher footfall in Hanwell resulting from recent developments, flytipping an issue, and traffic through the village is at an all time high. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. development of the site would not cherish, protect or enhance the distinctive natural and built environment. Development would not be consistent with Key objectives 5, 9 and 15. Development would result in coalescence.
LPR-B-022	Catriona Reid	LPR-A-214	Extremely concerned about development of this site. Higher footfall in Hanwell resulting from recent developments, flytipping an issue, and traffic through the village is at an all time high. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. development of the site would not cherish, protect or enhance the distinctive natural and built environment. Development would not be consistent with Key objectives 5, 9 and 15. Development would result in coalescence.
LPR-B-022	Catriona Reid	Option 18	suggest development is most appropriate to the East or South of Banbury where there is lesser prospect of incursion on neighbouring villages
LPR-B-022	Catriona Reid	Option 19	strongly support Option 2 to limit development at Banbury and protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. No objection to the development of sites LPR-A-154, LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-205, which would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages.
LPR-B-022	Catriona Reid	Hanwell	Comments relate to Hanwell. Before considering further expansion and development perhaps focus should be shifted to meeting existing healthcare service needs. Reference to the Hanwell Conservation Area document which identifies points which support the protection of open space and rural character.

LPR-B-023	Karen Turner	Adderbury	Comments relate to Adderbury. Infrastructure including schools cannot cope with the new residents and traffic proposed. More to offer families in Aynho, Kings Sutton, Charlton, Croughton, Deddington. Village could sustain a few more small pockets of new housing further out of the village but not the 1000s proposed. Development will result in no local fields to walk, wildlife and air quality will suffer and the area in general will suffer. Beautiful villages are being lost amongst the greedy developers who give little thought to the aesthetics of the area.
LPR-B-024	Hugo and Caroline Seely	LPR-A-107	Strongly object. Sites extend outside the built area of the village on agricultural land enclosed by mature trees and native hedgerows home to protected species. The land frames the wider Cotswolds AONB and can be seen from as far away as Broadway Tower. The land is sited on an area referred to as 'the Ironstone Downlands' and characteristic of the ironstone landscape west of Banbury, adjacent to the local hills of Long Hill, Yarn Hill, Epwell Hill, Gallow Hill and Brailes Hill. The site could generate over 350 new homes, with a population in excess of 700, which represents a population increase of 130% (current population estimated at 533 (ONS, 2019). Substantial increase in traffic and access to services and facilities which are unlikely to be able to absorb the increase in population. Existing roads are not suitable for existing traffic. Road passing the site is inappropriate for pedestrian use with no pavements. Water and sewerage provision for the current local community is already limited. Sibford Glover is a dark skies village- the elevated position will contribute to an unacceptable increase in light which will be visible for significant distances. Development of the site would be at odds with existing and proposed planning policy.
LPR-B-024	Hugo and Caroline Seely	Option 34	Rather than seek to source and offer new land for potential development, we believe that greater thought is needed to establishing new boundaries that protect the existing landscape. These proposed sites, part of the Ironstone Downlands, are of similar character to the adjacent Cotswolds AONB, but do not have the same protective status. The ridge to the north of the village of Sibford Gower contributes to the wider character of the north Cotswolds, providing expansive views west and an imposing and strong green skyline when viewed from Broadway Tower. Between them, these north-south ridge lines contribute to the wider landscape, framing the northern Cotswolds AONB.
LPR-B-025	Brown & Co.	LPR-A-165	Support the development. The two sites at Land at Mill Lane, Charlton-on-Otmoor are ideally placed to provide housing to support the existing services and facilities in the village and ensure the village thrives. Sites can assist with the provision of a wider mix of dwelling types. In line with para 69 of NPPF, the sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, are built-out relatively quickly and assist with maintaining a 5 year housing land supply. The sites are accessed down Mill Lane with a footpath on both sides of Mill Lane. The development would provide much needed housing for the village of Charlton-on-Otmoor. There will be economic benefits through the construction jobs created and from owner/occupiers using the services and facilities within the village and the wider area. There will be social benefits through the provision of market and affordable housing providing a mix of housing along with environmental benefits through strengthening the hedgerow and trees on the boundary of the site and providing a biodiversity net gain. Residential development at both sites at Land at Mill Lane, Charlton-on-Otmoor will provide much needed housing in Charlton-on-Otmoor to support the existing services and facilities in this rural community and also provide much needed housing across Cherwell.
LPR-B-025	Brown & Co.	Question - Green Belt	When defining Green Belt boundaries plans should not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open such as these sites and they should be released from the Green Belt.
LPR-B-025	Brown & Co.	Option 31	It is considered that a combination approach is used with a parish level figure for each area to ensure housing is delivered but also work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet the housing need and the two sites at Land at Mill Lane, Charlton-on-Otmoor are ideally placed to assist with the local housing need and to maintain and enhance the rural community
LPR-B-025	Brown & Co.	Option 32	if the Council develops a Rural Settlement Hierarchy it is important significant weight is given to existing services and facilities such as a Primary School, local Church and Public House. The Charlton-on-Otmoor Parish Profile shows in 2021 the services and facilities include a post office in the Community Hall 1 morning a week, a Primary School, two Churches, a recreation ground with children's play area and The Crown Public House and new housing development will enable this rural community to continue to be supported. It is not considered creating a settlement boundary is the right approach beyond which development would not normally be permitted as it can lead to pressure for development within the boundary on areas of open space which would not be appropriate.
LPR-B-026	Andrew Crawley	Option 30	Believes that the policy to build in large volumes on rural land, much of which is currently agricultural land is extremely short sighted. Every arable or pasture field that is changed to housing increases the strain on the food producing land that remains thus necessitating more and more intensive farming. This will inevitably reduce species diversity both in the plant and animal kingdom and will also increase pressure on our waterways and atmosphere. It is my belief that, given the scale on which the government wishes to build, this will become an unsustainable strain which will cause an ecological disaster in the UK.
LPR-B-026	Andrew Crawley	LPR-A-065	Comments relate to Hempton. Village has no pub, school, shops, playground or leisure facilities. Development would be extremely unwise. No bus service that serves the village therefore reliance will be on private car to access the nearest village (Deddington) for schools, facilities and to use the single shop that is there. Development of the fields would almost double the current population. Existing B4031 would need to be upgraded to cope with extra traffic. Water supply is via small pump located in Deddington. This pump breaks down a few times a year leaving us without running water for hours (or more) on occasions. The water pressure it does provide is pretty low at the best of times, so the mains water supply to Hempton would have to be substantially improved and updated to accommodate any new housing.
LPR-B-027	Epwell Parish Council	Option 30	The Village of Epwell has no public transport, narrow and poorly maintained roads and limited capacity for mass development with limited services and facilities The needs for limited and targeted local development has been identified in the Community Plan led by the residents and the parish council

LPR-B-027	Epwell Parish Council	Option 31	The Epwell Community Plan encourages those wishing to develop to liaise with the Parish Council prior to making any planning application. The residents have expressed preferences in the type, number and style of future housing. No specific area has been identified as potential development land in the Community Plan. Close cooperation with CDC to understand the level of contribution to housing stock expected from rural communities is paramount before appropriate development land can be identified by both the Parish Council and CDC.
LPR-B-027	Epwell Parish Council	Option 32	With the stated aim of central government and OCC in encouraging 20 minute neighbourhoods, villages with no public transport, located some distance from employment centres and with no services and facilities are unlikely to contribute to this aim. The existing village classification system based on the level of services and facilities has proved successful in limiting development in rural areas where large scale development would be inappropriate.
LPR-B-027	Epwell Parish Council	Option 33	Epwell Parish Council has in recent times supported rural businesses within the Parish boundary. The need for diversification is widely recognised. Whatever policy is adopted to support the local economy close consultation with Parish Councils and residents is necessary to ensure continued support.
LPR-B-027	Epwell Parish Council	Option 34	The vast Majority of residents support active management of wildlife habitats. Woodland, hedgerows streams ,ponds and verges The concept of "VALUED LANDSCAPES" is very subjective. Most people living in rural areas regard their local area as "VALUED" Those areas not afforded VALUE status would be less protected from inappropriate development.
LPR-B-027	Epwell Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Provide impartial free advice and expertise to communities wishing to draw up a Neighbourhood plan.The financial burden on a small village is prohibitive to many producing a detailed and legally recognised plan. Give more influence to a Community Plan that by necessity is less detailed, less expensive to produce but still reflects the wishes and aspirations of a community.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Option 2	Key objectives 10-19 are very laudable but there is very little specific detail on how these will be achieved. Questions raised: 1) Can consideration be made to providing a safe and suitable cycle route from Deddington to Banbury? (and to Oxford)? 2) What are the plans for managing surface water flooding? This issue will affect us all.The existing infrastructure was designed to standards that are no longer relevant. 3) What are your plans to manage the cumulative surface water that is collected by SuDS features (protecting the local estate) and then discharged into our waterways which flood areas downstream? Can consideration be given to accumulating developer contributions towards strategic flood defences? 4) What are your plans to protect existing homes from surface water flooding when the antiquated surface water drains are insufficient?
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Option 2	Key objective 28 - In this connection we consider S106 contributions are very important, and those concerning developer contributions towards Primary Care are of particular concern. There have been a number of recent developments in the Cherwell District Council area where Section 106 agreements have included no request from OCCG for a primary care contribution (e.g Salt Way, Longford Park, Hanwell Fields, Wolvercote). Is there any way that OCC and CDC could support OCCG to develop a plan suitable to deliver new primary care infrastructure as a part of the 2050 and ARC plans?
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 3	Favour No. 1 and No.2. No.1 as transport routes are focused on main urban centres. Support No.2 with the aim of trying to wean people away from travelling by car.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 6	Favour No.1. Raise the percentage requirement to 40% at least in the rural areas. House prices are so disproportionately high in Cherwell's villages that developers should still be able to make sustainable profits with a higher percentage of affordable homes. More homes that young people can afford should help keep villages alive and vibrant. In Deddington and probably other villages there is a unusually high proportion of over 65-year olds.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Option 7	Favour No.2 Is there a misprint here? Should it be "30% affordable homes to buy" – ie, First Home and shared ownership? In Deddington, as we have ascertained from housing needs assessments, there is a possibly greater need for affordable homes to purchase than to rent. People are unable to get on to the CDC housing register but cannot afford the market rate for houses and flats in their home village. We would suggest 50% of affordable homes to purchase – in line with government policy – and we would prefer (insist on) some kind of mechanism that prevents them being sold thereafter at a market rate.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 8	Favour No.1 All new dwellings should at least meet national space standards. People paying top dollar for first homes should not be obliged to settle for homes with poky little rooms and no storage space.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 14	Favour No.2. for all age approach and No.3.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 15	Favour No.3. Some kind of sports provision should be available nearby where people live. Certainly Certainly not the 2nd option, whereby people would have to travel from the villages to the towns to play a game of football

LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Question - Local Green Spaces	The steering group intends to put forward Local Green Spaces under the Deddington Neighbourhood Plan.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 16	Favour No.1 With more people working from home and the possibility of small workshops in rural areas, digital infrastructure and future proofing is essential. It should also have the crucial side benefit of reducing travel, congestion, pollution.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 18	Neither No.1 or No.3) seem very appealing, but probably best options
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Option 30	Favour No.1. Adding substantially more development in the rural areas would change the character of the whole district for the worse. Villages that CDC has hitherto striven to preserve would be over-extended, spoiling their beauty and rural identity. Most of the existing working population of, say, Deddington, currently commute to work by car. Focusing development in rural areas would add greatly to congestion and pollution – the very things CDC hopes to reduce in prioritising combatting climate change.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Option 31	Favour No.2 Many rural communities have completed or are currently working on neighbourhood plans which include sustainability studies on specific sites and housing needs assessments, indicating the type and numbers of housing needed. Neighbourhood planning teams have much closer understanding of their communities' preferences and other local issues than the district council. It would be a slap in the face to neighbourhood planners and parish councils to impose district council choices on the villages. It would also be contrary to government strategy of encouraging local people to take local decisions.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Yes. This would help to ensure that development takes place in the most suitable locations in terms of accessibility and infrastructure, as well as protecting local character and the landscape. Defined settlement boundaries provide greater certainty as to where certain types of development are likely to be acceptable in planning terms. This is also supportive of a planned approach to development. Many other LPAs have a policy of defining settlement boundaries, and this approach has also been followed in the Adderbury and MidCherwell Neighbourhood Plans.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Option 32	Favour No.2 In the interests of minimising pollution created by commuting and in the interests of work/life balance for the working population, accessibility of settlements to urban centres should be paramount. Weighting formulae can be arbitrary. A CRAITLUS type survey is needed of distances travelled from individual settlements to work destinations, average network distances, and proportion of workers travelling to each identified destination etc. It should not be a tick box exercise. The degree of usage of bus services should be analysed. Bus services in rural areas are frequently little used for a variety of reasons, so they don't contribute to reducing commuting. <a href="https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/84/evidencefor-adopted-local-plan-part-1/328/infrastructure-evidence/5">https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/84/evidencefor-adopted-local-plan-part-1/328/infrastructure-evidence/5</a> [Cf. Parish profile comments: For Deddington residents who work, Deddington is essentially a commuter village. According to the 2011 census, more than 90% of residents travel to work by car. There is a bus service Oxford/Banbury via Deddington but only 3.5% of population used public transport to commute to work. As the parish grows, this has serious implications for pollution control.]
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Question - Housing Policies	Yes, modern, alternative, stylish methods of construction should be encouraged, especially if they produce better insulated and more affordable homes.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Provide the information they need in a timely manner to create a viable plan – eg a target figure of the number of dwellings they should be aiming for, and what infrastructure will be needed.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 33	Favour No.1. Criteria-based policies are more focused, although risk not being respected.
LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Option 34	It is vital existing policies should not be diluted. Defining valued landscapes per No.2 would be useful additional protection.

LPR-B-028	Deddington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Sustainability Appraisal	representation provides an extract of table 3.5 from the sustainability appraisal and notes that the table is difficult to understand and interpret. Comments provided in relation to table 3.5 1. Air and wider env'l quality – This must be made worse by higher growth. The negative should be shown against Option 2. 2. Biodiversity – Higher growth means greater loss of habitat. Significant negative should apply to option 2. 3. Climate change mitigation – agree their finding. 4. Climate change adaptation- ? 5. Communities – Higher growth puts greater stress on services and infrastructure, which are not increased in proportion. Therefore a negative against higher growth. 6. Crime – more people means more crime, so moderate negative against Option 2. 7. Digital infrastructure = 8. Education and skills - = 9. Employment and Economic Growth – Higher growth means more car dependence and commuting, as employment prospects are not increased – significant negative against Option 2. 10. Flood risk - = 11. Health – Health services are not increased to match higher growth, so services will be more stressed. Negative against Option 2. 12. Historic environment. – Higher growth has an adverse effect on the historic environment. Significant negative against Option 2. 13. Homes – the only positive for Option 2 14. Land and soils – development means loss of agricultural land. Significant negative against Option 2. 15. Landscape – Development must cut off views of the landscape. It can't improve it. Significant negative against Option 2. 16. Poverty etc = 17. Transport – Significant negative against Option 2. 18. Waste – The local rivers are already polluted by sewage discharge. Higher growth will increase this. Significant negative against Option 2. 19. Water- Higher growth means greater demand for scarce resource. Moderate negative against Option 2.
LPR-B-029	Chris Wardley	Adderbury	Comments relate to Adderbury. The whole of the CDC exercise in terms of Adderbury is, in my view, totally out of proportion to almost every possible measure I can think of from the size of Adderbury now, the development which I have seen take place in the village in the last 23 years, the already totally inadequate highway network in and around the village, the facilities of the village, Adderbury's relationship to the town of Banbury whereby if even a small number of these sites were to be developed either as part of the new plan or as and when the five year land supply falls below the threshold (as it inevitably will fairly regularly as it has done) the village would simply become part of Banbury.
LPR-B-030	John Holloway	LPR-A-175	Firmly against any proposal that would jeopardise this village, its community and heritage. Expanding the village will loose its rural identity. Development would have a detrimental effect on the village and surrounding area. The village does not have amenities, services or utilities to support expansion. Key issues include: Traffic concerns relating to A361, already a hotspot for accidents; No Doctors Surgery in the village; Limited Bus Services to Banbury, and nothing on a Sunday; No Schools; Low water pressure; Intermittent power disruption; Sewage already is a problem within the village; No Village Shop; No mains gas supply; Countryside erosion; Wildlife disruption; Closure of public footpaths
LPR-B-031	Sam Patterson	Deddington	Comments relate to Deddington and surrounding villages (Clifton and Hempton). Developing on land surrounding Deddington imposes a serious risk on the local character, landscape and infrastructure. Any development in Deddington would cause further traffic in what is already an extremely busy traffic town. Concerns that Deddington does not meet the minimum air quality and noise pollution targets. The local school is at the heart of the cross roads in the village; the danger traffic already imposes on parents and children walking to and from school. An increase of heavy traffic as a result of further development would inevitably lead to a life threatening accident, of that I have no doubt. We have a neighbourhood team looking into local housing needs and they should be consulted with prior to any decision. Deddington has poor transport sustainability credentials and therefore does not have the infrastructure to support further development in the area without investment in these transport links. Deddington and the surrounding villages is to be deemed unsustainable and therefore should not be considered for development.
LPR-B-032	Paul and Jan Amond	Shutford	Comments relate to Shutford. Roads could not support construction traffic or traffic generated by developments. Local country lanes would be overloaded with large increase in delivery vans of transit size or bigger. Traffic coming from Banbury would cause a pinch point on the High street. No opportunity to widen the road from the junction of West St. down to the George and Dragon. The site at 5 ways junction, of the two sites earmarked, would appear to be the one site that would create the least disturbance to the village in terms of construction
LPR-B-033	Andy Watt	LPR-A-155	Strongly objects to development of this land. Site is unsuitable for housing development. Little or no access to public transport/amenities, and the adjoining marina and canal have suffered from flooding. Loss of jobs and income if the marina residents move away due to the precesnce of the new housing. Environmental impact of the development is concerning in terms of flooding. brownfield development would be more preferable. impact on existing residents of Kyetts Corner. More suitable sites elsewhere.

LPR-B-034	Andrew Robinson	LPR-A-171	<p>Development would almost double the population of the village; an unsustainable increase. Shutford does not have the infrastructure to meet a significant rise in population. The village has no bus service or shop and services. The existing road access and infrastructure is insufficient to meet the demands of modern day construction traffic and the potential congestion arising from significantly increasing the local population. There are very narrow roads, steep hills and multiple bends leading to the village (and within it) which would not support the increased car and HGV traffic arising from the proposal to build on the land. There is no street lighting for the majority of the village no on the roads used to access the village. There have been recurring mains water supply leaks observed in the village and further issues with drainage.</p> <p>The mains water supply and the waste water/sewerage infrastructure could need expensive upgrade to meet the demands of a significantly increased population. The loss of green belt land associated with the proposal would significantly reduce water infiltration. Reduced water infiltration and increased surface run off from newly developed land could increase flood risk within the village. There is no village school, or any school within safe walking distance. The nearest village primary school has a low pupil capacity (103), which would not meet a significant increase in population growth. There are also no pavements or cycle routes leading in to or out of village making villagers highly reliant on car usage to access any services. There are high levels of Radon gas within the area, increasing the long term health risk to residents from lung cancer. Radon gas issues would need to be addressed to safeguard new residents. Shutford is adversely affected by power cuts, with the electrical supply most unstable during inclement weather. More housing could place too much demand upon the existing supply. Although broadband is available within the village, the speed is relatively low in comparison to that within urban areas. A significant increase in local usage would bring down speeds further. there is no piped gas supply to the village, placing a reliance on expensive bottled gas, oil or wood. There is a very high content of iron stone under the ground in Shutford, with a previous mining permission to remove it from an area immediately adjacent to LPR-A-171. Applications to renew this permission to extract iron stone were recently refused on several grounds, one being the unsuitability of HGV access to the village via the existing road infrastructure. The proposed housing development would also incur similar HGV access issues. High iron stone content could create problems with the construction of the development. In winter conditions, the roads in and around Shutford are not gritted and leave residents stranded due to the steep hills and bends. Loss of rural view, unsustainable housing site.</p>
LPR-B-034	Andrew Robinson	LPR-A-004	<p>Development would almost double the population of the village; an unsustainable increase. Shutford does not have the infrastructure to meet a significant rise in population. The village has no bus service or shop and services. The existing road access and infrastructure is insufficient to meet the demands of modern day construction traffic and the potential congestion arising from significantly increasing the local population. There are very narrow roads, steep hills and multiple bends leading to the village (and within it) which would not support the increased car and HGV traffic arising from the proposal to build on the land. There is no street lighting for the majority of the village no on the roads used to access the village. There have been recurring mains water supply leaks observed in the village and further issues with drainage.</p> <p>The mains water supply and the waste water/sewerage infrastructure could need expensive upgrade to meet the demands of a significantly increased population. The loss of green belt land associated with the proposal would significantly reduce water infiltration. Reduced water infiltration and increased surface run off from newly developed land could increase flood risk within the village. There is no village school, or any school within safe walking distance. The nearest village primary school has a low pupil capacity (103), which would not meet a significant increase in population growth. There are also no pavements or cycle routes leading in to or out of village making villagers highly reliant on car usage to access any services. There are high levels of Radon gas within the area, increasing the long term health risk to residents from lung cancer. Radon gas issues would need to be addressed to safeguard new residents. Shutford is adversely affected by power cuts, with the electrical supply most unstable during inclement weather. More housing could place too much demand upon the existing supply. Although broadband is available within the village, the speed is relatively low in comparison to that within urban areas. A significant increase in local usage would bring down speeds further. there is no piped gas supply to the village, placing a reliance on expensive bottled gas, oil or wood. There is a very high content of iron stone under the ground in Shutford, with a previous mining permission to remove it from an area immediately adjacent to LPR-A-171. Applications to renew this permission to extract iron stone were recently refused on several grounds, one being the unsuitability of HGV access to the village via the existing road infrastructure. The proposed housing development would also incur similar HGV access issues. High iron stone content could create problems with the construction of the development. In winter conditions, the roads in and around Shutford are not gritted and leave residents stranded due to the steep hills and bends. Loss of rural view, unsustainable housing site.</p>
LPR-B-035	Steven Lock	Shutford	<p>Comments relate to Shutford. Roads are narrow and in poor state of repair; any increase in use of widening would destroy habitat, hedgerows, ponds, etc. Access from the proposed sites to the village amenities would be via a road with no suitable lighting or footpath. The geology of whole village is situated on ironstone thus making improvements to facilities both complex and costly. current infrastructure cannot support the present population adequately so any additional dwellings would require major improvements (e.g sewers). The village has no shop and few facilities; reliance will be on car; increase in vehicle movements would not support the carbon footprint reduction of the village. all development should prove environmental sustainability before progressing into the Cherwell Plan and thus supporting the zero carbon national objectives. The location of the village is not conducive to development except for infill where appropriate.</p>
LPR-B-036	James Macaro	Deddington	<p>Comments relate to Deddington. I would like to express my concerns about the proposed further housing developments for Deddington. I understand the need for houses but not on such a large scale. Deddington has already had a very big development at Deddington Grange and a smaller one at Windmill close. There are already further developments under way on the Clifton Road side. I don't believe Deddington has the capacity or infrastructure for any further large developments. I believe smaller scale developments around 510 acres would be more manageable.</p>



LPR-B-037	Claire Dalbeck	LPR-A-175	The village does not have the services to support double the number of people in the village. The scale of build is totally disproportionate to the size/ proportion of the village. Everyone who lives here has deliberately bought into a quiet, rural, picturesque village. development of the site would compromise everyone's way of life here and clash with the historic character of the place. The village has already been hit by the monstrous warehouses just off the motorway junction, and then double the size of it would be most unfair to all residents and the environment.
LPR-B-038	Ray Herd	LPR-A-175	Number of units proposed is out of keeping with the small and quiet village and would change its character. The village is conservation controlled with great historical and architectural interest. No schools or shops in the village, and insufficient services to maintain the proposed level of housing. The village is totally unsuitable for a development of this size. Vehicular access via the A361 is hazardous and difficult as it is currently. To increase this for the length of time necessary to build so many houses would necessitate severe disruption to villagers and all other road uses on this very busy road. Pollution of all types would reach an intolerable level. The concept of a bypass on the only feasible route around the village would be blocked by this development. Local GP services already under pressure and would be further stretched by new residents.
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Swalcliffe	Comments relate to Swalcliffe. The rural parish consists of around 100 households which has seen limited development with only 1 house built since 2015. the parish has some basic facilities including a community hall, pub, and woodland playpark. The conservation area was expanded in 2016 to include the majority of the current built up area. support the suggested vision for Cherwell which we believe establishes a framework for a vibrant and sustainable future.
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Option 1	focus on opportunities at larger settlements and planned growth locations
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Option 2	focus on Oxford-led growth. The character of Swalcliffe as an attractive and active rural village will best be maintained by offering limited affordable housing development for those working within a reasonable commuting distance, or those who work from home or in local businesses. Local services and infrastructure do not support expansion. There is one small shop in Sibford Ferris, otherwise the nearest shops are Bloxham or Banbury. There is one two lane road through the village (B4035); all others are narrow single rural lanes which are not suitable for significantly increased traffic.
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Option 30	Preferred option 1, limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Option 31	Preferred option 1, work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Option 32	Preferred option 2, give additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling. Comment. Swalcliffe is too far from Banbury for most to cycle or walk but an improved bus service may encourage residents to use this in place of a car to travel to Banbury and beyond.
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Option 33	Preferred option 3, combination of criteria-based policies and allocating sites to support the rural economy. Comment. As noted above, Swalcliffe already has a small but diverse rural economy and we encourage creative plans to develop this within the limitations of the parish infrastructure
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	Option 34	Preferred option 1, retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-039	Swalcliffe Parish Council	LPR-A-068	Strongly oppose the inclusion of LPR-A-068 in future iterations of this plan. This runs counter to the current strategy, which we believe remains extant, to limit growth in our rural areas and directing it towards larger and more sustainable villages (Para 4.3.1). It does not support the suggested vision for Cherwell, Point 10, "Our distinctive natural and built environment and our rich historic heritage is cherished, protected and enhanced. Cherwell maintains its rural character where its landscapes, its vast range of natural and built heritage and its market towns define its distinctiveness." Acceptance of such a development in the 2040 plan would go against the preferred rural options that we have proposed above. This development would destroy existing prime agricultural land. The addition of up to 85 houses on the boundaries of Sibford Ferris and Swalcliffe would completely unbalance both villages. The existing infrastructure, particularly the narrow country roads, would not support such an expansion and it would destroy their rural character.
LPR-B-040	Simon Lutter	Adderbury	Comments relate to Adderbury. Objects on environmental, road safety, pollution and loss of amenity grounds. It is unsustainable to build on fields that feed us. Proposals should be on brownfield sites not greenfield. Current sewerage and drainage will struggle with new development proposed. Queries how sewerage will be dealt with and whether Thames Water are being consulted. Queries the consideration given to waste collection services, policing, health, hospital and medical services will these be able to cope with the expansion plans? existing roads under strain currently, further development will make this worse and will consequently impact pollution levels. Additional traffic near Sir Christopher Rawlins School will impact pupils health. Additional traffic generated will affect highway safety. additional fumes from traffic is detrimental to health. Adderbury is a village and further increase in housing will lose that distinction and become part of Banbury. Additional housing on these fields will impact on the visual amenity to the detriment of the village. The proposed plan will impact on wildlife living on this land.
LPR-B-041	Richard Altham	Wardington	Comments relate to Wardington. Scale of development proposed is out of proportion to the existing village. Building large numbers of housing next to a Conservation Area would be an undesirable change in respect of the Wardington CA definition. Building more houses where the character of the surroundings wouldn't be affected and where large numbers of intensive housing have recently already been built and are continuing to be built would be better. Access to the site through the village is already a problem with no room to widen the road. The site should not be considered for development.

LPR-B-042	Cllr Hannah Banfield	LPR-A-185	Development should be directed to previously developed land and not greenfield sites. the current infrastructure capacity is insufficient at the M40 roundabout and the development of these areas would have an unacceptable impact on local roads. Existing issues at J11 of the M40, proposals would result in more traffic to the area that would further encourage traffic to local roads when there are incidents on the M40 J11 or A422. it would be prudent to resolve issues with the bottleneck of traffic at the M40 J11 roundabout. The proposal does not represent sustainable development as it fails to meet environmental objectives which include improving biodiversity and enhancing the natural environment. The area is a natural habitat for much wildlife. The area with its proximity to the M40 and the A422 gives the wildlife an unusual protection from human interference or disturbance. the allocation of this site would fail to respect the character of the countryside and the history of Banbury that is still preserved after the building of the M40 and A422.Public footpaths run through Nethercote, and is within walking distace of nearby residential estates. Potential flooding issues as result of removal of permeable surfaces. Land north ofthe M40 J11 is prone to flooding. Large scale commercial development does not consider residents in this quiet area and would bring unreasonable distrubances. Potential that there may be oil pipes running on the line (former Shell pipes). Queries what conservation protection can be given to the area?
LPR-B-042	Cllr Hannah Banfield	LPR-A-168	Development should be directed to previously developed land and not greenfield sites. the current infrastructure capacity is insufficient at the M40 roundabout and the development of these areas would have an unacceptable impact on local roads. Existing issues at J11 of the M40, proposals would result in more traffic to the area that would further encourage traffic to local roads when there are incidents on the M40 J11 or A422. it would be prudent to resolve issues with the bottleneck of traffic at the M40 J11 roundabout. The proposal does not represent sustainable development as it fails to meet environmental objectives which include improving biodiversity and enhancing the natural environment. The area is a natural habitat for much wildlife. The area with its proximity to the M40 and the A422 gives the wildlife an unusual protection from human interference or disturbance. the allocation of this site would fail to respect the character of the countryside and the history of Banbury that is still preserved after the building of the M40 and A422.Public footpaths run through Nethercote, and is within walking distace of nearby residential estates. Potential flooding issues as result of removal of permeable surfaces. Land north ofthe M40 J11 is prone to flooding. Large scale commercial development does not consider residents in this quiet area and would bring unreasonable distrubances. Potential that there may be oil pipes running on the line (former Shell pipes). Queries what conservation protection can be given to the area?
LPR-B-042	Cllr Hannah Banfield	LPR-A-034	Development should be directed to previously developed land and not greenfield sites. the current infrastructure capacity is insufficient at the M40 roundabout and the development of these areas would have an unacceptable impact on local roads. Existing issues at J11 of the M40, proposals would result in more traffic to the area that would further encourage traffic to local roads when there are incidents on the M40 J11 or A422. it would be prudent to resolve issues with the bottleneck of traffic at the M40 J11 roundabout. The proposal does not represent sustainable development as it fails to meet environmental objectives which include improving biodiversity and enhancing the natural environment. The area is a natural habitat for much wildlife. The area with its proximity to the M40 and the A422 gives the wildlife an unusual protection from human interference or disturbance. the allocation of this site would fail to respect the character of the countryside and the history of Banbury that is still preserved after the building of the M40 and A422.Public footpaths run through Nethercote, and is within walking distace of nearby residential estates. Potential flooding issues as result of removal of permeable surfaces. Land north ofthe M40 J11 is prone to flooding. Large scale commercial development does not consider residents in this quiet area and would bring unreasonable distrubances. Potential that there may be oil pipes running on the line (former Shell pipes). Queries what conservation protection can be given to the area?
LPR-B-043	Ivor Davies	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Supports the position that no further residential development is planned for Kidlington and the green belt beyond that identified in the Partial Review. The plan should commit to block further development until there is a very clear need for it. The text "Whether or not further growth (and Green Belt release for housing) is required at Kidlington is a matter for the Oxfordshire Plan." needs to be much clearer in intent to block further housing development.
LPR-B-043	Ivor Davies	LPR-A-024	should be allocated as green space as the site is used by many residents for leisure purposes.
LPR-B-043	Ivor Davies	LPR-A-224	should be allocated as green space as the site is used by many residents for leisure purposes.
LPR-B-043	Ivor Davies	LPR-A-156	should be allocated as green space as the site is used by many residents for leisure purposes.
LPR-B-043	Ivor Davies	Question - Travelling Communities	Would like to see a clearer statement wrt Travelling Communities in Kidlington – I note there are a number of development proposal in Kidlington, which I think are not appropriately sited, but its not clear how these are addressed by the plan
LPR-B-044	Anne Swain	Cropredy	Comments relate to Cropredy. Traffic and parking are an existing issue. More housing would have a detrimental impact on the nearest town of Banbury; access in to the town is a major problem at present. Doctors and schools in Cropredy have no spare capacity. Empty and derelict shops should be used in town centres to improve the area. Development for large scale housing would result in greenhouse gasses. Land would be better used as a resevier, create leisure facilities to generate business or plant woodland which would reduce impacts of global warming and may result in financial rewards for tree planting. No consideration given to existing residents. Cropredy is in the process of being spolit by overdevelopment similar to Banbury.

LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-175	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamscoote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities
LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-155	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamscoote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities
LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-202	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamscoote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities
LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-044	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamscoote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities
LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-088	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamscoote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities
LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-090	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamscoote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities

LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-114	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamsote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities
LPR-B-045	Peter Tinker	LPR-A-133	Comments relate to villages of Wardington, Williamsote, Cropredy, Great Bourton and Claydon. If the housing developments are to proceed, they should give consideration to improving facilities in these villages. Improvements include: 1. A health centre or cottage hospital, as an extension of the existing surgery at Cropredy for consultations with visiting specialists, thus avoiding the necessity for patients to travel to Horton or John Radcliffe Hospitals. 2. A variety of convenience shops and a post office within walking or cycling distance of the local villages. 3. An adventure recreation ground for children to tempt them away from bedrooms and keyboards. 4. Sports fields, tennis courts, clubs with coaching facilities. 5. If a new school is required, the design should include sufficient parking space for staff,visitors and school buses to avoid congesting the roads. 6. Space for office buildings and small workshops for potential start up businesses. The design of the houses should be as varied as possible and of the same standard and density as those in the existing villages. The new development should have its own name so that the existing villages retain their identities
LPR-B-046	Matt Foley	LPR-A-091	Obejct - roads in the area would not facilitate a new development and the work would be detrimental to the existing residents.
LPR-B-047	Phil Mansell	Adderbury	Comments relate to Adderbury. Exclusive emphasis on housing, at the expense of consideration of all the other environmental and economic factors that play a role in Cherwell's broader planning framework is disappointing. New residents would be unable to enjoy the benfits of traditional village life where transport, education and health infrastructure would be so intense it would limit thier quality of life. Housing would result in an extreme pressure on the natural environment limiting the degree to which incomers can benefit from the country surroundings. proposals would result in little potential for economic or social development.
LPR-B-048	Corrine Mitchell	Question - Bicester's Local Green Spaces	strongly support the designation of the Langford Community Orchard (LPR-A-204) and Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site (LPR-A- 125).
LPR-B-048	Corrine Mitchell	LPR-A-204	strongly support the LGS designations. Site is easily accessible and one of few wild space left in Bicester. Impreative that we preserve and look after these wonderful spaces.
LPR-B-048	Corrine Mitchell	LPR-A-125	strongly supporting of the LGS designation. Gavray Meadows will be even more important when the fields beyond the A4421 are developed for housing. The site is a remnant of the countryside that used to surround Bicester, full of wildlife and home to many rare species of butterflies and newts. The site has varied small ancient meadows bounded by hedgerows dating back to medieval times. It has magnificent mature trees, two ponds and lots of wild flowers inspring and summer. We should not lose it.
LPR-B-049	Gillian Hughes	LPR-A-185	Developing these areas would have a significant negative impact on our countryside. It will: increase noise from alarms and machinery; increase traffic and place more pressure on the M40 J11 roundabout which has already been highlighted as an issue in the Pla; remove key areas of natural habitat which are a haven for wildlife and birds and increase flooding risks by removing permeable surfaces
LPR-B-049	Gillian Hughes	LPR-A-034	Developing these areas would have a significant negative impact on our countryside. It will: increase noise from alarms and machinery; increase traffic and place more pressure on the M40 J11 roundabout which has already been highlighted as an issue in the Pla; remove key areas of natural habitat which are a haven for wildlife and birds and increase flooding risks by removing permeable surfaces.
LPR-B-049	Gillian Hughes	LPR-A-168	Developing these areas would have a significant negative impact on our countryside. It will: increase noise from alarms and machinery; increase traffic and place more pressure on the M40 J11 roundabout which has already been highlighted as an issue in the Pla; remove key areas of natural habitat which are a haven for wildlife and birds and increase flooding risks by removing permeable surfaces
LPR-B-050	Mr and Mrs D'Costa	LPR-A-091	Comments relate to Bodicote. Objects to unsustainable development in Bidcote. This development offers no benefit to the local residents .The increase in volume of road traffic and pollution through the existing estate will be detrimental to the health of the local population and environment. Access would have to be through the existing estate as no main roads near. The local roads could not cope with building traffic or the increase of traffic if new houses were built there.

LPR-B-051	Mark Chivers	LPR-A-175	<p>Comments relate to Wardington. The potential number of properties proposed would have a disproportionat and native impact on the village as a conservation area. Without exact numbers and blueprints of the development it is difficult to show the impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>Development of any size would mean that any construction traffic would have to use the existing narrow village roads, which would be disturbance for the existing residents. Alternatively construction traffic would have to create new access from the A361 which is problematic because of the layout of the roads. increased daily traffic with people commuting to work, schools, and shops as none of these facilities are in the village. The village has poor drainage; with no indication of improvements to the local draiange system which could result in local flooding. No indication of whether electricity, water and waste water systems will be improved to accomodate the developments. Larger development is out of scale and out of character with the village. The village may be in need of starter homes or smaller retirement properties or homes for local farm labourersbut there are no specific plans for these to comment upon. Other sites are more suitable, e.g. Upper Heyford large areas of the operational side of the former base. National policy supports brownfield rather than greenfield sites. Extensive archaeology likely to be required. Habitat surveys would be required for access to be taken off A361; timescales for these may delay development commencement. Landowner should divide up site to smaller parcels if only 25 units proposed.If brownfield sites are used up in the future and the village has more facilities and infrastructure then larger development could be considerd. at this time the site is inappropriate for development.</p>
LPR-B-052	Tammy Marrett	Deddington	<p>Comments relate to Deddington. Express concern over the councils support for the Housing and Growth Deal and being pro development. Existing development is essentially linking the villages of Adderbury and Bodicote. Has the local housing need been established and can evidence be provided to show how this is determined? how has the need been established for the 13 potential development sites around the parish of Deddington. concern raised over the number of new houses being built locally that need retrofitting as soon as they are built. Exemplar project at Elmsbrook; why is there no requirement for new development to meet these standards?</p>
LPR-B-053	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd for WS Deeley and Son	Call for Sites Promotion - Land connecting Chapmans Lane and St Thomas Street.	Land connecting Chapmans Lane and St Thomas Street, Deddington is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-053	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd for WS Deeley and Son	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north east of Chapmans Lane, Deddington	Land north east of Chapmans Lane, Deddington is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-053	Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd for WS Deeley and Son	Call for Sites Promotion - Land east of Hall Personal Training, Clifton Road,	Land east of Hall Personal Training, Clifton Road, Deddington is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-054	Judy Abbott	LPR-A-107	<p>Strongly objects. Increase in traffic is not supported by suitable roads, many already in a poor state and traffic is already heavy. Amenities in the village are inadquate to cope with increase in people. Government proposes development on brownfield land rather than greenfield, this is good agircultural land. Infrastructure not capable of coping with significant increase in demand. Development of this size would significantly change the character of the village which has previous supported small developments in the past but could not absorb a development of this scale.</p>
LPR-B-055	Derek Adams	LPR-A-214	<p>Development proposals would devalue and tarnish Hanwell's historical, environmental and cultural significance. Merging villages in to Banbury will not maintain its rural and historic character. The proposal effectively destroys the local identity of Hanwell. Additional housing to the north of Banbury puts additional strain on existing infrastructure. Any development that merges a village into a town cannot possibly be enhancing the setting of the village. The draft plan directly and completely destroys the open and agricultural setting and identity of Hanwell village. Hanwell will become just another suburb of Banbury. Hanwell village is not only a protected area but it has immense historical value. Hanwell Castle is steeped in historical significance and by encroaching on Hanwell's land space is to completely disrespect its place in history. The rare public observatory in the grounds of the Castle won't be able to function because of increased light pollution. Building on prime countryside land will produce more flooding and less drainage. By building on farm land the council is contributing to the destruction of the UK farming industry. If this development goes ahead it will radically disturb all crucial wildlife. Views will be utterly ruined and therefore spoil the area and affect tourism in the region. houses will be considerably devalued, but their views and direct access will be completely obliterated.</p>

LPR-B-055	Derek Adams	LPR-A-152	Development proposals would devalue and tarnish Hanwell's historical, environmental and cultural significance. Merging villages in to Banbury will not maintain its rural and historic character. The proposal effectively destroys the local identity of Hanwell. Additional housing to the north of Banbury puts additional strain on existing infrastructure. Any development that merges a village into a town cannot possibly be enhancing the setting of the village. The draft plan directly and completely destroys the open and agricultural setting and identity of Hanwell village. Hanwell will become just another suburb of Banbury. Hanwell village is not only a protected area but it has immense historical value. Hanwell Castle is steeped in historical significance and by encroaching on Hanwell's land space is to completely disrespect its place in history. The rare public observatory in the grounds of the Castle won't be able to function because of increased light pollution. Building on prime countryside land will produce more flooding and less drainage. By building on farm land the council is contributing to the destruction of the UK farming industry. If this development goes ahead it will radically disturb all crucial wildlife. Views will be utterly ruined and therefore spoil the area and affect tourism in the region. houses will be considerably devalued, but their views and direct access will be completely obliterated.
LPR-B-055	Derek Adams	Option 18	Banbury is simply not big enough and the infrastructure is not in place to accommodate thousands more homes. There will be much more traffic and therefore more fumes. Horton Hospital and all surrounding GP surgeries will simply not be able to cope. There are simply not enough schools to accommodate more pupils. Supermarkets will become far too overcrowded. If more housing is developed, I fear the entire area will suffer and Banbury and its surrounding areas will become London 2.0 where all the lovely satellite villages were swallowed up by out-of-character homes.
LPR-B-056	Tudor Hall School	LPR-A-185	Strongly objects to further development south of Banbury butting on to Wykham Lane. If these developments are permitted it will further erode the rural green corridor between Banbury, Bodicote and Bloxham, which has been significantly reduced with the urban expansion south of the Saltway. This development would replace existing agricultural land, used for cereals and livestock with the associated loss of habitat. It may adversely affect the business of Tudor Hall School. Development on a greenfield site will run counter to key objectives 5, 14, 15 and 23. The site should be removed from future iterations of the local plan.
LPR-B-056	Tudor Hall School	LPR-A-116	Strongly objects to further development south of Banbury butting on to Wykham Lane. If these developments are permitted it will further erode the rural green corridor between Banbury, Bodicote and Bloxham, which has been significantly reduced with the urban expansion south of the Saltway. This development would replace existing agricultural land, used for cereals and livestock with the associated loss of habitat. It may adversely affect the business of Tudor Hall School. Development on a greenfield site will run counter to key objectives 5, 14, 15 and 23. The site should be removed from future iterations of the local plan.
LPR-B-055	Ed Batchelor	LPR-A-175	Object to the application for change of use. Once granted there will inevitably be planning applications for housing. The number of houses permitted on average per hectare (as per council guidance) is far greater than that sighted in the original application; potential for 450 houses on sites combined. Potential scale of development is neither required or appreciated in the small community; increasing the village by 2/3 is not plausible. The current A361 and surrounding infrastructure would not support a development of this scale. If the site was fully utilised to its permitted scale of 23 houses per hectare, the highway access would not support the increase in capacity for cars turning off the main road- inevitably leading to a bypass being required which would further impact the surrounding areas as far down as Williamscot. Increased traffic flow and need for further infrastructure would weigh heavily on council budgets if combined with the houses being developed in Wardington. If a small area for change of use is given this will pave the way for further expansion once the houses start to be built.
LPR-B-059	Jan Funnell	LPR-A-175	Change of use must not be allowed. The village needs farming land. Do not need more houses and more cars on the A361. Doctors cannot cope just now. Sewerage system cant cope just now. No school, shop, mains gas. Would result in closure of footpaths which are used for dog walking. Do not give permission of change of use to building, residents like the farming village and the countryside.
LPR-B-059	Patricia Bryant	LPR-A-175	Could be as many as 300-450 houses which will completely alter the character of the conservation village. Will also loose the opportunity for a bypass in the future. Services in the village could not accommodate so many houses. Lack of infrastructure- no school or doctors. Change of use from agricultural land also the number of houses planned could be increased later without consultation.
LPR-B-060	Mr G Allen	LPR-A-168	Respondent owns the land subject to the call for sites submission, however has not been consulted by the submitter L&Q Estates. Mr Allen does not know L&Q Estates and clarifies land is not for sale. Concerned about being named in the submission without his consent. Requests name is removed from the documentation.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 1	Visions can be identified as a thoughtful and measured consideration of the future viewed through a variety of different scenarios. The success of this Cherwell Local Plan Review will be measured in delivering the right housing to the right people in the right places at the right time. Decisions must be delivered through a secure and robust evidential base, rather than the speculation of developers
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 2	Seeking to rationalise the complex nature of the Cherwell Local Plan Review into themes and objectives is a major challenge in itself, with the added requirement to present them in a manner which is broadly accessible to the non-specialist. The inter-connectivity of multiple objectives makes any decision regarding relative importance dangerous given that any range and value of priorities identified for a particular set of circumstances is unlikely to have universal application.

LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 3	Option 5 would appear to be the pragmatic choice, as it embraces the other options while continuing to offer a range of flexibility. There are clear advantages in continuing to utilise the existing urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington with their already established transport connectivity, likely to be further enhanced through the development of OxfordCambridge Arc. The use of previously developed land will clearly reduce the negative impact of further employment development on the rural landscape, but may offer insufficient land area. It should also be recognised that the rural economy is also a significant element of the rural landscape in itself, and is likely to experience further innovative development. In seeking additional development land in the larger villages, there is an inevitable possibility that the essential character and heritage of the village may be entirely consumed by the development and associated infrastructure.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 6	More inclined by 2nd option, but ensure that these percentages are met in full with actual housing units. With the identified ongoing pressure for affordable housing, it is essential that the provision is made where the local need is identified rather than as an afterthought in the <u>provision of development sites.</u>
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 7	Essential to identify the need and then prioritising that need rather than the mere application of an arbitrary formula.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 8	Option 1 as a minimum requirement. Option 2 could be identified as discriminatory.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	Provision for developing alternative methods of construction merit on-going review to investigate all aspects of the construction process eg efficient use of materials, innovative building techniques, thermal efficiency, thereby contributing to a positive awareness of climate change and the creation of new heritage environments for the future.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 10	Option 3 could be identified as aspirational if the objective is to identify and achieve the highest quality for our residents. However, such aspiration <u>may be significantly moderated by the implementation of relevant national guidelines</u>
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Listed buildings were built within the limits of construction methods, materials and lifestyle which were appropriate to the locality at that time. Such an approach is unlikely to meet modern energy efficiency requirements. In general, owners of listed buildings value their character and heritage, and are willing to accept some limitations to energy efficiency in order to preserve that identified character and heritage. The bespoke approach identified (para 5.5) would seem both advisable and reasonable, with a healthy dose of common sense being utilised by all parties.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 11	The paragraphs in 5.5 on 'What you told us' properly reflect a range of views. Although that can often only serve to perpetuate arguments 'for' and 'against' which can verge on self-indulgence at a time of crisis, CDC are clearly listening. The paragraphs in 5.5, in our view, are already well-developed and ambitious. Many of the measures proposed in this section concern local responses to the very real and very pressing climate crisis, although it would be hard to guess the urgency from the section's title 'Mitigating and adapting to Climate Change'. Responding to the crisis: The measures proposed do not always convey the scale of the crisis that confronts us. They are all necessary, and are much needed. In the rush to develop 'green growth', which is where the predominant emphasis is placed in this section, we wish to highlight the fact that reference to an equally significant diversity crisis impinging on all of us is presently almost entirely missing in the present document, except for <u>Option 13.</u>
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	draws reference to Dasgupta Review and Environmental Audit Committee report. A consumption-oriented way of life which is as predominant in Oxfordshire's towns and villages as anywhere else – and is presently not addressed in this section of Cherwell's Review at all, except as a policy issue in Option 13. From this perspective, truly sustainable economic development would mean recognising that our long-term prosperity relies on re-balancing our presently profligate demand on Nature's 'goods' and 'services' with its capacity to supply them. It also means that Cherwell, would need to account fully for the impact of our interactions with nature – one of the principle calls of the Government's Dasgupta Review. But any natural capital assessment as proposed in Option 13 needs to go beyond demonstrating impact to prevent its happening. we feel it should be a policy priority in this section of the Options Paper to clearly differentiate this more general use of the term from the much stricter requirements of ecologically supported development. The regenerative capacity that those requirements would safeguard should be upheld as strongly as any of the other pre-occupations that presently feature in this listing of Cherwell's Key Choices – and could properly be seen as the pre-condition for any one of them. The review would gain significantly from the provision of supporting links where appropriate to explanatory video footage of the issues involved and the scale of the crisis that is confronting us as a civilisation. The review is supported with photographs and diagrams, but is presently overwhelmingly word based, As a contribution to that recommendation, and in support of the proposition presented in these last few comments, we commend the following short video clip commissioned by HM Treasury as part of the Dasgupta Review: <a href="https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/dasguptareview">https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/dasguptareview</a>
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 12	Having concluded that an acceptable solution cannot be achieved on site, the base line for further action will be determined by reference to the criteria identified through the initial site assessment. Objective comparisons can then be made against the base line criteria to determine where the required biodiversity net gain / compensatory measures can be achieved. We certainly support Proposal 3) that the Council <u>should secure contributions to local environment bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district</u>
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 13	We are supportive of Option 2). Major developments, by their very nature, are likely to have a significant impact on the natural environment. It is encouraging to note that much work has already been undertaken in mapping Oxfordshire's natural capital (para 5.7.10). The use of this evidence at a more detailed local level to both demonstrate the potential impact of major development proposals and possible environmental net gain (para 5.7.11) will generate a greater understanding and awareness for all parties, and provide the basis for bold initiatives to interrupt the presumption in favour of economic growth and ensure that any development is ecologically sustainable.

LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	The example identified (para 5.7.12) offer an additional range of important areas which require detailed understanding within a structured overview of biodiversity and the natural environment. Clearly, it will be appropriate to embrace such further detail as may be required by national legislation within the Environmental Bill.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 14	In small village locations, an important first step should be an assessment of the existing provision for all age groups, linked with a consultation exercise to identify the residents' priorities. This will offer a baseline data set for the proposed development site which will be further informed through due consideration of the anticipated residential profile. A simple application to identify minimum provision through LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach appears to promote administrative convenience at the expense of rational and constructive dialogue
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	As indicated (para 5.10.4), local heritage assets do make an important contribution to the nature and character of their environment, both for now and for future generations. The creation and delivery of policies to formally protect such assets (para 5.10.6) is strongly supported.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Merely to determine the design of places as "beautiful" implies a very subjective judgement and lacks precision. All potential development sites, both big and small, will be located within areas which already exhibit local character through previous design, use of materials, existing land use, historical context. The basic concept of design codes and guides offers an option for considered review, but also could be seen as overly restrictive. An attempt to impose a national design guide and model design code would seem to ignore the diverse nature and character which is to be found throughout the country, or could be so vague within its terms and conditions as to be liable to ambiguous interpretation. While the option to devise and implement design and advice codes for individual small development sites may be unrealistic, it may be that an overall districtwide implementation could be viewed as simplistic in failing to acknowledge significant local variation. Perhaps priority should be targeted at the local level, thereby offering an overview which is able to reflect a closer understanding and awareness of relevant matters. A combination of the identified local levels will provide a sensitive and relevant document which fully embraces and informs Cherwell's on-going development options.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question -Transport & Connectivity	Many rural communities are found in areas where narrow roads and tight bends, often without a pedestrian footpath, are dominant features. Access to major highway provision and public transport is severely restricted, meaning that personal transport is an essential element of access to urban areas – work, shopping, recreation. The need for comprehensive electric and hydrogen charging facilities, both public and private, IS VITAL.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 16	It must be acknowledged that society is currently experiencing a digital revolution. It may be difficult to project longterm into the digital future, it would seem negligent not to require all new development to be future proofed, within the context of the best available information available at that time
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	In rural areas, where roads are frequently narrow with many difficult bends, personal transport is likely to remain dominant. With the increasing requirement to reduce pollution and enhance air quality, a comprehensive charging infrastructure (electric and hydrogen) is essential.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 17	When considering any revised methodology for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) it will be important to identify a known base level as a starting point ie to have a comprehensive record of the current situation which will form a factual basis for further consideration, avoiding the potential for seeking solutions through administrative convenience. The reference to grouping infrastructure by its catchment area (para 5.13.7) could offer an interesting perspective on connectivity, although the lack of scale identified for such catchment areas, as potentially applied to rural areas ,is a significant omission.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 18	Banbury's location has a limiting factor on future development due to the close proximity of the Northamptonshire and Warwickshire county boundaries. Rather than be restricted by existing county boundaries, an active dialogue with both Warwickshire and Northamptonshire could lead to innovative options for mutually beneficial housing and employment growth, e.g. DIRFT project near Rugby consideration could be given to creating a new M40 access. This would help to alleviate the current Junction 11 congested access to and from Banbury, and offer further development opportunities for housing and local industry with enhanced connectivity nationally. Active consideration could be given to the possibility of relocating the railway station, helping to alleviate another traffic hot spot and generating a significant brown field area for appropriate redevelopment



LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	LPR-A-107	proposals are totally inappropriate and should not be included in the revised local plan. Sites are not contiguous with the heart of the village and its conservation area. The land, which forms an elevated ridge, and, as such, forms one of the hills in the area referred to as Ironstone Downlands. Whilst lying just outside the Cotswolds AONB, these two areas of high ground help to cradle the gently undulating landscape of the AONB and its environs with only occasional buildings interrupting the scene. Totally inappropriate scale- potential to generate 350 dwellings which would increase the village by 131%. Any development of this nature would be significantly out of scale with the current settlement and contravene CDC's current planning strategy 'limiting growth in rural areas and directing it towards larger and more sustainable villages'. Development of any scale in this location is totally inconsistent with the planning/development strategies currently being promoted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council. The location of the proposed development sites means that car journeys will always be necessary to access employment, retail and other primary services. Locations are unsustainable and will increase the need to travel. Clear inconsistency with existing and proposed planning and development policy including: Guide new development onto the most sustainable locations; Use land effectively by planning positively for brownfield land and supporting urban regeneration; Limit growth in rural areas; Strictly control development in open countryside; Protect and enhance Oxfordshires highly valued countryside and landscape; and reduce the need to travel. Site Specific concerns include: access and movement- Pound Lane has capacity issues, restricted width and only 60m of footpath at the bus stop. Road is in poor nature, limited public transport, railway station is 8 miles away. Walking between villages is difficult due to topography. Forms part of the Oxfordshire Cycleway and is a route of regional significance due to rural character and low traffic volumes. Limited access to primary infrastructure- water pressure and quantity is an existing issue. Main length of Pound Lane has no main foul sewer making access to drainage difficult. Sewerage Treatment Plant has limited capacity and is unlikely to be able to accommodate any significant increase in foul sewage, its location makes any increase in size very difficult. Increase in surface water runoff is a major issue. Any substantial built development in the upstream catchment areas will only exacerbate an already difficult situation. Street lighting- It is highly likely that any new development would destroy the 'dark skies' nature of the village. Micro Climate - Lower winter temperatures and higher amounts of snow make access to and from the village more difficult. development located in an exposed location would require substantial additional measures to enhance their energy efficiency. Lack of understanding of agricultural activity- In locations with similar profiles to Sibford Gower, evidence exists that when new communities are established, frustration with existing agricultural activity can arise and, in due course, lead to conflict. Loss and degradation of the immediate and wider landscape- the proposed development sites would result in a direct loss of high quality agricultural land, damage to the network of hedgerows and trees which enclose it and loss of water to the immediate water table. The location of new buildings in such a prominent location would have a detrimental effect on the visual qualities of the wider landscape. Needs- It is vital for the village to have the ability to develop and re-shape itself to meet current requirements based on local needs rather than speculative development
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 30	Both options offer a rather simplistic approach to a complex problem. All solutions will have a lasting impact on the rural landscape, infrastructure, viability and heritage. Option 1 could generate a "moth balling" character to a village community, while Option 2 could overwhelm and destroy existing character and heritage. On balance, we support option 1. Both will require an unambiguous identification of needs, local and wider district, which are rigorously reviewed within a clearly defined monitoring programme. Previous experience suggests that national perspectives are likely to exert a dominating influence.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 31	Developing a collaborative approach with local communities is more likely to achieve positive outcomes by enabling all parties to express their wishes and concerns within a constructive and reasoned dialogue. A specific allocation of parish level figures would appear to identify an unequal partnership within the component partners.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 32	Of particular importance would be: Access to good quality education facilities, both primary, secondary and nursery; Access to primary medical care; Access to high speed and reliable internet connectivity; Local convenience shopping facilities, including a post office; Local recreational, community and entertainment facilities; Connectivity to major urban retail facilities; Connectivity to major employment locations; Safe and readily accessible highways infrastructure, with safe pedestrian provision; Provision of frequent, regular and affordable public transport; Availability of housing stock to sustain the provision of essential workers within the broader community. The development of a rural settlement hierarchy will require the need to identify a range of measures to determine the relative features of individual villages. Such criteria should be clearly defined, unambiguous and open to public scrutiny. It is essential that the target outcomes are publicly identified and understood before such criteria are brought together for comparison. When comparison data is drawn from the available information, it must be considered against the previously identified target outcomes, rather than such target outcomes being subsequently "adjusted" to coincide with planning convenience. It is essential to have precisely defined settlement boundaries for individual villages to provide greater certainty as to the extent of the built-up area, thereby addressing the current village boundary ambiguity. Should future pressures indicate a possible village boundary revision, this can be addressed through the identified democratic planning process. The Sibford Gower Parish Profile offers a concise and informative picture of our village, identifying a range of characteristics, detail and concerns which are particularly relevant to any future development consideration.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 33	Option 3 offers the most appropriate means of supporting the current and future development of the rural economy. Criteria based policies can offer clear direction and guidance as a baseline, while size and scale may indicate a more bespoke approach. While the nature and priorities of the existing rural economy can be readily identified, these may be at variance with the nature and priorities for an innovative 21st century rural economy. Inevitably, this could lead to conflict where a climate of rational discussion and dialogue will be an essential component in determining future planned development. The stated preference to favour the development of previously developed land and the conversion of existing buildings to limit the impact of new development on the countryside (para 6.6.13) is strongly supported.

LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Option 34	While the two options identified are not mutually exclusive, the current approach would appear to generate a broader perspective which is beneficial to the wider community. Designated conservation areas already offer an added focus and protection to specifically designated locations within the broader perspective. The suggestion of devising a nonstatutory designation protection for “valued landscapes” offers a level of protection similar to non-designated assets within conservation areas and is to be welcomed. The current draft plans of the County and District Councils both make reference to the overall quality of Oxfordshire’s landscape and to specific landscape and countryside features. Whilst some of these areas are afforded protection through measures such as ANOBs, others have almost identical characteristics, but do not have this recognition and the protection it brings. There is a strong case that the Cotswolds AONB be extended eastwards to include the high ground immediately to the north of Sibford Gower. The two inappropriate development sites proposed on land to the north of Sibford Gower are located on this important piece of landscape. Protecting this landscape through an extension of the Cotswolds AONB, or by defining it as a Special Landscape Area, would prevent this being considered.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	There is some scepticism regarding the value of Neighbourhood Plans. Their construction formula is perceived as extremely time consuming and expensive, while their time limited implementational effectiveness is constrained, given that they are required to fit in to an established Local Plan which, in its turn, will have to meet national policy requirements. While the suggestion (para 6.7.3) referring to allocating sites and developing local design codes offers an interesting option, it also identifies significant resource implications for both the local community and the local planning authority.
LPR-B-061	Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question - Development Management Policies	The national pressure for generating renewable energy and reducing energy consumption will be important areas for the successful planning and implementation of future growth in the 21st century. There is much talk, both locally and nationally, about affordable housing, although little common understanding of the term and the implementation policies. A precise understanding of the term “affordable housing” and clear implementation guidance would help to clarify this contentious area within the local planning authority. With the likelihood of more people choosing to live in rural areas, consideration should be given to policies dealing with light and sound pollution; protection of the rural landscape; support for the farming community. With recent challenging weather conditions likely to become a significant element in our future weather patterns, flood and water management cannot be ignored.
LPR-B-062	John Dovere and Lesley Coleman	LPR-A-001	Strongly object to sites which will disproportionately increase the local population of the villages. Inadequate infrastructure to service the existing population, let alone the additional population. Insufficient places at Deddington School. The local roads are inadequate for the present volume of traffic. The local roads are badly potholed and poorly maintained. The developments would bring considerable further traffic, pollution and CO2 emissions which would damage air quality and the environment further. Additional population would need to commute to Banbury, Oxfrud, London, etc for work. fail to understand why the Council is minded to cut down trees and concrete over fields, ignoring the effect on the local environment. There are many dilapidated and unoccupied buildings in Banbury and Bicester that could be renovated for homes. Hempton has few or no facilities; no shop or pub. Increase in traffic along the Hempton Road. Further development would put more pressure on The Horton which cannot serve current needs. The suggested developments would result in needless destruction of local wildlife habitats. Noise pollution will have an appalling effect on wildlife. Will result in light pollution. Increase in population will result in more rubbish and plastic waste. History tells us that development simply increases local population and demand for further development. The Council is exacerbating this self-fulfilling problem by allowing the construction of these housing developments.
LPR-B-062	John Dovere and Lesley Coleman	LPR-A-150	Strongly object to sites which will disproportionately increase the local population of the villages. Inadequate infrastructure to service the existing population, let alone the additional population. Insufficient places at Deddington School. The local roads are inadequate for the present volume of traffic. The local roads are badly potholed and poorly maintained. The developments would bring considerable further traffic, pollution and CO2 emissions which would damage air quality and the environment further. Additional population would need to commute to Banbury, Oxfrud, London, etc for work. fail to understand why the Council is minded to cut down trees and concrete over fields, ignoring the effect on the local environment. There are many dilapidated and unoccupied buildings in Banbury and Bicester that could be renovated for homes. Hempton has few or no facilities; no shop or pub. Increase in traffic along the Hempton Road. Further development would put more pressure on The Horton which cannot serve current needs. The suggested developments would result in needless destruction of local wildlife habitats. Noise pollution will have an appalling effect on wildlife. Will result in light pollution. Increase in population will result in more rubbish and plastic waste. History tells us that development simply increases local population and demand for further development. The Council is exacerbating this self-fulfilling problem by allowing the construction of these housing developments.
LPR-B-063	Clive Hunt	LPR-A-175	Objection relates to both parcels of land being promoted. Both parcels of land are greenfield sites outside the current village curtilage. In both cases the land is actively in full time agricultural use. Assuming even a conservative housing density of 30 houses/hectare this would result in excess of 450 houses. The current number of dwellings in the parish is 400. The proposed additional houses would swamp the village and entirely change its character from an unspoilt conservation rural village to a settlement dominated by modern houses The two sites straddle an already notably dangerous road (A361) – by potentially doubling village traffic and pedestrian flows, safety risks would be raised considerably. The only village facilities are a church, pub, village hall and garden centre. There is no shop, school or surgery and thus the proposed development is not sustainable given the lack of services. The village foul drainage plant already has to pumped out twice a week
LPR-B-064	Peter Abbott	Sibford Gower	Submits the following observations - The possible development of 12.5 hectares at this site is disproportionate to the existing village and would significantly alter its character, particularly in view of its proximity to the Cotswolds AONB. Infrastructure is inadequate for a significant development. Local facilities such as school and local surgery would be unable to cope. There is already inadequate public transport. Most houses would probably end up with 2 or more cars leading to increased traffic on already poor condition roads. Lack of local employment would lead to increased commuter traffic. Government policy is looking to increase use of brownfield sites thereby avoiding loss of useful agricultural land

LPR-B-065	Jonathan Akin and Natasha Kennedy Akin	LPR-A-175	Objects to change of use of land. Population of just over 766 people in our settlement village struggles enough with the daytoday sewage problems and low water pressure and intermittent power disruptions. Doubling the population would have a detrimental effect on our settlement and way of life. Concerns include- At present there is no village shop, even with the building of potentially 450 houses there would be no guarantee a shop or amenities would even be built. There is currently no school for the children of this village and no guarantee one would be built. Being so close to the A361 and its notorious accident blackspots, more traffic in and out of the village will only make the road more dangerous with the potential increase to loss of lives. Sewage is already a huge problem to this village and the increased numbers would have a crippling effect on the already struggling sewage. There is no doctor's surgery in the village, the closest surgery is Cropredy, they are not taking on new patients as they simply cannot accommodate them. We already must go to Byfield as there wasn't space for us at Cropredy. The closure of public footpaths and the disruption to local wildlife would change this beautiful village and its landscape for good.
LPR-B-066	Paul and Anne Webb	LPR-A-156	Object in the strongest manner. The site is located in the Green Belt. The proposed development is within the Kidlington Church Street conservation area, as detailed in your document dated March 1996, which states 'a conservation area is an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance (section 3 refers.) It would also affect the setting of the two grade 2 listed buildings nearby. Under a previous planning application (13/00990/F) a main Badger was destroyed and an artificial one was created (under a licence from Natural England). Since then, the Badgers have created another sett within the area of this planning application and are not using the artificial one. Therefore, is this approved this will mean yet another main sett being destroyed, and the Badgers moved once again. Under the terms of the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 Badger Setts are afforded legal protection, and as such the act forbids any interference with the badger sett for, amongst other things, the purpose of new construction works. The land in question is home to several families of Skylarks which are protected in the UK under the Wildlife & countryside Act 1981. Classified in the UK as a Red List species under the Birds of Conservation Concern review and as a Priority Species in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Not to mention its population is in decline putting it on the endangered list of birds. Where/what are the exceptional circumstances that are needed to be demonstrated by the developer to get this land taken out of the Green Belt?
LPR-B-067	Anne Marie Cromarty	LPR-A-204	Strongly supports the designations of the community orchard. Value these sites as valuable green spaces near the centre of the town. Has volunteered at the site. Please give Langford Community Orchard the Local Green Space designation so that nature can continue to flourish, people can strengthen their involvement in, and sense of community in this special place.
LPR-B-067	Anne Marie Cromarty	LPR-A-125	Strongly supports the designations of the local wildlife site. Gavray Wildlife Meadows is a precious remnant of the countryside that used to surround Bicester. The site has varied small ancient meadows bounded by hedgerows dating back to medieval times. It has magnificent mature trees, two ponds and lots of wild flowers in spring and summer. Gavray Meadows is a Local Wildlife Site due to its biodiversity and rare species of butterflies and newts. The site is also part of the Upper River Ray Conservation Target Area (CTA) which is protected as an area where action to improve biodiversity should be focused. Please give Langford Community Orchard the Local Green Space designation so that nature can continue to flourish, people can strengthen their involvement in, and sense of community in this special place.
LPR-B-068	R Meadows	LPR-A-178	This proposal is completely disproportionate and should not be approved. Any development as proposed would lead to the destruction of Adderbury as a viable village and to the way of life for the majority of its residents. Site specific comments include - The scale of this development is completely unsustainable and wholly disproportionate given the size of Adderbury village. The development would completely destroy the identity and viability of Adderbury as a village, subjecting Adderbury to increasing "coalescence". Adderbury school, retail and infrastructure generally is already at capacity and the proposal does not address that issue sufficiently which will result in more not less traffic movements and pollution from the 800 or so houses inhabitants. The proposal completely overestimates the scale and capacity of Adderbury's existing facilities and infrastructure to cope with a development on this scale. The traffic system is now over capacity especially at school drop off times and the introduction of the new roads proposed including the road accessing the B4100, and motorway junction will add significantly to the traffic volumes and exponential increase in pollution. The local road system simply would not cope. Further pollution will be generated through increased pressure on already over stretched waste and sewerage infrastructure. Adderbury Lakes is already suffering from increased pollution with raw sewerage discharges into the lake and adjacent Long Wall public footpath. The village is already deemed to be at capacity with recent housing developments and this development sits outside the local plan. The gap between Adderbury and Banbury and surrounding areas will be narrowed to an unacceptable level. This development impacts negatively on Adderbury's current "spatial feel". The development is on a "greenfield" site and no account has been taken of the impact on the environment as a whole or the considerable impact on local wildlife. The effect on existing residents "mental health" by the removal of open green spaces (the provision of which has been recently acknowledged as vital to mental well being) will be significant resulting in further pressure on already at capacity health facilities. This effect will be magnified by the considerable disturbance over a significant period through the building activity. The development seeks development in key "valued landscapes" which should be protected.
LPR-B-069	Paul Hornby	LPR-A-175	Registers concerns and objections to the proposed housing development on the following grounds- It is not suitable because of a lack of services, we already experience power outs, low water pressure, sewage problems current system struggles to cope, existing road network is inadequate for the current traffic load. Lack of Amenities we currently have no school, shop, an already oversubscribed doctor's surgery at Cropredy. The bus service is limited. Out of Scale with the current size of the village where we have only circa 350 residents. Would change the character of the historic village, most of which is in a conservation area. Would set precedent for further development / expansion without consultation.

LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Option 3	Given the expected change in employment practices post-pandemic, 5) is our preferred option, with the proviso that employment land on brownfield sites should only be in sustainable locations.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Option 5	Prefer 1), as there seems to be little scope for the conversion of existing retail, etc. outlets, and we would not wish to see a reduction in these sectors. With the 4400 dwellings proposed to address Oxford's Unmet Housing Needs the current retail area in Kidlington is relatively small and, whilst many retail areas are currently in decline, the emphasis should be on expanding the retail offer. This is consistent with the adopted Kidlington Masterplan.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	Kidlington will already suffer from drastic reduction of the Green Belt gap between it and Oxford and the substantial loss of Green Belt on its Western and southern edge. Further reduction of the Green Belt surrounding the Village must be avoided at all costs in order to maintain its character and avoid suburban sprawl. The Green Belt between Kidlington and Oxford will effectively be destroyed by the proposals to address Oxford's Unmet Housing Needs. There should be no further exceptional circumstances for the further release of Green Belt land in the areas adjoining Kidlington. Therefore, the options submitted in Appendix 2 within the Green Belt for possible development are unacceptable to KPC
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Question - Delivering infrastructure	There is already a substantial infrastructure deficit in Kidlington and the Plan should seek the means to address by other measures than S106 contributions.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Additionally no further release of Green Belt should be considered, residential development should be primarily infill.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Option 6	The priority should be for social housing and this should be emphasised within the 50% requirement for Affordable Housing.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Option 7	The priority should be for social housing and this should be emphasised within the 50% requirement for Affordable Housing.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Yes. Maintenance of the character of neighbourhoods and limiting need for parking are key criteria whilst also respecting the need for additional visitor parking. As a part of this Kidlington Parish Council is concerned about the alteration of semi-detached and terraced houses (even with extensions) to apartments as they change the character of a residential area and create additional pressure on on-street parking.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Option 26	It is paramount to respect the integrity of the Green Belt with no further reviews.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Option 27	Strongly agree with all 3. Stronger design framework needed for the Village Centre including the Oxford Road between Yarnton Road and Benmead Road on west side, as set out in the Kidlington Masterplan, which should be more of an extension of the High Street and less an arterial road. With the additional of the 4400 houses within the Partial review it will be important to strengthen and enhance the retail offer in the village centre. We support a 20 mph limit for this section, together with traffic-calming measures including a platform.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	All these factors are important. Enhanced bus/tram/cycle corridors along the A4260 will be critical to reducing the use of the car particular through Kidlington. We understand that the County Council transport strategy provides for a park and ride north of Kidlington to reduce the car through Kidlington for commuters from outlying villagers
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Option 28	Strongly support 1, as a key way of preserving and enhancing the character of Kidlington as a Village surrounded by Green Belt. Additionally, the Kidlington Recreational Trust needs to be consulted on these issues.
LPR-B-070	Kidlington Parish Council	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Cherwell DC should consult the Kidlington Recreational Trust
LPR-B-071	Cllr Andrew Beere	Nethercote	inherent contradictions in general planning policy and they come through here with regard to the text in the Local Review Paper 2021 ,and how they relate to the developments on our side of the town. Even a cursory glance at the Banbury Town Map P105 shows this Nethercote has to stay and remain part of a Green Buffer between the motorway and the Town /District and County Boundary Infact the building od the motorway provided a defacto "built" boundary for urban growth and industrialization on the East of Banbury; Yes at BAN15 some proposals are moving ahead in line with the earlier 2015 approved plan but as you will recall a BLUE Industrial zone east of the Daventry Road ,opposite BAN 15 was rejected by the Inspector in the final 2031 report. Historic commercial and housing growth between the town centre and the county boundary has almost filled all the green and brownfield sites. Extension of housing and commercial uses on the other side of the motorway will make traffic pollution worse. The proposed development along the Daventry Road is not coherently explained and is a threat to declared Council objectives spelled out in the September 2021 Review or form part of a balanced planning design for our town. In terms of Nethercote and the wider Green Buffer East of the MWAY the environment ecological and biodiversity and yes the social infrastructure have to come first.The proposals contradict key objectives 9, 25 and 26 and page 23 para 4.7 numbers 5 and 10. Reject P69 sites east of the town and seek to limit development to protect its landscape setting

LPR-B-071	Cllr Andrew Beere	LPR-A-185	inherent contradictions in general planning policy and they come through here with regard to the text in the Local Review Paper 2021 ,and how they relate to the developments on our side of the town. Even a cursory glance at the Banbury Town Map P105 shows this Nethercote has to stay and remain part of a Green Buffer between the motorway and the Town /District and County Boundary Infact the building od the motorway provided a defacto “built” boundary for urban growth and industrialization on the East of Banbury; Yes at BAN15 some proposals are moving ahead in line with the earlier 2015 approved plan but as you will recall a BLUE Industrial zone east of the Daventry Road ,opposite BAN 15 was rejected by the Inspector in the final 2031 report. Historic commercial and housing growth between the town centre and the county boundary has almost filled all the green and brownfield sites. Extension of housing and commercial uses on the other side of the motorway will make traffic pollution worse. The proposed development along the Daventry Road is not coherntly explained and is a threat to declared Council objectives spelled out in the September 2021 Review or form part of a balanced planning design for our town. In terms of Nethercote and the wider Green Buffer East of the MWAY the environment ecological and biodiversity and yes the social infrastructure have to come first.The proposals contradict key objectives 9, 25 and 26 and page 23 para 4.7 numbers 5 and 10. Reject P69 sites east of the town and seek to limit development to protect its landscape setting.
LPR-B-071	Cllr Andrew Beere	LPR-A-034	inherent contradictions in general planning policy and they come through here with regard to the text in the Local Review Paper 2021 ,and how they relate to the developments on our side of the town. Even a cursory glance at the Banbury Town Map P105 shows this Nethercote has to stay and remain part of a Green Buffer between the motorway and the Town /District and County Boundary Infact the building od the motorway provided a defacto “built” boundary for urban growth and industrialization on the East of Banbury; Yes at BAN15 some proposals are moving ahead in line with the earlier 2015 approved plan but as you will recall a BLUE Industrial zone east of the Daventry Road ,opposite BAN 15 was rejected by the Inspector in the final 2031 report. Historic commercial and housing growth between the town centre and the county boundary has almost filled all the green and brownfield sites. Extension of housing and commercial uses on the other side of the motorway will make traffic pollution worse. The proposed development along the Daventry Road is not coherntly explained and is a threat to declared Council objectives spelled out in the September 2021 Review or form part of a balanced planning design for our town. In terms of Nethercote and the wider Green Buffer East of the MWAY the environment ecological and biodiversity and yes the social infrastructure have to come first.The proposals contradict key objectives 9, 25 and 26 and page 23 para 4.7 numbers 5 and 10. Reject P69 sites east of the town and seek to limit development to protect its landscape setting.
LPR-B-071	Cllr Andrew Beere	LPR-A-168	inherent contradictions in general planning policy and they come through here with regard to the text in the Local Review Paper 2021 ,and how they relate to the developments on our side of the town. Even a cursory glance at the Banbury Town Map P105 shows this Nethercote has to stay and remain part of a Green Buffer between the motorway and the Town /District and County Boundary Infact the building od the motorway provided a defacto “built” boundary for urban growth and industrialization on the East of Banbury; Yes at BAN15 some proposals are moving ahead in line with the earlier 2015 approved plan but as you will recall a BLUE Industrial zone east of the Daventry Road ,opposite BAN 15 was rejected by the Inspector in the final 2031 report. Historic commercial and housing growth between the town centre and the county boundary has almost filled all the green and brownfield sites. Extension of housing and commercial uses on the other side of the motorway will make traffic pollution worse. The proposed development along the Daventry Road is not coherntly explained and is a threat to declared Council objectives spelled out in the September 2021 Review or form part of a balanced planning design for our town. In terms of Nethercote and the wider Green Buffer East of the MWAY the environment ecological and biodiversity and yes the social infrastructure have to come first.The proposals contradict key objectives 9, 25 and 26 and page 23 para 4.7 numbers 5 and 10. Reject P69 sites east of the town and seek to limit development to protect its landscape setting.
LPR-B-072	Phillipa Hunt	LPR-A-175	Strongly objects to both parcels of land. Objection reasons include - Both parcels of land are on greenfield sites outside the current village curtilage. All the land is in full time agricultural use. The current number of houses is about 400, if the Councils preferred density of housing is 30 houses per hectare , this would produce more than 450 houses therefore more than doubling the village, and changing its character. The village is an ancient rural settlement with very few facilities. There is no shop, School or Surgery and a very limited bus service. The roads through the village are narrow and not suitable for the extra traffic that would result from so many new houses. The proposed land is divided by the already very dangerous A 361 at a narrow point coming into the village and approaching a sharp chicane bend, traffic using the A361 from either parcels of land would add to the congestion on this very difficult piece of road. The village has severe problems with flooding. The proposed development is neither suitable or practical for the areas stated.
LPR-B-073	Nicholas Reynolds	LPR-A-175	A development of this size would be completely out of proportion to the existing size of the village. this proposal is out of scale for the village and surrounding area. The character of this small village would be destroyed and would reduce the unique small village life. The focus should be on repurposing existing buildings and brownfield sites to retain the embedded CO2 already in the buildings within the county. The CDC should be encouraging the use of empty houses before building more. Help for improving the existing housing stock should be prioritised before building new.suggest the CDC encourages and helps local farmers to increase food growing, instead of concreting over precious farmland. pollution and environmental impact of such a development would cause. With our urgent need to reduce energy usage. The carbon foot print of building new housing would outweigh the benefits. Even if all the houses were fully Net Zero, it would still take many tons of CO2 to build the estate. The granting of such development would set a precedent for further development requests from land owners around Wardington. The development would put an enormous strain on local Doctors, Schools, increased traffic congestion and travel pollution. It’s currently essential to have a car to live in the village. In the past large housing development companies have gone back on promises of including public amenities such as shops, schools etc. in favour of more houses and profit

LPR-B-074	Oswyn Murray	Sibford Gower	Supports the retention of policies relating to the protection of the environment, A housing policy that concentrated on the provision of housing in the main conurbations of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, with good transport links and where housing and workplace provision could be combined. The protection of the smaller village communities from predatory or speculative housing development, other than local amenity housing and the provision of housing restricted to local residents. The conclusions of a survey which fed in to the Sibfords Community Plan 2012, 95% of respondents did not wish to see more than 20 new houses in the villages, and most preferred small or medium groupings. There was a preference for 12 bedroom houses for first time buyers and sheltered housing, in traditional local vernacular. When asked to suggest possible locations for new housing there was a strong preference for the roads leading out of the villages (Hook Norton Road Pound Lane, Hawkes Lane) and opposition for land to the west and south of the villages. The target of 20 new houses has already been exceeded in the villages, and further development should be actively discouraged. Considered that these views still represent the three villages of Sibford Gower, Sibford Ferris and Burdrop. The main way in which the current Cherwell Plan could be strengthened is also the main priority of Cherwell District Council and the UK government, the improvement of our carbon footprint towards netzero carbon emissions by 2040. In the context of the north Cherwell area this requires primarily limiting car journeys and the improvement of the housing stock with alternative energy sources and better insulation. The Sibfords have a minimal bus service unsupported by Oxfordshire CC; there is no possibility of creating viable cycle routes because of hills. The nearest shopping, secondary schooling and work facilities are 7.5 miles away. Each new household will require at least 6 car journeys a day, which implies a minimum of approximately 16,500 miles a year per household. This is clearly incompatible with the zero carbon aims of Cherwell and the central government. all planning submissions to submit a carbon neutral plan for all new developments, which should include vehicle movements. In remote rural areas there should be no new development without such a zero carbon guarantee. One anomaly should be addressed; Cherwell adopted a categorisation of villages in which the Sibfords were declared to be a single unit in Category A. Despite many protests, Cherwell has continued to use this criterion for planning while at the same time for all other purposes treating the two Parishes as separate. This anomaly should be corrected since it impacts on a wide variety of issues.
LPR-B-075	Rex Anson	LPR-A-175	Strongly objects - A large part of Wardington is a Conservation Area, the proposed development would change the appearance of the whole village as it is far too large to keep the present character of the area. Wardington has for many years now, not had a school? Is the proposal to build a new school to accommodate the influx of children, as Cropredy would certainly not be able to deal with that number. There is also no shop in the village! The lack of services is also obvious. The sewer is already stretched, and the water supply is at times at very low pressure, and we also suffer a significant number of electricity cuts. A large number of residents from the proposed scheme would undoubtedly access Banbury via Cropredy and Great Bourton, bearing in mind the large industrial development on the A361 just before the M.40 Interchange. This alternative route is on minor country roads and would severely damage both villages. The A361 is already an extremely busy road, where, unfortunately there are many accidents and the extra volume of traffic would only add to the problem. There are many other areas in Oxfordshire where such a large development would not have the impact on a quiet and delightful village.
LPR-B-076	Wendy Anson	LPR-A-175	Strongly objects - A large part of Wardington is a Conservation Area and therefore should be protected. This extremely large development would completely change the character of the whole village. The A361 is already an extremely dangerous road and the volume of traffic from the development would most certainly add to the danger. With the additional traffic generated by the unsightly commercial development just before the M.40 interchange, I feel residents would almost certainly choose to access Banbury via Cropredy and Great Bourton. These two villages would undoubtedly suffer badly from this increase in traffic. The Utilities in Wardington are insufficient, i.e., sewage already stretched, water supply not consistent and electricity cuts are quite frequent!. There is no school, as this was closed many years ago, and also no shop. There must in Oxfordshire, be several far more suitable locations for such a large development, without destroying a beautiful unspoilt area.
LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 1	Charterhouse agrees with the suggested Vision.
LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 2	Charterhouse welcomes the key draft objectives for maintaining and developing a sustainable local economy. KO1 and KO2 especially state that the Council will need to allocate sufficient land to meet housing and employment need and raise the value of the local economy and support the growth of all sectors to create an inclusive economy. Currently the District employment land supply is geared towards national and regional distribution (which comes as no surprise given its strategic location on the highway network), although prohibits/limits opportunities for startups seeking flexible workspace. The Economic Needs Assessment (September 2021) prepared by Lambert Smith Hampton identifies the future economic and employment needs across Cherwell between 2021-2040. The assessment states that recent developments in Cherwell have predominantly been of an industrial nature, with a focus on the larger unit, logistics and distribution schemes. Therefore, Charterhouse considers that the Council will need to allocate employment sites that meet the needs of smaller businesses, ensuring the growth of all sectors is supported.
LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 3	Charterhouse recognises the significance of Banbury's role in Cherwell's spatial strategy but is concerned that Banbury has/is fast approaching the limits of its environmental capacity. Banbury has expanded significantly in the past decades and now is at a point where it cannot reasonably continue expanding east because of the M40; north because of flood risk and coalescence with Hanwell; west because of significant landscape harm and coalescence with Drayton; and south because of the complete encompassment of Bodicote and Adderbury. Accordingly, Charterhouse consider that the future growth of the District would be better served by the expansion of Bicester and the larger villages. The Council should therefore focus on this approach in the Proposed Submission Plan.
LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 4	Future employment land supply needs to provide opportunities for smaller start-up businesses seeking flexible workspace. The Council should therefore provide a mixture of uses in order to meet the needs of all businesses.

LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 18	Charterhouse recognises the significance of Banbury's role in Cherwell's spatial strategy but is concerned that Banbury has/is fast approach the limits of its environmental capacity. Banbury has expanded significant in the past decades and now is at a point where it cannot reasonably continue expanding east because of the M40; north because of flood risk and coalescence with Hanwell; west because of significant landscape harm and coalescence with Drayton; and south because of the complete encompassment of Bodicote and Adderbury. Accordingly, Charterhouse consider that <u>the future growth of the District would be better served by the expansion of Bicester and the larger villages</u>
LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 19	Charterhouse recognises the significance of Banbury's role in Cherwell's spatial strategy but is concerned that Banbury has/is fast approach the limits of its environmental capacity. Banbury has expanded significant in the past decades and now is at a point where it cannot reasonably continue expanding east because of the M40; north because of flood risk and coalescence with Hanwell; west because of significant landscape harm and coalescence with Drayton; and south because of the complete encompassment of Bodicote and Adderbury. Accordingly, Charterhouse consider that <u>the future growth of the District would be better served by the expansion of Bicester and the larger villages</u>
LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 22	Comments relate to land adjoining Bicester 12. Previously engaged in examination of the Local Plan Part 1. Believes examiner saw merit in the land forming part of Bicester 12 but felt it was best left to Part 2 of the Local Plan. Requests land interests be considered through this review. land interests extend to 13 acres and occupies one third of the Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and within River Ray Conservation Target Area (CTA). Policy ESD11 relates to CTAs and the respondent believes that the policy wording does not preclude sites within it from coming forward for development – the underlying objective of the CTA being to “restore biodiversity at a landscape-scale through the maintenance, restoration and creation of BAP priority habitats”. Ecological surveys undertaken in 2015 and 2015 indicated that in order to maintain biodiversity interest within this privately-owned site and to maintain ecological continuity across the A4421 to the rest of the LWS, restoration measures are needed as soon as practically possible, and certainly before the conservation interest is lost...” the landholding is evidently undergoing ecological succession to woodland which, left unmanaged, means the site continues to decline, eventually to a point where it would be impossible to restore it. Accordingly, the planning strategy Charterhouse intends to follow is that the partial release of the site for development to enable the remainder to be gifted to a local conservation organisation or similar, along with sufficient funding to facilitate key elements of restoration to take place and for an appropriate conservation management regime to be initiated is credible. Charterhouse wishes the land to be considered for commercial development on 5 acres. Such development would seek to deliver ‘nursery accommodation for start-ups and other local business
LPR-B-077	Maddi Simpson for Charterhouse Strategic Land	Option 23	To make best use of greenfield land the Council need to consider sites adjacent to existing allocations, such as the land adjoining Bicester 12 which will deliver c. 40 hectares of employment land and 1,500 homes. Charterhouse wishes the land off of the A4421 to be considered for commercial development on 5 acres of the site. Such development would seek to deliver ‘nursery’ accommodation for start-ups and other local business to support smaller business needs. We firmly believe that it should be possible to develop part of the site, provided a viable parcel is retained and can be restored/managed in the long term for biodiversity benefit. We would welcome further discussions with the Council to determine how the site can be brought forward sustainably as part of the LP Part 1 Review.
LPR-B-078	David Jennings	LPR-A-004	Site should not be included as North Newington as the development is in direct conflict with the terms of a category C village. North Newington does not have the road infrastructure to support the additional traffic (nor can it be expanded to do so- there are a number of narrow elements and bridge). Development in the village with a large number of conservation sites would be detrimental to the fabric and history of the village and the additional carbon footprint would impact the environment significantly. Particularly as there is extremely limited public transport links (1 return bus a day) and there are no cycle routes or indeed continuous pathways to Banbury. Amenities within the village are non-existent and the school is at capacity. The narrative in the Cherwell Local Plan in relation to North Newington is inaccurate and/or outdated.
LPR-B-078	David Jennings	LPR-A-135	Site should not be included as North Newington as the development is in direct conflict with the terms of a category C village. North Newington does not have the road infrastructure to support the additional traffic (nor can it be expanded to do so- there are a number of narrow elements and bridge). Development in the village with a large number of conservation sites would be detrimental to the fabric and history of the village and the additional carbon footprint would impact the environment significantly. Particularly as there is extremely limited public transport links (1 return bus a day) and there are no cycle routes or indeed continuous pathways to Banbury. Amenities within the village are non-existent and the school is at capacity. The narrative in the Cherwell Local Plan in relation to North Newington is inaccurate and/or outdated.
LPR-B-079	Anne Carro	Shutford	the village is not able to accommodate any future developments due to the following reasons- The roads around the village are not particularly good and the extra volume of more traffic will not help the current situation; The potential area does not have good access for vehicles, particularly heavy vehicles conveying building materials for construction; Sewage works are not adequate for more properties in the village; There are no shops, doctors or a school in the village.
LPR-B-080	J Carpenter	LPR-A-068	The site is totally disproportionate in relation to the size of the village and unnecessary, undesirable and unsustainable. It would undermine the housing strategy in the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, which wants to distribute new housing to the most sustainable locations with regards to public services and facilities, transport and employment. It also undermines the Oxford 2050 policies which focus on the 5 themes of addressing climate change, improving environmental quality, creating strong and healthy communities, planning for sustainable travel and connectivity and creating jobs while providing homes. As a result of poor public transport and no local jobs, each household could potentially have 2 cars or more having to use the local roads which would result in increased car traffic through a village that can't cope with existing levels of traffic.

LPR-B-080	J Carpenter	Sibford Ferris	I strongly object to all proposed sites within Sibford Ferris Parish being put forward in the Local Plan Review document and any other sites that may be added during the planning review process. The existing bus service doesn't have convenient times to allow people to travel into Banbury for work, the connections to Stratford up Avon are difficult and there are no direct bus services to Chipping Norton or Oxford. The road conditions in the village and surrounding areas are bad, roads are narrow with no pavements or safe places for pedestrians to walk and despite the main roads into Banbury 7.5miles away have a B classification they are still 60 & 50mph limits- so cycling is also dangerous. There is limited street lighting within the village. A lack of off road parking for existing households in the village results in cars parking throughout the village, on bends making it virtually a one way street and with no pavements dangerous for pedestrians.
LPR-B-080	J Carpenter	LPR-A-045	Proposals seek to extend already approved development of 25 homes into the other half of the field. This would easily double the size of the existing development. The village infrastructure is already at its limit and unsure as to how it will cope with this approved major development. As a result of poor public transport and no local jobs, each household could potentially have 2 cars or more having to use the local roads which would result in increased car traffic through a village that can't cope with existing levels of traffic
LPR-B-080	J Carpenter	Option 32	Travel is not sustainable and job opportunities severely limited. Air quality and noise pollution due to the large number of privately owned cars is already impacting the village and will be made worse by the construction of further new homes. Development on high quality agricultural land versus Urban development. The site is on excellent agricultural land with a footpath running through it, and a historic (coffin) path running south west to north east from the Old Grange to Folly Barn beyond the designated "public right of way footpath". linking the two village conservation areas of Sibford and Swalcliffe. The path that runs from Grange Lane to Folly Barn has amazing views that spans across several counties including towards the Cotswold AONB. This would be lost should housing be placed on the fields to the west and south. This view, that many local villagers enjoy on a daily basis, should be protected and preserved for the enjoyment, physical and mental health of the those who use it, and so should the land for agricultural purposes. Any additional new homes here would result in unwanted light and noise pollution in an existing rural environment. The main water and sewer system would struggle to cope with additional homes on this scale. There are no mains supplies to the east on Grange Lane- existing properties to the south and east all being on private fed spring and bore hole water and septic tank sewerage waste. The historic character of the area and its historic sensitivity should be protected. Any further development outside the existing village housing curtilage would have a negative visual impact on the rural character and appearance of the locality and cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, open rural countryside and rural edge of village setting, failing to reinforce local distinctiveness. Sibford Ferris is a small village community with limited facilities and infrastructure and has already had had approved more new houses than are realistically sustainable within the parish and I believe it will not be able to cope with any more.
LPR-B-081	Mike Pollard	LPR-A-175	Objects to site development. development strategy in the current development plan is fit for purpose and as such should form the basis of the distribution strategy in the rolling forward of the Local Plan. Wardington should not be a candidate to accommodate district level development needs. The village has minimal services and is a conservation area. The scale of the proposed housing allocation is out of alignment with current planning policy for the village and parish. It would have a major impact on the setting of the village, as well as adding extra traffic to quiet roads where people are still able to walk in relative safety. The southern section of proposed housing allocation area is currently a valuable area of greenspace close to the village, much used by many local people as there are rights of way through the fields. A more appropriate purpose for this area would be creation of more accessible natural greenspace for local people and wildlife, this could include tree planting. The proposed housing land is also part of a wider area of land west of the village that is important for wildlife and has been mapped by Natural England as 'Network Enhancement Zone 1', a clear measure of the sensitivity of the area to development. Due to the significant existing value for nature and high potential for nature recovery that applies to this area, the plan should focus attention on nature recovery in this location and ensure this can be delivered without being compromised by major housing developments which will lead to increasing habitat fragmentation and elevated levels of disturbance. Respondent has observed nine red listed birds to be breeding in and around the proposed allocation area over the past 20 years. In the current nature and climate emergency we must avoid to allocating land for development that will lead to major impacts on nature in our area and severely limit the potential for nature recovery.
LPR-B-082	Peter Cockrell	LPR-A-175	Objects to development on following grounds - The area of development land and potential number of houses is vastly out of proportion to the size and character of this conservation area village. Priority should be given to the development of brownfield sites rather than productive Agricultural land. The services and infrastructure of this small village are vastly inadequate for such a development. If this parcel of land is granted change of use for housing development and access from the A361 is opened up then adjoining land such as the village allotment plot could become subject to speculative development.
LPR-B-083	L Matthews	LPR-A-175	Raises strong objection on following grounds - future of village with few amenities; no shop, no school and very limited bus services; concerned how increased housing numbers would cope with this. Impacts on traffic using the 361 which is already an accident black spot
LPR-B-084	Carl Middleditch	LPR-A-185	Obejct - last area east of the M40 and is an attractive asset to the town, development would create severe loss of open countryside. Proposals for a connecting road from A422 to Overthorpe Road would further disrupt the people of Nethercote. Difficult to see who would benefit from this road and whether there is sufficient traffic to warrant it. Any forseen problems with the M40 intersection J11 could be overcome by construction of a slip road and additional approach roads.



LPR-B-085	Sir Frank Davies	Option 30	Against housing development in rural areas set above local need. few jobs in those areas and additional housing leads to greater travel to work thereby polluting the environment in contravention of the objectives of COP26. Developers favour expensive houses because they make more profit. This is an inefficient use of land and there is a glut of grossly underused 4 and 5 bedroom houses in most villages. because more expensive houses can only be afforded by high income purchasers and there are few such jobs in the rural areas this means long, polluting, journeys which usually mean by private car. this green and pleasant land is being destroyed for ever by mini towns with no facilities again encouraging travel to the towns. Both these points mean more long distance road upkeep. Fifthly, other high growth is met by housing estates which are essentially urban and spoil villages
LPR-B-086	Angela Turner	LPR-A-204	Support for the designation as local green spaces. Volunteering at the orchard. Used by the local community for walking their dogs, a quiet walk, playing with children and collecting fruit. The orchard is a special site as it still has the ridge and furrow formations and we have listed the original trees and shrubs, which make it a natural haven for wildlife and plan on making labels for other people to see. keep these two spaces as Local Green Spaces, along with any others, for people of the future, who move to this town to still have the pleasure of enjoying the tranquillity of green spaces within built up areas.
LPR-B-086	Angela Turner	LPR-A-125	Support for the designation as local green spaces. This wildlife site at Gavray Meadows dates back 400 years to medieval times with ancient small meadows bounded by hedgerows, ridge and furrow formations, green lanes, mature trees, wild flowers and dew ponds. It has rare species of butterflies, including all five species of the Hairstreak butterflies and newts and that it is part of the Upper Ray Conservation Target Area (CTA) which is protected as an area of where biodiversity action should be focused. These details make it beneficial for educational purposes, apart from enjoyable walks. keep these two spaces as Local Green Spaces, along with any others, for people of the future, who move to this town to still have the pleasure of enjoying the tranquillity of green spaces within built-up areas.
LPR-B-087	V Hampson and A Nockalls	Hanwell	Concerned about encroachment on the village from Banbury to the South. The effect on this 800 year old village will be catastrophic the road through the village is narrow and only capable of one vehicle width in many parts. The road has been without repair for many years and is already eroded and in poor condition. Traffic is a perpetual problem due to the road being unsuitable for the volume of vehicles which use the village as a cut through and have a total disregard for the speed limit. That aside the village is a conservative area and many of the trees are protected. More trees should be planted not cut down especially in this time of climate change and the issues currently under discussion by our government. double standards are applied by the council with regard to refurbishment of homes in Hanwell who have to comply fastidiously with the conservation rules yet it appears building developments can go ahead unchallenged. The boundary between Banbury and Hanwell must be maintained in order to keep the villages identity and preserve what is essentially an old English village.
LPR-B-088	James Reid	LPR-A-152	Extremely concerned about development of this site. Development would leave just metres between the edge of the conservation area down Gullicote Lane and track, which would not allow for any significant natural border as exists with the trees which hide the Banbury 5/Hanwell Chase development. Higher footfall in Hanwell resulting from recent developments, flytipping an issue, and traffic through the village is at an all time high. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. development of the site would not cherish, protect or enhance the distinctive natural and built environment. Development would not be consistent with Key objectives 5, 9 and 15. <u>Development would result in coalescence.</u>
LPR-B-088	James Reid	LPR-A-214	Extremely concerned about development of this site. Higher footfall in Hanwell resulting from recent developments, flytipping an issue, and traffic through the village is at an all time high. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. development of the site would not cherish, protect or enhance the distinctive natural and built environment. Development would not be consistent with Key objectives 5, 9 and 15. <u>Development would result in coalescence.</u>
LPR-B-088	James Reid	Option 18	suggest development is most appropriate to the East or South of Banbury where there is lesser prospect of incursion on neighbouring villages
LPR-B-088	James Reid	Option 19	strongly support Option 2 to limit development at Banbury and protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. No objection to the development of sites LPR-A-154, LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-205, which would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages.
LPR-B-088	James Reid	Hanwell	Comments relate to Hanwell. Before considering further expansion and development perhaps focus should be shifted to meeting existing healthcare service needs. Reference to the Hanwell Conservation Area document which identifies points which support the protection of open space and rural character.
LPR-B-089	Jamie Jones	Question - Settlement	stop turning our small little country into a mass of concrete adjoining other towns city's.. this must stop for our future generations. People can't even get permission to live in a caravan that can be moved... corruption is setting in like Spain just kept quite , on the gravy train
LPR-B-090	Drs John and Hilary Maddicott	Kidlington	Almost all the sites listed in your documents are within the Green Belt. There should be no further Green Belt development. Enough Green Belt land has already been sacrificed in the Oxford-Kidlington gap and in the Begbroke-Yarnton-Kidlington triangle. Further Green Belt development will not only contravene a planning principle but will vastly increase the volume of traffic on local roads and place a heavy strain on local facilities, such as doctors' surgeries, which are already under extreme pressure. The Council should act now to query some of the assumptions in the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan; Any figures for future growth in the OGNA should be vigorously challenged.

LPR-B-090	Drs John and Hilary Maddicott	LPR-A-156	land is entirely unsuitable for development for the following reasons- on Green belt and most of the land is in the Conservation Area which should be protected. The area forms part of the beautiful assemblage of fields, pasture and meadow land which stretches down to the river Cherwell. Bordered by historic Church Street, it has a number of listed buildings along its periphery. Any development in this area would intrude in an ugly and unacceptable way on this historic and visually appealing landscape and would negate the purpose for which the Conservation Area was established. Site is a wild life haven; development would seriously damage the natural history aspects of the area. Whole site forms part of the flood plain; climate change will increase frequency of damaging rainfall; site unsuitable for housing. Access is via a relatively narrow residential road which gives on to Mill Street, which already carries a large volume of car and (frequent) bus traffic. <u>Development would greatly increase the traffic flow in this whole area</u>
LPR-B-090	Drs John and Hilary Maddicott	LPR-A-024	This is good agricultural land, at present mainly used for the cultivation of wheat, barley and oats. At a time when the country is supposed to be producing more of its own food agricultural land should not be easily given up for housing. These fields are widely used for leisure activities – by dog walkers, ramblers and to some extent by cyclists. Almost every hedge has a parallel footpath running beside it, some rights of way, others merely permissive.. In the event of development these would largely be lost, depriving Kidlingtonians of a valuable leisure and health resource. Access to the site could be obtained only via the Moors, already a busy residential road carrying much traffic to and from the main road to Banbury. Building over this very large area would greatly increase traffic, with detrimental effects on the environment and on the <u>circumstances of Moors’ residents.</u>
LPR-B-090	Drs John and Hilary Maddicott	LPR-A-224	This is good agricultural land, at present mainly used for the cultivation of wheat, barley and oats. At a time when the country is supposed to be producing more of its own food agricultural land should not be easily given up for housing. These fields are widely used for leisure activities – by dog walkers, ramblers and to some extent by cyclists. Almost every hedge has a parallel footpath running beside it, some rights of way, others merely permissive.. In the event of development these would largely be lost, depriving Kidlingtonians of a valuable leisure and health resource. Access to the site could be obtained only via the Moors, already a busy residential road carrying much traffic to and from the main road to Banbury. Building over this very large area would greatly increase traffic, with detrimental effects on the environment and on the <u>circumstances of Moors’ residents.</u>
LPR-B-091	Malcolm Bannister	Sibford Gower	Strongly objects to development around the village. This would almost double the size of the village. Categorisation as a category A village is not a true reflection of our communities and their facilities. Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower wish to seek reclassification as two separate villages. Pound Lane is a narrow country road, at some points causing cars to pass each other with difficulty and it is without pavements for most of its length. would undermine the housing strategy in the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, which seeks to distribute new housing to the most suitable locations with regards to public services and facilities, transport and employment. Also undermines the Oxford 2050 policies which address climate change, improving environmental quality, creating strong and healthy communities, planning for sustainable travel and creating jobs while providing homes. New housing should be located in sustainable areas; proposals for Sibford Gower should be removed <u>from the local plan.</u>
LPR-B-092	Debbie Pitt	Shutford	Proposed development would increase the village by almost 50%. Would result in extra pressure on the narrow roads and infrastructure including drainage and sewerage which isn't capable of coping with the present situation. No bus service, no primary schools, no shop, no GP surgeries and a small play area which would require people to drive out of the village to access facilities. Driving would not help our zero emission targets. Housing <u>should be built taking in consideration of infrastructure and the environment</u>
LPR-B-093	C A Warner	LPR-A-107	The site in question is within an area referred as part of "Ironstone Downland" and next to an area of outstanding natural beauty. The potential development on this location would double the size of Sibford Gower and is quite unacceptable and would damage valuable countryside. Access to the site is totally inadequate. Increased traffic generated by such a development would have a detrimental affect on the villages of Tadmarton, Swalcliffe and Broughton with commuter traffic heading for Banbury and the M40 so increasing CO2 emissions. Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate. New developments generate levels of lighting (street lighting) which would destroy the 'dark sky' environment currently enjoyed. Development in rural areas should be limited to local needs and be <u>directed to larger sustainable villages and towns. Site is inappropriate and should be dismissed</u>
LPR-B-094	Mervyn and Valerie Benford	Shutford	Comments provided in relation to developments providing improvements to relevant facilities, access and viable mobile phone services. Council response is sensitive and mindful of the potential, real problems of resources and road access. would what is proposed be an opportunity to have those present problems addressed — and in particular the provision of effective mobile phone access? Queries the numbers of units/plans envisaged for Shutford. increasing predictions of more and heavier rainfall the water table lower in the village becomes a serious concern for potential housing. Might such a mixed development be helpful for possible local downsizing? Will changes in the future for work and at work change family needs as children reach adulthood? What type of housing is proposed? The Dairyground housing estate is viewed as an asset - Houses mean people and potential support for local enterprise and partnership/social/cultural life- but within sensible limits. No new developments should happen without full and responsible consideration of the resources and road access problems. Ecofriendly housing not dependent on fossil fuel might be an asset. endorse the comment in the Parish Council's response about brown field sites if development does ultimately go ahead.
LPR-B-095	Nick Fennell	Adderbury	Up to 8 new developments around Adderbury would go against the 2018 Neighbourhood Plan. Immediately before the CDC plan was finalised, and hence before our Neighbourhood Plan, Adderbury experienced a 20% housing increase with the developments on Milton Rd and Aynho Rd. The village voted for the protection afforded by our current residential settlement boundary and local gaps between Adderbury and Bodicote and Milton. agreed Neighbourhood Plan would be obliterated if even a proportion of the possible developments was approved. The current infrastructure would be inadequate to support the increased traffic and demand for school places – but no increase in employment opportunity. It is not what our (already large) village needs, and would severely damage <u>what defines a village - its community, individual identity, charm and history</u>

LPR-B-096	Colin and Diane Hanney	LPR-A-175	Strongly object to development site. Not suitable due to lack of services. The village is category 'B' and has no school or doctors surgery or retail to sustain a development of this potential size. Only one pub in village. Out of proportion to the existing village. The area could not take development of, what potentially could be between 300 and 400 houses as this would change the aspect and character of the village entirely. A development of this size would not enhance the needs of the local community. The village is a conservation area. The land identified is highly populated by wildlife. Parcels of the land is currently used for crop growing and sheep grazing. The A361 is already heavily congested which has unfortunately resulted in deaths and with the expected increased traffic from HS2 and the commercial developments at Junction 11, an additional development of this size will only increase the potential for more accidents on this road.
LPR-B-097	Alasdair Gibbs	Shutford	Sites proposed are entirely inappropriate. Shutford has very restricted infrastructure in terms of road access, water, drainage or sewage; much of which was installed in the early 1950s. Sewerage system struggles to cope. The road network simply could not cope with the increased traffic that further homes would bring; roads are narrow with no room to expand. Vibration from large wagons has resulted in major collapse of respondents water well. Little street lighting. Even if the access and infrastructure were to be improved, which would be a major task requiring substantial investment, the village has no shop, school or leisure facilities other than the village hall, pub and children's play area. All residents travel by car; no bus or rail links. Roads unsuitable for large wagons. development should respect the green belt and environmental nature of Shutford, and consider brown field sites before encroaching outside the present village boundary.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	There should be reference to the Circular Economy, as well as greater promotion of Active/Sustainable Travel as a means to achieving climate action. There are strong links between resource efficiency, the circular economy and climate change and this is not specifically acknowledged. Climate change policies and objectives should be worded to reflect this, so they shape developments that include community spaces to support resource efficiency and the circular economy, energy efficiency, public recycling/composting infrastructure and active travel. Policies on sustainable construction should require buildings to be designed for energy efficiency and zero carbon to mitigate climate change. We welcome the intention to include detailed policies concerning Air quality in the and note the congestion impacts on air quality at Banbury and Bicester. The transport user hierarchy set out in LTCP prioritises walking and cycling, in conjunction with sustainable public transport for longer journeys, to deliver a zero-carbon Oxfordshire transport system that enables the county to thrive whilst protecting the environment and making Oxfordshire a better place to live for all residents.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	We suggest that there should be reference made to the emerging Local Transport Connectivity Plan (LTCP). An issue for OCC which the Local Plan 2040 will need to address is the identification, provision, funding and overall deliverability of the infrastructure and County Council services needed to support sustainable development. However, transport matters within this paper are well addressed from a strategy perspective, and additional detailed points are provided where they could be further strengthened, in particular reference is requested to the Bicester southeast link road.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 1	We support Cherwell's emphasis on climate action in the vision and acknowledgement of opportunities for post COVID-19 recovery. We would welcome further reference to innovation and connectivity. Reference should be made to the emerging Local Transport Connectivity Plan (LTCP). A number of supporting strategies including the Rail Strategy as well as the Freight and Logistics Strategy, will address the challenges associated with the movement of goods and passengers in Oxfordshire. We support Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change at the heart of the vision, with Healthy Place Shaping and Maintaining and Developing and Sustainable Economy as the other key elements. All new homes should have or be made ready for EV charging and the fastest available broadband. Theme 2 – this section could expand on the modal shift we need to create to achieve a reduction in carbon emissions. Growth should be concentrated in areas which have established transport connections and investment in infrastructure should be focused on active and sustainable travel. Pg22 (Development Management Policies)- Connectivity should be more specific, active and sustainable travel will be prioritised. Pg. 23 – not one point in this section is on transport.. Whilst technology and innovation are mentioned in terms of taking advantage of them, which is great, there is a gap around ensuring that communities/developments are equipped to face the changes that current innovation becoming mainstream will bring (e.g., electric vehicles, automated vehicles, 5G/6G etc). This could be considered an aspect of sustainability. It is welcomed that the first pledge within the suggested vision is to achieve climate action targets. Point five needs to explicitly reference the importance of creating health enabling environments where it is easy to be active, access healthy food, and to connect with neighbours. The design and delivery of new developments and their connectivity to existing communities need to reflect healthy place shaping principles. The section should include the rich and nationally significant archaeological resource of the District which contributes greatly to its sense of place. This archaeological resource forms an important part of the character of Cherwell which needs to be protected and enhanced as set out in the environmental objective of sustainable development. The county would further welcome policies within the emerging CDC Local Plan 2040 that: strengthens or supports policies for net zero carbon homes, specifically construction and design standards that reduce energy demand in line with the energy hierarchy. The Pathways to a Zero Carbon Oxfordshire (PAZCO) report builds on the previous Low Carbon Economy Report (2014), with updated evidence of pathway options for Oxfordshire to achieve net zero carbon and should be referred to. Recognition should be given to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan as part of the Development Plan for Oxfordshire. We would expect to see commitment to continuing to work with the County on these issues, particularly on waste.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 2	We welcome the key objective set out in delivering developments that minimise and are resilient to the impacts of climate change, including extreme weather events. We welcome the inclusion of objective 20 in meeting the housing needs of all sectors of Cherwell's communities. We suggest that further iterations of the Local Plan should explore policies to encourage the development of good quality lifetime homes and create dementia friendly environments to support active, independent, and healthy lifestyles to improve their quality of life and community integration. Consideration should be given to objective(s) around ensuring that innovation/technology are used to further each of the themes. We offer no judgement as to which objectives are the most important, but welcome reference to prioritisation of active travel, reduction of dependency on public transport and high standards of connectivity (KO16) and meeting the housing needs for all residents (KO20), we would welcome reference to the need for Extra Care Housing. KO1: There should be an emphasis on developing brownfield sites in preference to allowing "urban sprawl"? (partly addressed in KO7 and KO23) as this is best from a sustainable transport perspective. There should be reference to these being locations that are suitably well connected in terms of sustainable travel. This is very important as the lack of truly affordable homes means that people who work in the health and care sector have to commute significant distances as they cannot afford to live locally. KO3 is vital to achieving the wider climate emergency targets and improving people's mental and physical wellbeing, as reduced commuting distances will allow for a better uptake of active travel. KO 9 – could note something around futureproofing for current innovation becoming mainstream in order to ensure attractiveness for businesses – evidence that you're more likely to attract high tech/high performing business to an area that is equipped well for the future. KO 10 – given the need to offset existing development which can't be brought up to zero carbon standards with retrofit, ideally, new development should be better than net zero and could make mention to EV charging. KO11 – could mention smart energy systems. KO12 is important because the demand for new housing cannot be met without a key focus on the impacts of climate change and the individual risks to each property. Typo at KO14: Secure new green....KO16 – prioritising active travel ignores the complexity of rural travel which does not seem to be given so much thought. Need to ensure that active travel is not promoted above all else as it is not an option for many. However, it is important to reduce transport emissions. KO24: There should also be an aspiration to reduce the need to travel at all. KO30: Facilities such as pubs create reduce the need to travel further afield for leisure purposes and encourage closer community cohesion. KO20-31 are all very high priority if we are to deliver our aspiration of healthy place shaping. These objectives address the wider social determinants of health that the Local Plan can influence and reduce health inequalities.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 3	Sustainable travel options should be a key consideration in the location of employment land, providing access to residential development and other uses. OCC transport planning colleagues will work with Cherwell to assess the impact of employment land options. Transport connections should guide the location of employment land. Locations where people can sustainably travel to need to be identified and then an assessment of whether the site is suitable for employment should take place, so Option 3 is not appropriate. Option 5 would offer the best solution for the people of Cherwell. A significant proportion of residents do not live within the urban centres of Banbury, Bicester, or Kidlington and if we are to encourage commuting via active travel then it is important that people can live within short distances from their place of work. In addition, the public transport network should allow those living further away from the larger employment hubs to be able to get to work without relying on the use of a car.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 4	Favour Option 2 to enable mixed use sites.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Supporting Employment	Favour Option 2 to enable mixed use sites. Consideration should be given to potential B8 requirements within residential areas, for freight consolidation. The Council may also want to think about policies around requirements for futureproofing for innovation/tech set to become mainstream in areas where there is an objective to promote science, tech, and innovation businesses in particular. With the recognised decline in town centre shops and services, it is crucial to ensure that the locations of new retail and leisure are considered in respect of the local communities and their ability to travel on foot, by bike or via public transport. The concept of 20-minute neighbourhoods relies on the ability to access services without driving. To sustain and manage economic growth as identified in the plan we must leverage every opportunity; maximise every 'lever' we have within the 'system' to encourage skills, training, and employment opportunities. We must ensure we fully embrace Community Employment Plan (CEPs) aligned to major developments thus creating a county wide approach to increased employment and training opportunities. A county wide approach creates opportunities for residents from all districts. Following successful pilot CEPs instigated by the Skills Board and the OxLEP Skills Team, further work to implement CEPs into planning policy has been in progress. This approach has been endorsed at Growth Board, Local Enterprise Partnership Board and by the Skills Board. CEPs are fundamental to the successful delivery of strategic objective's identified in Oxfordshire's Local Skills Plan and Report and Economic Recovery Plan and the emerging Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership. CEPs could be greatly beneficial in providing opportunities for people of all ages to gain necessary skills, apprenticeships, and work, to address the identified skills shortage and lack of training opportunities locally and providing enhanced social mobility and economic growth as a result. If skills, training, and employment levels are not significantly improved in deprived areas, this will consequently inhibit local economic growth and prosperity. The preparation and implementation of Community Employment Plans could significantly benefit businesses, the economy and provide opportunities for local people to improve their skills and training in support of the strategic plans. Community Employment Plans can be part of our approach locally – delivered in partnership with willing investors. CEPs provide the framework to help developers deliver on these ambitions. CEPs are employer-led initiatives which can form part of planning obligations for significant developments. The measures contained within CEPs seek to maximise the wider community benefits of development through ensuring that local people can better access job opportunities arising from development. The outcomes in CEPs should apply at the construction phase and at end-use phase of employment generating development. The Cherwell Plan should seek to encourage the implementation of CEPs which are focused on strategic sites. There are a significant number of strategic sites at various points in the planning process locally and an additional pipeline over the midterm. Each represents a huge opportunity to support wider skills and training opportunities and may be particularly helpful in boosting social mobility. Oxfordshire has the collective knowledge and experience to support developers in the delivery of CEPs. The Plan must provide the strategic hooks for us to legitimately engage and support developers as they invest in Oxfordshire and Cherwell and in turn leverage that investment to the benefit of all our communities.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 5	Flexibility of use will be an important element of the COVID-19 recovery and provide adaptability in a changing town centre landscape maintaining vibrancy and reducing transport impacts. There is an opportunity to rethink the role and look of town centres. If some retail has moved to the edge of town, then spaces in the centre could be converted to parks/bike repair places/gyms/other community facilities, whilst ensuring strong active travel connections to retail areas. Disused department stores could be converted into health centres which would be accessible to more people and in turn reduce the burden on GP services. Option 2 seems a better although as towns act as service centres, the idea of a 20-minute neighbourhood should still be retained as having amenities more spread out would be less conducive to active travel.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	20-minute neighbourhoods are not purely for encouraging the shift to active travel. It is to allow those from deprived communities to have equal access to shops and services which might otherwise be inaccessible due to travel distance and lack of quality infrastructure. If town centres are allowed to become entirely residential then this would result in a loss of community facilities and result in widening health inequalities. iHUB within OCC prefers Option 1 allowing flexibility but protecting key shopping areas. Although the Banbury section of this plan contains a number of paragraphs on Banbury's built heritage there is nothing to highlight the archaeological resource within the town. Banbury has a wealth of archaeological heritage assets which are often overlooked. Archaeological excavations ahead of development in and around Banbury have revealed a significant prehistoric landscape, a Bronze Age funerary landscape and later prehistoric settlement. In line with the NPPF the local plan should aim to set out a robust strategy for the protection and enhancement of this archaeological resource. In addition to Alchester Roman Town and the Priory Bicester contains a wealth of archaeological sites which should be highlighted. The town contains a scheduled medieval village at Wretchwick and considerable evidence of wide scale Iron Age and Roman field systems survive below ground around its edges. This includes a large area south east of the current town where evidence of Roman wine production has been reported. A number of Bronze Age barrows have been recorded within the town. Bicester dates back to the Saxon period. Saxon halls and sunken featured buildings have also been recorded within the town. In addition to the Cold War heritage, the site of the airfield at Upper Heyford has considerable archaeological interest located alongside Aves Ditch. A number of later prehistoric Banjo enclosures have been recorded along the line of this boundary feature. Whilst the development of the area south of Camp Road would have removed much of this potential the majority of the Flying Field could still contain significant archaeological sites.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Supporting our Town	A policy on out-of-town retail centres is important so that such centres do not reduce retail activities in town centres. The policy should require retail centres be accessible by sustainable and active travel.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 6	There remains a lack of new supply of social rented housing the district, the percentage of affordable housing on new developments needs to be increased. Housing remains unaffordable even for those who don't fall into the deprived bracket. This is partly due to the high house prices in South East England. More should be done to enable first time buyers and young families to get onto the property ladder. In addition to the 30% and 35% requirements for affordable housing in the current Local Plan to address Cherwell's need for affordable housing, the percentage of required affordable housing is 50% for the Partial Review allocations. The 50% requirement was included given that these allocations were made to address Oxford's unmet housing needs and there is a requirement for sites to deliver 50% of the houses as affordable housing in Oxford City. Consideration should be given to the required percentage levels of affordable housing having regard to viability and strategic considerations identified through the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 7	Prefer Option 1 where priority is given to social rented housing. Given the high cost of average house prices in Oxfordshire and the lack of supply of truly affordable homes, increasing social rented housing is important and its % should be increased above 30%
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 8	Prefer Option 1 to require all new dwellings to meet minimum requirements. The Covid pandemic has highlighted the impact of overcrowding on both physical and mental health. The Local Plan should include a requirement that all new dwellings meet nationally described minimum space standards
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 9	Prefer Option 1 to introduce accessibility standards. A new specific policy for accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes would be welcome as this would reduce the health inequalities experienced by the ageing population of Cherwell and enable those living with long term conditions to live independently, thereby reducing the pressure on health services.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Travelling Communities	Specific locations are often identified by members of the Gypsy and Traveller community, who even with the expert advice of knowledgeable agents, often fail at the application stage, or achieve approval for a very reduced number of pitches. There is no perfect location for sites, but sites are normally on marginal land that developers see no potential for large or small developments. Guidelines and planners are concerned if locations are isolated and not near schools, retail, or public transport. Yet this is never an issue for the Gypsy and Traveller community when they build sites, they are pleased to have a location to call home. They don't like sites in overdeveloped areas where they don't have privacy. Cherwell DC have lost 2 sites in the past few years. Planning consent has been achieved in several locations, Chesterton and Caulcott, there being an appeal on the proposed site at Piddington. There needs to be positive intervention by planning enforcement within the Council, as has recently been proved with Cherwell's action in the High Court in respect of the site at Manor Park, Nr Islip, where many plots that should according to the planning consent be for members of the Gypsy and Traveller community, were being rented out to persons from the settled community. This is widespread throughout the County and UK. Cherwell was one of the first to take positive action. We all know that many sites are located at locations where the settled community would not even consider living. But with the requirement for more suburban and commercial development, this are becoming harder to find. Many sites have little or no impact on the adjoining communities.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Housing Policies	Housing policies should support Modern Methods of Construction, including design for disassembly, offsite construction, and modular homes. This will need to consider that many of these MMCs are not fully tested – AIMCH project would be useful to review for consideration of how these MMCs can be made most commercially viable. It would also be good to be supporting digital approaches such as digital twinning and Building Information Modelling, to support reduced environmental impact and reducing snags. There’s potential for significant change in this field over the life of the new plan, so any policy might be better to be relatively flexible in wording and point elsewhere to follow best practice. There should be a policy restricting conversion of homes into houses in multiple occupation as these tend to result in overcrowding, if such conversions are permitted the policy should require that they meet minimum space standards. A policy to support the provision of housing to meet specific needs would be consistent with the requirements in paragraphs 60-62 of the NPPF. We observe an opportunity to include policies to support circular economy principles and on embodied carbon, to manage the emissions in producing building materials, their transport and installation on site, as well as their disposal end of life.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 10	Cherwell Local Plan should take this review as an opportunity to explore including sustainable design and construction standards above those required by Government. We prefer Option 1’ if OP2050 already exceeds government requirements; Option 3 if it does not. This Policy should ensure that provision for sustainable management of waste during construction and occupation is considered by developments as part of their Planning Applications. They should consider the reuse of materials on site and the use of recycled and secondary aggregates during construction. They should consider the storing and segregation of waste and ensure access by waste collection during occupation. We would be happy to explore this further with you. We need to be as ambitious as possible in tackling the climate emergency to prevent catastrophic impacts. It would be best to set targets for both residential and non-residential development above those required nationally in order for Cherwell to become a front runner and set an example. We only have around seven years left of our carbon budget in Cherwell and so drastic action is needed now. The County supports the preferred option to bring forward higher design requirements but the policy wording should be strengthened to require major developments to be net zero. Should the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 not include a policy requiring major developments to be net zero, the CDC Local Plan 2040 should set their own higher standard. We welcome the publication of the LETI Climate Emergency Design Guide which clearly defines net zero carbon in buildings (both embodied and operational carbon) and sets a clear roadmap to achieve this. The County Council does not have a statutory role in setting design standards for new developments but is a cosignatory with CDC on the Oxfordshire Energy Strategy which outlines a shared commitment ‘to reduce countywide emissions by 50% compared with 2008 levels by 2030 and set a pathway to achieve zero carbon growth by 2050’. This target reflects the Climate Change Act 2008 and the County Council’s Climate Action Framework, which sets out our commitment to be a zero carbon organisation by 2030 and playour part in enabling a zero carbon Oxfordshire by 2050.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Agree with suggested approach in relation to retrofitting. Suggest encouraging latest PAS is applied to retrofit (currently PAS 2030/2019 and 2035 for retrofit). For retrofit need to think about how we can support the supply chain to develop. This may be outside scope of Local Plan though. Retrofitting buildings to meet targets on carbon emissions should be more important than preserving historic buildings. There will clearly be some exceptions, but retrofitting should not simply be denied because a building holds some historic significance. Local Plan policies should identify opportunities for reducing carbon dioxide emissions from the existing building stock by identifying potential synergies between new developments and existing buildings through the retrofitting of energy efficiency measures, decentralised energy and renewable energy opportunities. The County is supportive of retrofit and would like to work with Cherwell, especially where funding is routed through larger scale bodies such as county councils. We also note an established need as outlined in the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) Stage 1 report, which includes a schemes gap analysis and recommends additional future schemes to address environment needs to 2040
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 11	Prefer Option 1, but there needs to be an impetus for local onsite energy generation for developments. The County is supportive of allocations of sites for renewable energy generation and renewable energy data is available through Project Local Energy Oxfordshire (LEO). Proposals will need to be considered alongside network capacity and demand. Energy projects typically require significant investment and planning, and local plans are the ideal means to securing a strategic and managed approach that provides certainty for both developers and the community, developed through a rigorous process, and tested in terms of viability. In terms of carbon emissions outside of the control of the local authority, local plans provide the mechanism to ensure that developers improve standards, connect to key infrastructure, such as heat networks, and where this is not possible, make financial contributions to energy projects within the local area.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	To help in climate change mitigation and adaptation, we would expect to see the Circular Economy within the Plan. The Issues Paper also does not discuss resource efficiency. Resource efficiency and sustainable management of waste will continue to have a significant link with Climate Change. A number of the proposed objectives contain the word ‘sustainable’ within them, in particular in the development of sites, as well as supporting the efficient use of local resources yet waste is not specifically mentioned within any objective. In Objective KO28, waste is not included as an area/need that should be met by the District. The paper includes no reference to reducing waste, recycling, waste minimisation, resource efficiency or managing waste in new developments. Is it the District’s intention that the objectives are all inclusive of waste issues and resource efficiency, even if not specifically mentioning them in the Review Paper currently? It is felt that the future Local Plan could expand these further. Consideration of other technologies likely to impact on climate change e.g., autonomous vehicles. Setting out sharing space within development to promote their use through shared schemes rather than private ownership. Also need to think about impacts of the change’s climate change will require i.e., reduce car usage and ownership. Promotion of redeployable parking, for example. Last mile delivery might also be worth thinking about re drone and cargo bike delivery for example – ensuring charging, docking facilities available etc. There should be targets on how many electric vehicle charging points there will be installed and consideration taken on the location/distribution of these. Energy policy on new developments set metrics not only for carbon, but for total energy use, so that new-builds do not put added strain on an electricity grid which is coming under pressure from the electrification of vehicles and heating – in line with local and national zero-carbon goals.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Green Belt	Countywide strategic matters relating to the Green Belt might be addressed by the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. We acknowledge this is a sensitive issue and will need co-ordination with other authorities. Consider the need for a transport hub off of the A44 at the Bladon roundabout to assist sustainable transport into Oxford, Woodstock and Blenheim as well as linking to other local areas.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 12	A combination of Options 2 and 3 seems the most appropriate here as developer contributions are a simple and effective way to ensure that the impacts of a development are mitigated in the right way. By channelling some of this funding to local environmental bodies, it will increase their capacity to undertake projects aimed at biodiversity protection/enhancement and increasing access to nature. At the same time this community activity needs to support enhancement and protection of priority areas in the nature recovery network
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 13	Prefer Option 2 as simply assessing impact of development on natural capital is insufficient, developers need to be required to show how they are mitigating potentially negative impacts to achieve environmental net gain. Major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	We support the references to Natural Environment and Biodiversity and the aspiration to secure the delivery of biodiversity net gain and mitigate the impact of climate change on biodiversity. The development of a robust and diverse green infrastructure network will deliver multiple environmental benefits and meet the needs of existing and future communities, as well as help in the delivery of mitigation and adaptation to climate change. There is an opportunity through the emerging Oxfordshire Nature Recovery Strategy to identify schemes in the Nature Recovery Zone to enhance habitat restoration and to integrate this with wider infrastructure types such as flood alleviation and transport. It would be good to consider integrating natural environment into buildings and infrastructure – green walls, roofs etc. Consideration of moss walls may be beneficial for air quality improvement and climate change mitigation. The Plan should include policies on green and blue infrastructure including access to nature as well as air quality.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 14	Option 3 creates a more inclusive place for children overall rather than children effectively only be accepted in certain places. This has the potential to foster a greater sense of community and conveys a message of reclaiming the streets for people and moving away from a purely movement-based approach. Good to have traditional provision as well. Provision of highly accessible, informal as well as formal play spaces are linked with good mental and physical wellbeing in children. With childhood obesity and levels of inactivity on the rise, it has never been more important to focus on the provision of a variation of different types of play areas.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 15	Prefer Option 2. Centralised hubs or enhancing existing facilities ensures that there are high quality facilities that meet community need, so less need to travel elsewhere. There could then be a focus on ensuring sustainable travel connections to these places. It is a priority to use developer financial contributions to enhance the provision of existing facilities, with contributions supporting connectivity by sustainable and active travel from new developments to existing facilities. However, where there is no scope for expansion at existing facilities, developers should be obliged to ensure that sports hubs are provided at the development.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Anything that would promote the use of outdoor spaces for walking, exploring, recreation and learning is ultimately good for people's wellbeing. Where new development is able to reveal the significance of heritage assets, this should be harnessed to its maximum potential. This section should certainly reference the wealth of archaeological information within the District which contributes greatly to its sense of place. The District contains a number of Iron Age Hillforts, castles, and the scheduled Roman Town of Alchester along with earthworks of shrunken medieval villages and preserved former field systems. The District contain numerous undesignated archaeological sites which are considered to be of the same significance and would need to be considered in line with policies for designated sites set out in the NPPF. This archaeological resource forms an important part of the character of Cherwell which needs to be protected and enhanced as set out in the environmental objective of sustainable development.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Good design needs to cater for future change. Suggest pointing people towards Innovation Framework to help address these kinds of considerations. Taking inspiration from the design of Elmsbrook Eco-Town, Bicester, new developments should maximise space for walking, cycling, resting, and enjoying the local landscape. 'Beauty' is a fairly subjective concept so would be difficult to quantify in a specific policy. We would recommend a policy that all new developments are required to meet Building for a Healthy Life standards. A policy could be included that focuses on creating safe environments which promote good physical and mental health, with places and routes that are safe and perceived to be safe by creating passive surveillance and active frontages, as well as including measures to improve safety for all road users, particularly for those that walk and cycle.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	We support the concept of the 20-minute neighbourhood and believe this is key to getting more people out of their cars and sustainably using their local communities for services. The principle is good but even with everything people supposedly need within 20-minutes, people will still want to travel further, so strong public transport connections need to be considered. One possibility is creating a network of 20-minute neighbourhoods that are well connected by public transport. In rural areas there could be consideration of the time taken to reach employment or shops being used to grade accessibility, and thus guide where development could/should be encouraged without encouraging commensurate longdistance commuting. A place for all ages is important, given proportionally high levels of older people living in rural locations. There is the potential to treat clusters of villages as '20minute cycle' neighbourhoods which between them may have the range of assets associated with this concept. Also, villages in the hinterland of our urban centres can be connected to the market towns through cycle routes that encourage active travel between them.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	We support the proposed transport and connectivity approach which prioritise reduction in the need for travel and then active and sustainable modes. The transport user hierarchy set out in LTCP highlights a new and right approach is required that prioritises walking and cycling, in conjunction with sustainable public transport for longer journeys. Application of the transport user hierarchy will deliver a more balanced and effective transport network that provides for a greater range of travel modes and accessibility needs. However, you probably need to have decarbonisation via technology running alongside the hierarchy, rather than within it. There are also new forms of transport which don't fit neatly within categories – e.g., micro mobility modes, which play a role in decarbonisation, but need to be carefully managed to ensure they're not detracting from un-powered active travel modes. This will enable all residents to have more choice and easier interchange between sustainable modes, making every-day journeys more convenient. In order to support this hierarchy and prioritise walking and cycling OCC will create plans for improved infrastructure across the county. Comprehensive cycle and walking networks are fundamental to successfully increasing their usage. The development of the Strategic Active Travel Network will expand the opportunities to walk and cycle between towns, villages, and key corridors in Oxfordshire. This improved connectivity will contribute to encouraging walking and cycling and delivery of our vision. There are also existing off-road networks that could be developed to support the uptake of walking and cycling. There are hundreds of kilometres of Public Rights of Way throughout Oxfordshire that have the potential for transformation into high quality multi-user routes. Encouraging an increased number of public transport trips will also be an essential part of delivering our LTCP vision. Increased public transport use will help to reduce the number of private vehicle trips and deliver air quality improvements. Public transport is key for rural areas and strong connections to service centres are required. There is considerable emphasis on active travel throughout the transport section which is welcomed, and there will need to be ongoing work between CDC and OCC on the challenges of providing effective public transport for the rural areas. Developments need to help deliver the LCWIPs in order to provide active travel connectivity. There is a need to not just consider the infrastructure but the whole journey of travelling, to include changing facilities at workplaces, bike repair stations and provisions for winter. These factors should be built into policy so that a comprehensive approach to active travel is taken. It may be difficult to prioritise public transport/cycling in the rural villages but the larger destinations (Bicester, Kidlington, Banbury) need to reduce car parking and prioritise bus lanes/cycle lanes. There will be a need to consider low carbon technology to a greater degree for rural areas and protecting the bus service is essential.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 16	Support Option 1. We welcome reference to Broadband and Digital Infrastructure, which has been integral to the response to COVID-19 and is fundamental to enhancing connectivity and providing resilience. The Plan should ensure that any new homes or commercial premises planned to be built have “full fibre to the premises” digital connectivity to enable more people to work from home, reducing the amount of traffic on the roads. This will help ensure that connected homes and offices optimise environmental controls reducing power consumption and pollution. The Plan as a whole needs to embrace and enable new technologies for transport and connectivity. “Future-proofing” is essential. Digital infrastructure is key to reducing the need to travel. Good digital connectivity needs to be expedited though and not just something for the future and the infrastructure needs to be in place to respond to this. A sense of urgency should be added to providing good digital infrastructure. Ensuring sensible space is allocated for street cabinets (for 5G/6G), to avoid future obstruction to wheelchair users etc. Full Fibre should be standard for new development.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Transport Policies	Approved LCWIPs could be included within the IDP as appropriate. LTN 1/20 should be used for attractive and safe cycle provision. The new Oxfordshire Street Design Guide could be mentioned. Oxfordshire Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy will be producing a guidance note for developers specifically. Should reference Innovation Framework and Oxfordshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy. It may be helpful to integrate a high-level policy which pertains to changes within transport options available/ trends of societal change, significant change might be expected, and exact trajectory over this length of time is uncertain. This could call on the need for changes within options available/level of need for provision being considered in planning development/infrastructure, and that this should be done with the key themes in mind. Then point to Innovation Framework provides upto-date guidance/evidence. As part of the standards for cycle parking and electric charging in new developments, there should be specific obligations for cycle parking to be accessible and convenient from the roadside, thereby encouraging people to cycle to and from their homes. Plugin points should be close to people's homes and convenient for everyday use. The Plan needs a policy on the creation of delivery hubs to reduce the multiple trips into villages that are generated by online shopping. Identifying delivery points at which all delivery companies could leave packages would enable active travel within villages and improve air quality. Providing enhanced cycling and walking infrastructure is key to improving connections across the network. In addition, people need support to change behaviour and make modal shift. We would support a policy of community activation being included in the Local Plan that identifies the range of complementary measures that need to be provided in order to address the barriers that people experience to cycling and walking more. The Plan also needs a policy to endorse the continued review and investment in LCWIPs and ensure that connectivity between settlements is considered to develop a comprehensive network of walking and cycling infrastructure is needed across all areas to enable this shift to happen on a bigger scale.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 17	We agree that updating the methodology would be appropriate. The methodology should be updated to consider the social and environmental benefits of schemes and their contributions to climate action, healthy place shaping and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure influences so much that it cannot be considered just as a physical facet. A catchment approach would be good for rural areas where needs cannot be met in individual neighbourhoods alone. It is important to look at areas by catchment and their accessibility.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	A policy should be included to future proof infrastructure. The Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) Stage 1 report included a schemes gap analysis and recommended additional future schemes to address environment needs to 2040: Home Efficiency Retrofitting Scheme; Zero Carbon Heat Network Scheme; Electric Vehicle Charging Sessions; Zero Emissions Zones; Zero Carbon Public Transport Scheme; Habitat & Biodiversity Restoration Scheme; Strategic Flood Alleviation Scheme; and, Renewable Energy Scheme.



LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 18	OCC will work in partnership with Cherwell to assess the transport impacts of the growth options. Further urban extensions will simply increase the need to travel, and thus congestion, unless they come with very strong sustainable transport connections. The current concentration of employment to the east and housing to the west of Banbury has increased the need to travel which needs to be resolved with active travel, public transport and as a last resort highway improvements. Before considering any further extensions into the open countryside, consideration must be given to new peripheral or orbital routes that will relieve the traffic in the town centre, allowing for the allocation of space to sustainable traffic modes and making it a more pleasant town to walk or cycle in. Such routes must not bisect residential areas, where there will always be a conflict between place and movement. Traffic free cycle routes must be created between the town centre and the extensions, as well as orbital routes. Consideration should also be given to the natural environment, and enjoyment of public rights of way, which may be lost if the separation is lost between villages. There is excellent walking country around Banbury, which is an attractive feature key to encouraging tourism. Green 'fingers' and corridors must be provided rather than simply encircling the town with new development. Focussing development on a settlement well connected with Banbury would make public transport critical, to avoid increasing traffic. The settlement would need to be of sufficient size to generate enough demand to make public transport services between the site and Banbury commercially viable. Across the existing and planned school estate in Banbury, there are options to accommodate further growth. Where existing/planned schools are intended to serve growth, travel routes to those schools are key, especially to ensure safe and sustainable travel patterns. If the scale of growth exceeds the potential of the existing/planned school estate, then housing developments should be of a scale, individually or in close proximity, to make a new primary school viable. The scale of housing development at an existing settlement outside of Banbury would need to be carefully planned. In some cases, there will be an existing primary school which may benefit from local population growth to a certain degree, but there will be a limit to the scale of growth it can support; beyond that limit a new school may be required, but it would be important that this does not destabilise the existing school. Any new settlement would need to be of a scale to make viable a new primary school.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 19	Development to the east of Banbury would be challenging due to the severance caused by the M40, and would require additional crossings of the motorway, including for motor traffic, and improvement of existing road corridors as well as the development of good quality traffic free cycle routes. However, housing here would be closer to the main employment areas. To other sides of town, the hilly topography could make cycling unattractive, although the increasing uptake of e-bikes could counteract this. Any sites need to demonstrate strong sustainable connections and consider how they could help to relieve the significant issues on Hennef Way. Existing and planned secondary schools are concentrated to the south and west of Banbury. Unless extensions to the north or east were of sufficient scale to provide a new secondary school site, housing in those locations (especially east of the M40) might generate less sustainable travel patterns to secondary school. Banbury has a wealth of archaeological heritage assets which are often overlooked. Archaeological excavations ahead of development in and around Banbury have also revealed a significant prehistoric landscape, a Bronze Age funerary landscape as well as later prehistoric settlement. In line with the NPPF the local plan should aim to set out a robust strategy for the protection and <u>enhancement of this archaeological resource.</u>
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 20	Conversion of shops and restaurants to homes can present problems in terms of parking. Consideration of parking policy and zones is required. It can be difficult to fit in convenient and sufficient cycle parking into this type of premises. A reduction in the need for retail and office space is inevitable, and there is a need to rethink the town centre, so that parts of it can be redeveloped as residential, if necessary, allowing buildings to be demolished rather than converted. It is important to take steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission. Creating a balanced mix of uses in our town centres of retail, leisure, community, and arts as well as housing is required to create <u>thriving town centres. This applies to Kidlington and Bicester as well.</u>
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 21	Prefer Option 2. A mix of development will encourage the vibrancy of the area and is preferable in terms of collocating jobs with potential employees. However, consideration must be given to HGV access.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	By linking open spaces with good quality walking and cycling routes, to make them more accessible and attractive. The Options paper identifies the importance of connecting Banbury's green spaces. It needs to identify the importance of ensuring effective stewardship of green spaces. Without good maintenance people stop using green spaces due to safety fears. Longterm stewardship models of community buildings, green spaces and other areas of public realm need to be identified and supported through a policy in the new Local Plan which requires developers to contribute to sustainable stewardship of public spaces.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Addressing Inequality in Banbury	Improving walking and cycling infrastructure and providing for good quality cycle parking and provision for ebikes, and cargo bikes, would enable families to manage without a car, and reduce the need for them to pay for public transport. The following policies could be included. A Health Impact Assessment Policy which requires major developments to explicitly undertake a health impact assessment of their proposals to ensure that masterplans address identified local health and wellbeing needs of an area in the formulation of proposals for a site. A policy that promotes wayfinding and walkability of local neighbourhoods. This can ensure that routes through developments and which connect new housing with existing communities cater for all age groups including the elderly and those with a disability, through for example the provision of benches, shading and clear signage. A policy that promotes early provision of community infrastructure to address issues of social isolation and loneliness as such local assets can support social interaction and help to support the growth of friendly communities. A policy that supports community development which will contain actions to encourage community cohesion, both within the development itself and between the new development and existing communities, through supporting social capital and building on opportunities afforded by existing and proposed, soft and hard, community assets. A policy that supports the creation of healthy food environments making it easier for people to make healthier food choices by providing allotments (based on local need) and other opportunities for food growing such as community gardens, community orchards, roof gardens, edible landscaping involving fruit and nut trees. A policy that reduces the density of fast-food outlets, particularly in local areas of high deprivation. A policy that sets out place based cultural-wellbeing strategies which set out proposals to support the cultural enrichment of the place. Such strategies should include a mixture of projects where cultural elements are integrated into the form and function of new developments to achieve a high quality, distinctive design, as well as financial contributions to cultural projects where the focus is on community engagement.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Improvements to the public transport network and to cycling infrastructure are vital to reduce car dependency. Significant investment in cycle infrastructure linking outlying areas and adjacent settlements will be vital in achieving this aim. Regarding paragraph 6.2.36, this should be more positive and say 'promote' active travel. Regarding paragraph 6.2.35, reducing stationary traffic as a means of reducing emissions will become less relevant as a reason for providing more road capacity, as most new vehicles now switch off instead of idling, and electric vehicles will become the norm. 'Targeted' road capacity improvements could include measures to take trips out of the centre of town, as this would improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and allow more road space to be allocated to them. Strategic transport connection issues are at a critical stage and need addressing. Provision of electric bike hubs where residents can loan/rent ebikes for travel to and from work/leisure/retail facilities is needed to address the fact that Banbury sits in a bowl of hills which make modal shift difficult. A programme of maintenance and improved lighting and signage of walking routes, together with increased bench provision and replacement of metal barriers with wooden bollards to promote footpath access by double buggies or mobility scooters. These comments apply to Bicester and Kidlington as well.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 22	It is hard to see where further major urban extensions could take place in any direction without Bicester merging with one of its surrounding villages. In the interest of reducing the need to travel, reducing travel distances, and promoting active travel, urban extensions would be preferable to focusing development at surrounding settlements. Suitable and direct pedestrian, cycle and public transport routes must be made available to any such urban extension. Focusing development at existing or new settlements, no matter how well connected they are to Bicester, does not reduce demand for travel. It is less likely that future residents of such developments would travel by active modes due to distances involved. High quality public transport options would be key; however, car use would likely remain the most convenient and attractive travel mode from such developments. Across the existing and planned school estate in Bicester, there are options to accommodate further growth. Where existing/planned schools are intended to serve growth, travel routes to those schools are key, especially to ensure safe and sustainable travel patterns. If the scale of growth exceeds the potential of the existing/planned school estate, then housing developments should be of a scale, individually or in close proximity, to make a new primary school viable. The scale of housing development at an existing settlement outside of Bicester would need to be carefully planned. In some cases, there will be an existing primary school which may benefit from local population growth to a certain degree, but there will be a limit to the scale of growth it can support; beyond that limit a new school may be required, but it would be important that this does not destabilise the existing school. Any new settlement would need to be of a scale to make viable a new primary school. In addition to Alchester Roman Town and the Priory Bicester contains a wealth of archaeological sites which should be highlighted. The town contains a scheduled medieval village at Wretchwick and considerable evidence of wide scale Iron Age and Roman field systems survive below ground around its edges. This includes a large area south east of the current town where evidence of Roman wine production has been reported. A number of Bronze Age barrows have been recorded within the town. The current Town almost certainly dates back to the Saxon period.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 23	Growth should be centred around key transport corridors which serve the greatest potential for exploiting existing, and delivering new, viable public transport services as well as direct walking and cycling routes. Development towards the centre of Bicester where housing development is already prominent would be beneficial, such as the OCC owned site at Hudson Street (LPR-A-031) which is situated near The Bicester School and Bicester Leisure Centre and is within walking distance of Town Centre. Additionally, the OCC owned site on Queens Avenue (LPR-A-031) would also be appropriate.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 24	Option 1. Town centres are usually the most accessible locations within the respective towns and Bicester town centre is typical of this. Town centres are the origins and destinations of bus services, where rail stations are located, are generally more walkable with pedestrianised streets and are usually well connected with cycle routes. Maximising use of town centre locations offers a great potential for increased sustainable travel within the town.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	The blue lines scheme which promotes active travel and people's engagement with getting active has been a big success – their use should be maintained and extended to support walking connectivity between existing and new housing developments. Existing small areas of green space need to be identified for improvement/rewilding spaces such as Dangerfields park to enable easy local access to the natural environment.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	When the next version of the Local Plan is published, we would be happy to provide further input and comment on proposals for local green spaces in Bicester.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Reduce the need to travel through the promotion of home working, high quality internet etc. Ensure that development is suitably located to maximise and exploit opportunities for sustainable travel. Reduce travel distances so that walking and cycling are more attractive choices. Ensure the provision of high quality, continuous, direct and, where possible, traffic free and segregated pedestrian and cycle routes throughout Bicester and to nearby surrounding settlements. Much of this is currently lacking in Bicester. Remove barriers to active travel along key corridors and between residential and employment areas. Implement the Bicester LCWIP. Ensure that there is a reliable, frequent, joined up and logical public transport network for the town and surrounding settlements as well as inter-urban services. Ensure that rural areas that rely on Bicester for employment and services are well connected by public transport, to further reduce the need to travel by car. Provision of electric bike hubs where residents can loan/rent ebikes for travel to and from work/leisure/retail facilities is needed to address the fact that Banbury sits in a bowl of hills which make modal shift difficult. A programme of maintenance and improved lighting and signage of walking routes, together with increased bench provision and replacement of metal barriers with wooden bollards to promote footpath access by double buggies or mobility scooters.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Development of sites for residential uses should be controlled in a manner that is appropriate. No type should be wholly restricted. The introduction of a policy to control the subdivision of larger existing dwellings could be introduced. Need to ensure that any development will not have an adverse impact on the transport network. Need to ensure apartments have sufficient cycle storage/ EV charging. Policy should wrap around redevelopment of properties to flats/apartments to be more acceptable within a short distance to a high frequency public service route
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 27	Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Reference should be made to the LCWIP to determine key routes for sustainable travel. Public transport connections to Oxford and to transport hubs e.g., park and rides and Oxford Parkway to facilitate multi-modal journeys are also important for commuting, leisure, and private appointments. Ensure that rural areas rely on Kidlington for services are well connected by public transport, to further reduce the need to travel by car. We should encourage and support developments that are located within 400m of the key arterial routes such as the A4260 and Bicester Road that are well served by frequent public transport should. And these should be governed by comparatively stricter parking standards. Policies that limit parking provision at both origin and destination are seen to influence how people travel Kidlington lacks well joined up east to west connectivity. We also need to prioritise and explore how Kidlington benefits from the shorter east – west routes for walking and cycling. Provision of electric bike hubs where residents can loan/rent ebikes for travel to and from work/leisure/retail facilities is needed to address the fact that Banbury sits in a bowl of hills which make modal shift difficult. A programme of maintenance and improved lighting and signage of walking routes, together with increased bench provision and replacement of metal barriers with wooden bollards to promote footpath access by double buggies or mobility scooters.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 28	Option 1. This is very important given the high levels of childhood obesity in Kidlington. Creating a network of connected places by active travel will help to reduce the need to use a car to access these. Linking green spaces will create a greater sense of community, cohesion and reinforce the rural character of Kidlington which some residents felt was being eroded. New opportunities for nature conservation and publicly accessible open space could be provided within new developments, rather than simply protecting existing green spaces. OCC Estates recognise that future development needs to be carefully planned. Where sites are located within or on the edge of Kidlington, then policies that support appropriate development that is consistent with the NPPF will be supported. The introduction and maintenance of areas of strategic green space needs to be carefully considered to ensure that otherwise appropriate development is not prevented as a result of the designation.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 29	Heyford Park has always been a challenge from a sustainable transport point of view, but the larger the settlement the more opportunity there is for trips to stay local if there is a good mix of employment and other facilities. Growth would need to include both housing and employment. A high level of commitment to sustainable living, including transport, would need to be at the heart of any further growth. If there is to be further growth the village needs to be designed to clearly put active modes and bus as the first choice for local movements applying the 20minute neighbourhood concept. External connectivity is particularly challenging and significantly reducing the dependency on car use for longer distance trips would help to reduce the impact on the neighbouring villages. There is a station, but it needs to be understood what role this station has in the future rail strategy and there need to be high quality cycling and bus connections. There are higher quality services from the Bicester stations, particularly Bicester Village Station, and the provision of a strategic cycle route and bus services to this station would assist. Bus connections need to be supported with bus priority provision where possible to make mass transit a clear first choice for trips to larger towns. High quality cycle access to Bicester park & ride may provide further opportunities for connectivity. Further allocations should only be made if the above can be clearly demonstrated; without this in place further growth should be limited because of the impact on surrounding villages and environment from an increase in car trips. The suitability of this area compared with others need to be carefully assessed. The constraints of the junction at Middleton Stoney means that significant road infrastructure would be required to bypass the village in order to mitigate additional development. Further capacity improvements at M40 J10 would also be required, beyond those already planned. In addition to the Cold War heritage the site of the airfield at Upper Heyford has considerable archaeological interest located alongside Aves Ditch, formally thought to be a routeway and now considered to be a tribal boundary. A number of later prehistoric Banjo enclosures have been recorded along the line of this boundary feature. Whilst the development of the area south of Camp Road would have removed much of this potential the majority of the Flying Field could still contain significant archaeological sites.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 30	The scale of housing development at an existing settlement would need to be carefully planned. In some cases, there will be an existing primary school which may benefit from local population growth to a certain degree, but there will be a limit to the scale of growth it can support; beyond that limit a new school may be required, but it would be important that this does not destabilise the existing school. Villages without housing growth often experience aging populations, which can make village primary schools unviable. At the time of developing the last Local Plan this impact was masked by an overall rise in birth rate, but birth rates are now falling, which will put pressure on small schools in the absence of housing development suitable for young families. OCC Estates recognise that future development at rural settlements needs to be carefully planned. We do not necessarily believe that limiting development to that which is required to meet local need is the best solution. Directing a mix of development to the rural villages over the plan period, in line with paragraphs 69, 79 and 80 of the NPPF, is supported and thus option 2 is the preferred.
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 31	Option 3 will allow local communities to be more involved in the shaping of their area, including through the Neighbourhood Planning process, but these are not the only sources of rural housing and it will be necessary to provide policies that deal with the non-allocation approach to windfall development in the rural areas. Windfalls comprise an important source of housing in the rural areas and therefore policies which set out the development strategy for rural settlements and the countryside will be necessary to be consistent with the NPPF. A further option should be explored which includes option 3 but which allows for a development strategy to be provided which addresses the provision of nonallocated windfall sites.

LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Option 32	<p>In respect of question 1, a reliable level of public transport needs to be given additional weight. In respect of question 2, we agree that it is essential to give additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling. Should be a combination of the above, plus digital connectivity (both mobile and physical, could also consider satellite). Satellite connectivity likely to significantly improve in coming few years (roll-out of low earth orbit satellites is set to be significant over the next 5 years and will enable super-fast broadband equivalent speeds).</p> <p>This may make lack of broadband digital connectivity less of a barrier to development in future. OCC Estates believe both options have merit as both the availability of facilities and services, as well as accessibility of the settlement, have an impact on the overall sustainability of new development. Not all development in rural areas will be accessible to the nearest urban centre and a development strategy that allows limited development within the built parts of rural settlements is recommended. Defining settlement boundaries is a possibility, however the more frequently employed 'built up area of the settlement' approach, which avoids the need for hard boundaries, has been shown to be successful elsewhere.</p>
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	<p>We are supportive of local communities preparing neighbourhood plans and will offer advice during the preparation. Reference should be made to the OCC Neighbourhood Planning Guide which provides guidance on the role of the county council in neighbourhood planning and support available.</p> <p>Whilst Climate Emergency Declarations are typically made by city, county, or district councils, at the scale of a Neighbourhood Plan, town councils can and have taken this step. Neighbourhood Plans are a means of promoting renewable and low carbon energy projects in the local area, in accordance with the strategic policies of the local plan. Some Neighbourhood Plans include specific policies and allocations for renewable energy. Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan (2016) Policy 4.13C identifies the potential for hydroelectric power on the River Thames.</p>
LPR-B-098	Oxfordshire County Council	Question - Development Management Policies	<p>We welcome policies on HMOs. It would be helpful if these policies could set a car and cycle parking standard for these type of dwellings to help us deal with minor planning applications of this type. Car and cycle parking policies would be welcomed. Especially in the context of growth in urban areas of Banbury, Bicester, and Kidlington. The county council has had Civil Enforcement Parking powers from 1st November 2021. This means that Controlled Parking Zones can be implemented and enforced by the county council. This allows us to encourage developments to provide car free or low car housing, as the CPZ provides comfort that indiscriminate parking would be controlled. Therefore, it would be useful to bring in policies for urban areas which require developments to provide higher levels of cycle parking and lower levels of car parking, thus supporting Theme 2 of the Local Plan which is seeking to reduce carbon emissions and act on the Climate Emergency. Innovation and technological change would be useful to cover with reference to the Innovation Framework. A policy on the support for provision of core infrastructure and expansion of existing infrastructure is recommended. A policy for assisted living for older persons, or development for elderly/supported accommodation or extra care units would be consistent with the objectives in paragraphs 6652 of the NPPF. To ensure that policies supporting renewable and low carbon energy and requiring reduced carbon emissions from new buildings, confident and effective development management is required. In decision making, according to the recent RTPI and TCPA Planning for Climate Change (2019) publication LPAs should: attach great weight to climate change adaptation and mitigation; and not refuse applications that incorporate energy efficiency measures and design responses on the grounds of incompatibility with the existing townscape.</p>
LPR-B-099	Avison Young for the National Grid	General	<p>One National Grid asset located within the area. Electricity Transmission - 4YH ROUTE TWR (001 - 107): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COWLEY - EAST CLAYDON (plan provided with approximate route). National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during policy development. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets. Request that contact details provided are included on the council consultation database. General guidance provided re electricity and gas assets with links to guideline documents.</p>
LPR-B-100	Tony Churchill	Kidlington	<p>Objects to extent and assumptions made in the local plan. The housing need appears to be grossly exaggerated. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) household projections for Oxfordshire for 2050 are 53,000. The fields behind Webbs Way have skylark nest sites and so must be protected. During last winter there was widespread flooding of the fields from the Cherwell towards Kidlington. Has this issue been considered? The location of a Travellers site on the Moors is totally unsuitable being adjacent to two retirement homes. I feel our representatives have given up protecting the Green Belt and now is predated by a feeding frenzy of developers. The walk routes that were so beneficial during lockdown will be built over.</p>
LPR-B-101	Bobbie Brown	Option 18	<p>Development should NOT happen to the North of the town. The Bourtons Parish Council recently carried out a survey to assess housing needs within the villages. They established that there are no housing needs; previous developments have met needs. The Parish is a rural community and should remain that way. Existing/ongoing developments north of Banbury are already putting substantial strain on an area that lacks infrastructure to support them.</p>
LPR-B-101	Bobbie Brown	Option 19	<p>Development should be limited "at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages". There are already developments to the South, connecting Bodicote and Banbury. This could continue further, towards Addebury, where there is infrastructure to support further housing. Protecting rural areas is needed to maintain the environment, eco system and character of the country as a whole. The wildlife habitats around our villages MUST be protected for future generations. No logic to build more houses within or around the Bourtons limited amenities. No infrastructure to support more people, no shops, no public transport, very few, if any jobs. Single lane roads around and between the two Bourtons are not fit for purpose. They are already in a state of disrepair; further volumes of traffic will exacerbate the problem</p>
LPR-B-101	Bobbie Brown	Little Bourton	<p>there are various springs throughout the village. The fields to the north of Chapel Lane, often have standing water. The rain water gullies often overflow Water flows down Chapel Lane, resembling a river. At one point, when Thames Water were repairing the drains in the lane, I was told that the drainage system below the road is collapsing in places.</p>

LPR-B-102	Cathryn George	Sibford Gower	The development of the 30 acre site at Pound Lane would double the number of houses in the village which has a small population currently just over 500 people and it is totally inappropriate for such a small rural village of outstanding beauty. Sibford Gower being classified as a Class A village is ridiculous. Development of this size would obviously damage the lovely countryside and it is not a sustainable location for many reasons including the increase in commuter traffic that would be caused. Site is located at the highest point in the village next to an AONB. Existing roads, cycleways and footpaths, water supply, sewerage and surface water drainage are totally inadequate to cope. Village is a dark sky village. Village has poor transport links, drainage infrastructure and little employment which would encourage more people to commute which negates low carbon living. Brownfield sites in and near towns could be developed in a much more sustainable way. The beautiful landscapes and history of the village should be valued and conserved.
LPR-B-103	Mary Nash	Sibford Gower	This development will be disastrous environmentally, releasing massive amounts of carbon, and causing irreversible damage to ancient hedgerows, mature trees and to the water table, the very things that the council is committed to protecting. It makes no sense to build on a greenfield site in a village like Sibford Gower with poor transport, drainage infrastructure and little employment, so encouraging more and more people to commute from the village; this contravenes KO 16 to reduce car dependency. The proposed development would double the number of houses in the village whose infrastructures are already significantly underdeveloped. Developments should be directed towards brownfield sites in and around towns, where amenities already exist, and the result would be significantly less destruction of our precious natural environment, and a vast reduction in carbon emissions.
LPR-B-104	Jason Beeney	LPR-A-034	Strongly objects. Junction 11 of M40 often congested; further development would increase traffic and create more congestion on the roundabout. The A361 will not be fit for purpose if the development is permitted. The development is unnecessary; Building further warehouses on the outskirts of Banbury are totally out of character of the town. Significant increase in traffic will result in an increase in air pollution in one of the most polluted areas in Oxfordshire. Given recent coroner rulings, the increase in air pollution shouldn't be taken lightly. Air pollution also has a negative impact on climate change and makes it harder to decrease global temperatures. The need for the conservation of nature should not be dismissed. Council should be looking at developing brown field sites rather than greenfield sites. The development of brown field sites would be far better for the environment
LPR-B-104	Jason Beeney	LPR-A-168	Strongly objects. Junction 11 of M40 often congested; further development would increase traffic and create more congestion on the roundabout. The A361 will not be fit for purpose if the development is permitted. The development is unnecessary; Building further warehouses on the outskirts of Banbury are totally out of character of the town. Significant increase in traffic will result in an increase in air pollution in one of the most polluted areas in Oxfordshire. Given recent coroner rulings, the increase in air pollution shouldn't be taken lightly. Air pollution also has a negative impact on climate change and makes it harder to decrease global temperatures. The need for the conservation of nature should not be dismissed. Council should be looking at developing brown field sites rather than greenfield sites. The development of brown field sites would be far better for the environment
LPR-B-104	Jason Beeney	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. Wardington has minimal services; one pub and one church. The village could increase in size by between 300 and 450 houses; this would effectively increase the village by nearly 50%. This is not sustainable given the lack of services the village has. Development would change the character of the conservation village and would be out of scale to the village. The need for the conservation of nature should not be taken lightly. By changing the land usage you are not only removing nature when the houses are built but you are increasing the number of cars in the village increasing the air pollution.
LPR-B-105	Samantha Cox	LPR-A-175	Objects on following grounds - The significant number of new houses proposed are not sustainable because of lack of services. They are also out of scale to the character of the village. Such a development would result in a significant change of character of a conservation village
LPR-B-106	Robert Gottlieb	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-106	Robert Gottlieb	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-106	Robert Gottlieb	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-106	Robert Gottlieb	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-106	Robert Gottlieb	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-107	Ora Sapir	Kidlington	Land behind the Moors is used daily for walking. Lots of birds and butterflies and some bees. Do not develop them. Do not build on pink areas, need green areas for health. Keep nature and green belt; area in the NE is used by many birds and currently has a planting and hedgerows. Need non-wooded land for biodiversity. Greenbelt land used for recreation. Greenery is essential for our health. Polluted air will result from increased housing and traffic. Green belt is an area of beautiful nature. Areas are used for tranquility and relaxation. Rich in wildlife, essential for ecological balance. Land is part of the character of the area. Areas are historical landmarks. Green belt needs protection more than ever
LPR-B-108	Alan and Lisa Phipps	LPR-A-185	Strong opinion that sites are not suitable for inclusion for development in the local plan. The M40 provides a natural end to the urban sprawl and the land East provides an appropriate green area before the Northamptonshire border; this green space really deserves protection. Development should be directed to previously developed land and not greenfield sites. The current infrastructure capacity is insufficient at the M40 roundabout and development of these areas would have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The proposal does not represent sustainable development as it fails to meet environmental objectives which include improving biodiversity and enhancing the natural environment. The area is a natural habitat for much wildlife. The allocation of this site would fail to respect the character of the countryside and the history of Banbury that is still preserved after the building of the M40 and A422 dual carriageway. Many people come to enjoy the scenery and quiet. Development of the area of any type would create an increase in flooding by removing permeable surfaces. The fields South of the A422 are medieval ridge and furrow landform. Development of this area would therefore see many miles of hedgerow ripped out and lost forever. The hedgerow in the area meets criteria that makes it legally protected under the Hedgerow Regulations Act and legally defines the hedgerow as an "important" hedge. There is a Grade II listed building in Nethercote, by this definition it is considered a building that is "of special interest, warranting every effort to preserve it". Large-scale commercial development gives no consideration for residents in this quiet, peaceful area and would bring unreasonable disturbances from units such as alarms and machinery. There is an abundance of underground streams within the area and some properties still have Victorian water wells. Shell used the land running alongside the now M40 which ran oil pipes and therefore it is thought that this land does likely still have some contamination. There is no gas connection and there are no mains drains. It would be impractical for commercial units to operate off mains drainage
LPR-B-108	Alan and Lisa Phipps	LPR-A-034	Strong opinion that sites are not suitable for inclusion for development in the local plan. The M40 provides a natural end to the urban sprawl and the land East provides an appropriate green area before the Northamptonshire border; this green space really deserves protection. Development should be directed to previously developed land and not greenfield sites. The current infrastructure capacity is insufficient at the M40 roundabout and development of these areas would have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The proposal does not represent sustainable development as it fails to meet environmental objectives which include improving biodiversity and enhancing the natural environment. The area is a natural habitat for much wildlife. The allocation of this site would fail to respect the character of the countryside and the history of Banbury that is still preserved after the building of the M40 and A422 dual carriageway. Many people come to enjoy the scenery and quiet. Development of the area of any type would create an increase in flooding by removing permeable surfaces. The fields South of the A422 are medieval ridge and furrow landform. Development of this area would therefore see many miles of hedgerow ripped out and lost forever. The hedgerow in the area meets criteria that makes it legally protected under the Hedgerow Regulations Act and legally defines the hedgerow as an "important" hedge. There is a Grade II listed building in Nethercote, by this definition it is considered a building that is "of special interest, warranting every effort to preserve it". Large-scale commercial development gives no consideration for residents in this quiet, peaceful area and would bring unreasonable disturbances from units such as alarms and machinery. There is an abundance of underground streams within the area and some properties still have Victorian water wells. Shell used the land running alongside the now M40 which ran oil pipes and therefore it is thought that this land does likely still have some contamination. There is no gas connection and there are no mains drains. It would be impractical for commercial units to operate off mains drainage
LPR-B-108	Alan and Lisa Phipps	LPR-A-168	Strong opinion that sites are not suitable for inclusion for development in the local plan. The M40 provides a natural end to the urban sprawl and the land East provides an appropriate green area before the Northamptonshire border; this green space really deserves protection. Development should be directed to previously developed land and not greenfield sites. The current infrastructure capacity is insufficient at the M40 roundabout and development of these areas would have an unacceptable impact on local roads. The proposal does not represent sustainable development as it fails to meet environmental objectives which include improving biodiversity and enhancing the natural environment. The area is a natural habitat for much wildlife. The allocation of this site would fail to respect the character of the countryside and the history of Banbury that is still preserved after the building of the M40 and A422 dual carriageway. Many people come to enjoy the scenery and quiet. Development of the area of any type would create an increase in flooding by removing permeable surfaces. The fields South of the A422 are medieval ridge and furrow landform. Development of this area would therefore see many miles of hedgerow ripped out and lost forever. The hedgerow in the area meets criteria that makes it legally protected under the Hedgerow Regulations Act and legally defines the hedgerow as an "important" hedge. There is a Grade II listed building in Nethercote, by this definition it is considered a building that is "of special interest, warranting every effort to preserve it". Large-scale commercial development gives no consideration for residents in this quiet, peaceful area and would bring unreasonable disturbances from units such as alarms and machinery. There is an abundance of underground streams within the area and some properties still have Victorian water wells. Shell used the land running alongside the now M40 which ran oil pipes and therefore it is thought that this land does likely still have some contamination. There is no gas connection and there are no mains drains. It would be impractical for commercial units to operate off mains drainage

LPR-B-108	Alan and Lisa Phipps	Nethercote	submit the hamlet of Nethercote as a potential Local Green Space (LGS) in recognition of its importance and to afford the area special protection against development. Nethercote falls to the East of the M40 and borders with Northamptonshire. The M40 sees a natural end to the urban sprawl of Banbury and land East of the M40 is rural, providing an important green space on the edge of Oxfordshire, before the Northamptonshire border. This green space deserves protection. There are numerous public footpaths running through Nethercote, all regularly enjoyed by all; in walking distance of nearby residential estates in Banbury, Overthorpe and Middleton Cheney and many people come to enjoy the scenery and quiet. The area is a natural habitat for much wildlife. consider that the Hamlet of Nethercote meets the criteria, and is deserving of the protection from development that would be afforded by Local Green Site designation. The area is significant to the history of Banbury and local agriculture alike; creates an important and tranquil green space on the edge of the county; provides an accessible green space for the nearby town and is rich in wildlife including rare species.
LPR-B-109	Susan and David Hall	LPR-A-204	Strongly support the LGS designations. Well used space by a variety of volunteers, school groups, beavers, etc. also used for dog walking, reading and meditating. The peacefulness of this lovely space thus promotes wellbeing and decreases stress during these challenging times. The orchard is a unique but easily accessible site; local people and the wildlife it nourishes would suffer if it were lost. sites have provided vital recreational spaces during the pandemic and should in general be safeguarded in line with Bicester's policy of encouraging healthy lifestyles. The message from COP 26 is that nature needs to be safeguarded.
LPR-B-109	Susan and David Hall	LPR-A-125	Gavray Meadows is a precious remnant of the countryside that used to surround Bicester. The site has ridge and furrow meadows bounded by hedgerows dating back to medieval times. This makes it a useful educational resource for history and ancient methods of agriculture. It has magnificent mature trees. it is a designated Local Wildlife Site due to its biodiversity and rare species of butterflies which according to the Upper Thames Branch of Butterfly Conservation, is one of only four sites in the UK where all five species of Hairstreak butterfly have been seen. The site is part of the Upper River Ray Conservation Target Area (CTA) which is protected as an area where action to improve biodiversity should be focused. It is another unique but easily accessible site which needs and deserves additional protection. sites have provided vital recreational spaces during the pandemic and should in general be safeguarded in line with Bicester's policy of encouraging healthy lifestyles. The message from COP 26 is that nature needs to be safeguarded.
LPR-B-110	Adey Evans	Little Bourton	building anymore housing would be at detriment to us. We have narrow roads, only some footpaths, as the villages are so old, no local shop, school or Doctors Surgery, lack of public transport & nothing at all for youngsters. Not to mention the wildlife that would be upset if building work was started in a rural area such as ours. We are Little Bourton residents and chose to live out here but if you keep building, we'll be joined up with Banbury at this rate, which we don't wish to happen.
LPR-B-111	Tom Coyne	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Housing should focus on renovating brown field sites particularly due to the change in retail following the coronavirus pandemic. Developments on greenfield sites is not acceptable when there are options to use brownfield sites given the planetary emergency including the biodiversity and climate crisis.



LPR-B-111	Tom Coyne	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Housing should focus on renovating brown field sites particularly due to the change in retail following the coronavirus pandemic. Developments on greenfield sites is not acceptable when there are options to use brownfield sites given the planetary emergency including the biodiversity and climate crisis.</p>
LPR-B-111	Tom Coyne	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Housing should focus on renovating brown field sites particularly due to the change in retail following the coronavirus pandemic. Developments on greenfield sites is not acceptable when there are options to use brownfield sites given the planetary emergency including the biodiversity and climate crisis.</p>
LPR-B-111	Tom Coyne	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Housing should focus on renovating brown field sites particularly due to the change in retail following the coronavirus pandemic. Developments on greenfield sites is not acceptable when there are options to use brownfield sites given the planetary emergency including the biodiversity and climate crisis.</p>

LPR-B-111	Tom Coyne	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Housing should focus on renovating brown field sites particularly due to the change in retail following the coronavirus pandemic. Developments on greenfield sites is not acceptable when there are options to use brownfield sites given the planetary emergency including the biodiversity and climate crisis.</p>
LPR-B-112	Tom Osborne	LPR-A-041	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPRA-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-112	Tom Osborne	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPRA-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-112	Tom Osborne	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-112	Tom Osborne	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-112	Tom Osborne	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-113	Alice Detre	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-113	Alice Detre	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-113	Alice Detre	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-113	Alice Detre	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-113	Alice Detre	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-114	Kelly Saunders-Cross	LPR-A-049	Object on following grounds - farming field is home to a wide variety of wildlife. Field floods routinely in winter; has required drains to be installed to protect adjacent properties. Queries local school capacity to accommodate new development and whether roads can accommodate new development. Loss of walking route would be a huge loss both physically and mentally to residents and community. formally object to this particular development proposal owing to the the destruction of natural habitats, risk of flooding, loss of natural views, compromised walking experiences for existing residents, additional traffic in already congested places, additional pollution from building (then sustained with vehicles for residents) and the loss of mental health benefits from having the natural world on our doorstep.
LPR-B-115	Heather Pal	Shutford	Development will result in more problems with roads, parking, etc. Village has a pub, village hall and church. No shop, school or bus service. Cant be suitable for development in the context of looking to reduce carbon footprint with more cars, children looking for places at a full school and nursery at North Newington.
LPR-B-116	MGD Sainsbury	Adderbury	The Proposed development in the field to the east of the pub will not only extend Ribbon development but block off views, and as happened in the 1930ies will be the first step in turning a Village into a sprawling town with infrastructure problems in the future. Previous development in Adderbury has made every effort to avoid ribbon development along the main roads and into the village. Ribbon development in the past has created canyons of bricks and blocking off views and destroying village ambience.
LPR-B-117	Tom and Mary West	LPR-A-107	development would damage valuable countryside and increase growth in a sensitive rural area. It is not a sustainable location for many reasons and would increase commuter traffic. There are many issues around the unsuitability of the site, including Siting the land is the highest point in the village, next to an AONB. Access and movement, roads, cycleways and footpaths are totally inadequate. Infrastructure inadequate; water supply foul and surface water drainage. Village is a dark sky village. Loss of agricultural land. Damage to ancient hedgerows, mature trees and to the water table. The Oxfordshire Vision emphasis progress towards a carbon negative future and leaving the natural environment in a better state than we found it. It should ensure that the integrity and richness of the countryside's historical character and natural environment are valued and conserved.
LPR-B-118	Allan Ziff	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-118	Allan Ziff	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-118	Allan Ziff	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-118	Allan Ziff	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-118	Allan Ziff	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-119	Alison Grieve	Hempton	Objects to proposals in the hamlet. Hempton does not have any public transport and has not had any for some years. There are no facilities in Hempton so the car is always required to go to shops, doctors surgery, hairdresser, pub etc. New building would create more commuters, more pollution, more traffic congestion and more life threatening incidents at the 'pinch point'
LPR-B-120	John Minshaw	Deddington	Strongly object. Deddington is a village and has been swamped with housing; there are already three developments in progress – all of which have been vigorously objected to. 85 new homes have already been built in Deddington on Banbury Road. These new homes are having a negative effect on local services. The village is already choked with traffic and services are under immense pressure. some of the proposed sites are adjacent to protected conservation areas and listed buildings. The Poplars is a particular example of this; as it borders the castle walls. If these sites were to be built on, the heritage of the area, that we have held onto for so long will be lost. The current proposal intends to increase the population of the county by 43%.
LPR-B-121	Susie Minshaw	Deddington	Strongly object. Proposal for 8 further housing sites is ludicrous, extremely worried that Deddington and the surrounding area is at great risk of being swamped by over development. The infrastructure is not suitable for such growth. The knock-on effect will pressure local services, contribute to congestion and pollution. It will also harm local character and the landscape. The Poplars is one such development that has been put forward and this is adjacent to Deddington castle - a conservation site! We must protect our heritage.
LPR-B-122	Alex Springford	Sibford Gower	Objects to development in village. Any development would damage the village significantly. Village has areas of natural hedging and trees which are home to lots of animals and insects, including bats. Development would result in loss of habitat. Village is unlit, so no light pollution or wasted electricity on road lighting. The small village would not be able to handle large amounts of traffic and would be harmful to the environment with added traffic going through to access the site. Need to keep as much green and agricultural land as possible.

LPR-B-123	James and Virginia Price	Wardington	<p>concerned re level of housing proposed in the village; existing village would be swamped and entirely alter its character as a village and community. village would become a dormitory town for Banbury and other centres of population, with the accompanying large increase in traffic. Services in the village are at present entirely inadequate for this; there is no shop in the village at present. The village hall, at present a popular and much used hub for village life, would be entirely unable to cope. The centre of the village has no pavement for pedestrians, so that the village street would have to be reconfigured for pedestrian safety from the considerably increased traffic, scarcely possible given the restricted width of the historic street.</p> <p>Wardington is a conservation village; effort should be made to conserve its character, not to swamp it with modern housing, arranged in a pattern entirely at odds with the historic layout of the village. there is much land contingent to Banbury and elsewhere which is more suitable for development, rather than wrecking a conservation village.</p>
LPR-B-124	Kidlington Development Watch	Question - Housing Policies	<p>CDC failed to acknowledge expert advice submitted to the LPPR which illustrated that the housing figures were not justified. No changes were made as a result. Trust in the integrity of the planning process in Cherwell (and across Oxfordshire) were severely eroded. The council should make this a meaningful consultation where comments are reviewed with an open mind and the plan developed in response to comments. CDC state that the housing requirement is likely to be above the standard methodology set by the Government, which for Cherwell is 756/716 dpa. Surprised by the statement. 716 dpa is very close to the 2014 Local Plan requirement which was overturned by the planning inspector and CDC was forced to adopt a much higher 1140 dpa. CDC is prejudging the outcome of decisions to be made on the Oxfordshire Plan. Councils planning should not be based on supposition; why has this assumption been made. It is hard to see how CDC are at this advanced stage without knowing how many houses are being planned for. Cherwell has a choice both about the housing requirement in its own local plan and, as one of the joint authorities preparing the Oxfordshire Plan, the overall requirement for that plan. Cherwell should therefore plan on the basis of the Standard Method (716dpa) which is already well in excess of demographic need, but is the minimum set by current Government policy. Cherwell Council – as one of the joint authorities- should also insist that the Oxfordshire Plan requirement should also be based on no more than the Standard Method. It would be very unwise to plan for more now when it is not clear that such a high number would be built. It is more likely that planning for an excessive number of houses would result in a choice of sites from which developers could ‘cherry pick’, a free-for-all situation that good land-use planning is intended to avoid.</p>
LPR-B-124	Kidlington Development Watch	Question - Green Belt	<p>support your proposal not to cause more damage by removing further land from the Green Belt. absolutely no justification for further building in the ‘urban fringe’ or Green Belt. However, we are very concerned at the indications that this is exactly what the Oxfordshire Plan will propose. It is not acceptable for Cherwell to say that further Green Belt release around Kidlington is a matter for the Oxfordshire Plan. Cherwell should insist, as one of the joint planning authorities for the Oxfordshire Plan, that there should be no further release of Green Belt land in Cherwell, or in Oxfordshire as a whole. This is also consistent with government policy which states that Green Belt is a permanent designation and that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. As Green Belt boundaries have only recently been established through the LPPR, they should not now be changed.</p>
LPR-B-124	Kidlington Development Watch	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	<p>Agree that a policy to control redevelopment for apartments is needed. consider that issues to be addressed would include: capacity of the local road network; safety of access to the local road network; adequate parking provision so as not to require further on-street parking; new hard surfaces (for example for parking) to be limited so as (a) to prevent excess water run-off and (b) to be in keeping with the landscaping of surrounding properties; development not to be out of scale or overbearing compared with surrounding buildings; development not to overlook neighbouring properties or to result in additional noise in comparison with the preexisting situation; conversions should provide a decent standard of living accommodation with adequate space and daylight standards; the number of apartments to be limited in the light of what can be accommodated within the existing building envelope and typical buildings on surrounding plots. suggest that the Council prepares a design guide, addressing these issues, particularly with regards to development along the main Banbury/Oxford Road in Kidlington.</p>
LPR-B-124	Kidlington Development Watch	Option 26	<p>consider that no further small scale Green Belt Review for employment purposes is needed or justified. The ‘Technology Park’ at Langford Lane is only in the early stages of development (possibly 1000- 1500 jobs) and the LPPR has provided for expansion of the Science Park at Begbroke. Both of these have the potential to accommodate a very significant number of jobs. There are other very substantial proposals for employment generating uses nearby in the adjacent Districts such as at Oxford North (48,000 jobs) and at Eynsham. Oxford City itself continues to protect large areas of land for employment uses, even though there is little sign that this will be developed. Indeed large sites to the south of the City – the Business Park and Science Park are still not fully built or occupied despite having been under development for very many years.</p>
LPR-B-124	Kidlington Development Watch	Option 28	<p>Supports Kidlington Parish Council’s aim (para 6.4.14) to secure a connected ring of green space around the whole edge of Kidlington through the Local Plan Review and to strengthen Kidlington’s distinctive character of a ‘village set in the landscape’. We also agree with CDC’s proposal – as far as it goes to explore the potential to create a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington; there should be a commitment to actually create the network of what green spaces now remain and to retain the distinctive character. Respondent provides commentary re the potential for a green network surrounding the village and provide observations on sites/areas identified on a map described as (a)(k) which consist of a variety of developed and undeveloped spaces. The review of the potential green networks surrounding the villages concludes that Areas (A) &amp; (G) are constrained by existing development restricting access; Areas (B), (D), part (F) and (I) are already protected as Green Areas by nature conservation; designations, recreation use or flood risk (in some cases more than one constraint applies); Areas (C), and (D), part are areas of LPPR sites which are reserved as Green Spaces; Area (E) is also a site in the LPPR where it is now difficult to provide a link in a network of Green Spaces – we strongly suggest that CDC negotiates with the developer on this matter; Areas (H) and (J) provide the best opportunities for realising the aim of ‘a village in the landscape’. Most of these areas are therefore either protected as Green Areas by more than Green Belt designation, or cannot be Green as they are already developed. It is not essential for areas in these two categories to be formally protected by Local Green Space designation, although this might nevertheless be considered worthwhile.</p>

LPR-B-124	Kidlington Development Watch	Question - Local Green Spaces	Land north and north east of Kidlington is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-124	Kidlington Development Watch	Question - Local Green Spaces	Land at Bury Moor Fields, Kidlington is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-125	Sally Gray	Sibford Gower	Object to development in the village. Sibford Gower is a small, dark sky village that borders on an AONB. It is limited in infrastructure with services all at capacity at present. There are inadequate roads, cycle ways and footpaths, very little public transport provision, inadequate water supply, foul and surface water drainage. Development of the sites would go against key objectives 15 and 16. makes little sense to build on a greenfield area rich in biodiversity in an area known as Ironstone Downland. Much more in line with Oxfordshire's objectives would be to build on Brownfield sites where amenities already exist. fully support Oxfordshire's vision to progress towards a carbon negative future and 'leaving the natural environment in a better state than we found it.'" This proposal would not meet this desire and would involve the destruction of mature trees, hedgerows, the loss of agricultural land and an increase in commuter traffic in a rural village.
LPR-B-126	Elanor Showlin	LPR-A-178	The proposals for 800 homes will result in the small village feel of Adderbury being lost and would be just another suburb of Banbury, characterised by constant noise and disturbance. Concerns re impact on highway safety as a result of the increase in houses; the village does not have the infrastructure to support the development. Current environmental infrastructure will not cope; problems with sewerage and impact on air pollution will be exacerbated by more cars and motorway junction. Current staff shortages at the council unable to cope with current bin collections in the village; how will they cope with an additional 800 homes? 800 homes is disproportionate with the size of the village and by comparison to those villages in the surrounding area.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Question - Housing Policies	Concerns raised amongst the villages that large housing estates will be tacked on to existing villages, many of which are very unsustainable with little amenities and public transport. 90% of planned rural housing in the current local plan has been delivered- no need for large rural housing sites. If permission is given for an estate of any size to be attached to a village, policies should be set to ensure it is integrated and not cut off as a separate neighbourhood. Conservation Areas not marked on the maps. Villages of Hanwell and Drayton concerned that the creep of housing from Banbury should not be encouraged and a clear areas maintained between the villages and town. The standard method should be used in response to para 5.4.4
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 1	Support for KO 5 and KO 9
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 2	KO29, KO23, KO9, KO5 and KO4 most important
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 3	Employment should be focus on No 1 urban areas and No 3 previous developed land
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 4	employment land No 2 mixed use but to concentrate on other classes rather than B8
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 6	No 1 increase the percentage of affordable homes
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 7	No 2 keep the same tenure mix
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 8	No 1 all dwellings should meet a minimum standard that allows comfortably living.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 9	No 2 rely on Building Control
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 10	No 2 use standards set by Government.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Historic buildings must be protected even if it means they are not retrofitted.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 12	No 1 compensation measures should be as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 14	Children's play. The use of small areas dotted about should be avoided and in villages the Local Parish Council should be involved in play provision. Village facilities should be enhanced rather than another small site.



LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 15	No 3 use contributions to both enhance and build modern facilities Astro type pitches that can be used in all weathers
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20 min neighbourhood is impractical in most rural areas
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The car is essential for rural areas it is impossible to place it at the bottom of the transport hierarchy. Eventually electric or hydrogen vehicles will replace petrol but this type of transport will always be needed as neither public transport nor walking or cycling will replace it
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 16	No 1 developers should provide all the infrastructure needed for digital connections
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Question - Transport Policies	no in rural areas there must be provision for car transport.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 18	Nos 2,3 and 4 for reasons of sustainability. No 1 site to the north should be discarded.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 19	No 2 Must protect and maintain the separation of villages from Banbury.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 21	No 1 canalside needs to be developed for housing. It is a brownfield site and if used for housing will protect green field. Policies need to be in the plan to ensure this area is developed as soon as possible
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Banbury's road infrastructure must be improved. We cannot continue to build houses and industrial units without improvement to the roads. Banbury is at cross roads of several A roads and as such needs roads for both local and more regional transport.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 29	No 1 as rural areas have already supplied 90% of the rural allocation development should be limited to local needs.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 31	No 1 work with communities to provide limited sites preferable small infill plots
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 32	No 1 build where there are facilities but again even villages without may be able to take infill and conversions. Village boundaries should be carefully looked at and I suspect that I would support this policy.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 33	No 1
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Option 34	Nos 1 and 2. The country side must be protected and if a village has a conservation area outside the built up limits then this need a separate policy protecting it from development.
LPR-B-128	Cllr George Reynolds	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Questions the value of neighbourhood plans unless they have planning teeth and are not ignored after only 23 years.
LPR-B-129	Tony	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-129	Tony	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-129	Tony	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-129	Tony	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-129	Tony	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-130	Emilia Zakrzewska	Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris	Strongly objects to any large scale development. We live in a small, rural community set in beautiful Oxfordshire countryside which would be destroyed by any extensive development. We need to conserve and cherish what the land has to offer without building monochrome developments which solely satisfy a hunger for money. It is our duty to look after and protect this land and not succumb to greed. It is no match to what nature has to offer.
LPR-B-131	Alan Lodwick	Question - Housing Policies	The current plan provides for numbers well in excess of need, based on the highly exaggerated assessment of the 2014 SHMA. It would seem unwise therefore to plan further for any more than given by the Standard Method (716dpa). As one of the authorities preparing the Oxfordshire Plan, CDC should also press for the Standard Method (unadjusted) to be used in that plan.
LPR-B-131	Alan Lodwick	Question - Green Belt	support CDC's proposal not to make further allocations in the Green Belt. As one of the joint plan authorities for the Oxfordshire Plan and having already recently changed the boundaries of the Green Belt to make substantial allocations for development, CDC should also ensure that there is no further release of Green Belt in the Oxfordshire Plan.
LPR-B-131	Alan Lodwick	Option 26	Disagree with the need for such a review. No further small scale Green Belt review for employment purposes is justified as there is almost certainly already over provision in the area especially when taking into account other committed developments nearby in neighbouring Districts.
LPR-B-131	Alan Lodwick	Option 28	agree with Kidlington Parish Council's aim to secure a connected ring of green space around the whole edge of Kidlington through the Local Plan Review and to strengthen Kidlington's distinctive character of a 'village set in the landscape'. I also support the more detailed proposals submitted to CDC by Kidlington Development Watch (KDW) including those for 2 new areas of Local Green Space on the north and north-east boundary of the built up area of Kidlington for the reasons given in KDW's representations.
LPR-B-131	Alan Lodwick	Kidlington	support all of the representations made by Kidlington Development Watch which provide more detail in addition my comments above.
LPR-B-132	Lois Ann Lawless	Wardington	Proposed development off Greenward and round the Judges would nearly double the size of the village. Deeply concerned that provisions would need to be made to make sure sewerage, water and electricity supplies are adequate for future needs. Village experiences frequent electricity and water cut offs. There would be a need for a further school, shop and open spaces for childrens play. Increase in traffic in conjunction with HS2 traffic would result in harmful effects on air quality. New builds should be held to stringent construction standards including solar panels, ground or air source heat pumps to meet environmental responsibilities of the future. Failure on the part of the CDC to provide sensitive appropriate infrastructure and building processes to sustain future needs would be irresponsible, immoral and an abnegation of the trust placed in them by the community
LPR-B-133	Hugh Smith	LPR-A-204	Supports LGS designation. The orchard is a rare and tranquil green space just a short walk from the town centre, open to all. It has a wide variety of trees and shrubs providing a much needed haven for wildlife. The site is well used by the local community and volunteers meet regularly
LPR-B-133	Hugh Smith	LPR-A-125	Supports the LGS designation. Gavray Meadows is a wonderful and bounteous green space and a precious remnant of the countryside that used to surround Bicester. The area is a Local Wildlife Site due to its biodiversity, and rare species to be found here include brown hairstreak butterflies and great crested newts. The site is part of the Upper River Ray Conservation Target Area (CTA) which is protected as an area where action to improve biodiversity should be focused.
LPR-B-134	The very Revered J.Barrie Lawless	LPR-A-175	Needs to be a balance between the need for housing and the need to maintain the village character. The proposals could and should make sure that the village centre remains unspoilt and provided a range of properties are in the mix, our quality of life and the quality of life for new residents should also be unchanged or improved. Further development in the village should have to meet the following criteria: Each house to have space around it with trees and beautiful views that reflect a natural feeling in keeping with our status as a village in a conservation area; Houses suitable for first time buyers through to large homes for larger families; There is a consideration for children, teenagers, young families, the middleaged and the aged to have the things they need, including schools, a shop, safe play areas, good pavements for walking and uncongested roads; We can expect that needed infrastructure- water, electricity, sewage, internet access - will be more than adequate to meet future needs for all; We can expect that builders will be held to the highest standards to provide sustainable structures that are not only attractive but meet our environmental responsibilities for energy that do not rely on coal or gas - we need to make that change as a condition for new building permits.
LPR-B-135	Sally Bird	Milcombe	Village does not have the infrastructure in place for this capacity of new builds, the schools and doctors surgeries in the area are already at full capacity/ breaking point. It will our children that will suffer if they cannot get into local schools etc going forward. Milcombe is a small community that will totally lose its identity if this amount of houses are built

LPR-B-136	Ben Daniels	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-136	Ben Daniels	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-136	Ben Daniels	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-136	Ben Daniels	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-136	Ben Daniels	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-137	Sarah Obrien	LPR-A-175	Objects to the proposals for 300-450 houses, ridiculous amount and would totally destroy the image of the village. The village no longer has a school, shop, post office and only one pub. Water supply is hit or miss, power cuts are frequent and WIFI is not brilliant. To double the size of the village with a major road running through it is totally unacceptable. Development would cause disruption and the village would suffer from having electric, water/sewers all having to be modernised, HS2 disruption is enough.
LPR-B-138	Janet Powell	Adderbury	Development on the land in St Mary's Road is greenfield. Residents have spent thousands of pounds to maximise views from their properties. The fields are home to wildlife and many local people use the footpath through the field. The site is too far from the school for children to walk which will result in an increase in traffic using the already overcrowded roads and not enough parking available at the school. The village has no doctor/dentist and only a small shop. Need retain sense of community and history. Would be better to build a new town on a brownfield site.
LPR-B-139	Ginny Steven	LPR-A-175	objects to proposal. Size of the land proposed is completely out of scale compared to the size of the village and also greatly extends the curtilage of the village. Wardington has absolutely no services to support extra housing, no doctor surgery, no school, no shop, limited water supply, limited sewerage supply, only 1 pub to serve the community. Our local Cropredy surgery already struggles to serve the local community and increased housing and extra patients would cause a huge problem. The residents choose to live in the village that is a conservation village and not built up because it is surrounded by green fields and nature. Extra housing will greatly change the character of the village and damage wildlife during and after the building of such houses. The village sits on the very busy and dangerous road, A361, which already has huge increased traffic due to the building of HS2. development on this land would prevent a bypass from being an option in the future.
LPR-B-140	Ginny Steven	LPR-A-034	strongly objects. already have enormous warehouses on the other side of the road at 'Banbury 15' which are surplus to demand. Many warehouses remain empty many months after completion. The warehouses already built at 'Banbury 15' will bring extra traffic to a very congested roundabout junction. The site will cause terrible traffic problems for banbury and be a complete eyesore. If this development goes ahead it will cause increased traffic and congestion at busy times. It is also wrong to be building on green fields at a time where we need to protect and nurture our natural environment and wildlife. This sort of development will increase air pollution due to increased traffic in the area and this has already been proven to be harmful.
LPR-B-139	Ginny Steven	LPR-A-168	strongly objects. already have enormous warehouses on the other side of the road at 'Banbury 15' which are surplus to demand. Many warehouses remain empty many months after completion. The warehouses already built at 'Banbury 15' will bring extra traffic to a very congested roundabout junction. The site will cause terrible traffic problems for banbury and be a complete eyesore. If this development goes ahead it will cause increased traffic and congestion at busy times. It is also wrong to be building on green fields at a time where we need to protect and nurture our natural environment and wildlife. This sort of development will increase air pollution due to increased traffic in the area and this has already been proven to be harmful.
LPR-B-140	Keith Stevens	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-140	Keith Stevens	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-140	Keith Stevens	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-140	Keith Stevens	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-140	Keith Stevens	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-141	Mr & Mrs P Haines	LPR-A-134	Site entrance is opposite a childrens play area which is busy with people and parking on the road; the development will make it more dangerous for children walking to the play area. The site remains the only green land in the village. No shops or schools in the village which means new homes will create more traffic. Will pose a risk to children and general residents as the main lane in the village. disruption caused by the development will not be in the interest of the village. Wildlife on the site is important in addition to the surrounding hedges and trees.
LPR-B-142	Alex Steven	LPR-A-175	Object to the proposal. Totally out of scale with the village and extends beyond the boundary. Residents choose to live in the village as it's a conservation village surrounded by green fields and nature. More homes will greatly change the character of the village and damage wildlife. Village has no services to support extra housing (no shops, doctors, school, limited water supply and sewerage and only 1 pub). local Cropredy surgery already struggles with the number of patients to look after so extra patients would cause a huge problem. The village is on the very busy and dangerous road, A361, which already has huge increased traffic due to the building of HS2. Also building on the proposed change of use land would prevent the village trying to get a bypass in the future.
LPR-B-143	Stephen Betts	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-143	Stephen Betts	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-143	Stephen Betts	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-143	Stephen Betts	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-143	Stephen Betts	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-144	Andrew Price	LPR-A-175	Village is a conservation village. The scale of development proposed would double the size of the village which will have a detrimental and disproportionate impact on the village and its history. Development of the site would contrast starkly with the existing and historical development of the village. The village has no school, shop or otherwise and infrequent and limited public transport. the road infrastructure including the A361 main route is limited, extremely narrow and would struggle to cope with an additional load. Indeed the parish had sought the opportunity for a by pass given the recent and ongoing disruption from HS2 and the plan would take away any future option for such given the proposed land stands in the only feasible route.
LPR-B-145	Joanne Wilson	LPR-A-175	Strongly Disagree with the proposed building application
LPR-B-146	Martin Powell	Adderbury	Effort that was put in to the creation of the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan has been ridden over roughshod. The plan should have a primary concern to preserve the integrity of the Ironstone villages that North Oxfordshire and the Cotswolds are known for. It is essential that these villages remain as villages rather than continue to grow, get subsumed into suburbs of towns such as Banbury or coalesce with other villages or hamlets. The green space between settlements must be preserved and existing development boundaries maintained. The suggested plan suggests intentions to reduce the separation between Adderbury and Milton and between Adderbury and Bodicote, either of which would lead to a loss of identity for Adderbury. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps must be a priority in the consideration of all future planning applications. Development of any or all the proposed sites will have a devastating impact on the local and regional ecology. Many people use the footpaths through these fields. Any new housing would not be within walking distance of the centre of the village and therefore not feel itself to be part of the village community. Traffic around and through Adderbury village has increased with the new housing built in the last ten years. Additional housing will exacerbate these problems. there are many brownfield sites, particularly disused airports, where new settlements could be constructively planned and well laid out with facilities that could benefit local villages. I commend this approach rather than one that is piecemeal and detrimental to all existing villages.
LPR-B-147	Derek Adams	Hanwell	Rep includes a video illustrating the distance from the proposed development and the village of Hanwell. Hanwell becoming a suburb of Banbury is totally, irrevocably unacceptable. historical village in a protected area with Grade I and II Listed buildings, ancient woodland and a wide variety of wildlife. We and the people of Banbury enjoy this area for its natural beauty and wide reaching views. We will NOT let it be destroyed by new housing developments and will fight for every inch of its natural beauty. Banbury is already overcrowded with hospitals and GP surgeries that have a six month waiting list (I have proof), there aren't enough schools, traffic will increase as will toxic fumes, flooding will increase with lack of drainage and the countryside will be turned into an urban blight. Development will result in the death of farming in the region. Respondent previously contacted CDC in Oct 2020 to seek development details but no records were provided at that time.



LPR-B-148	Susanna Rea	LPR-A-175	Wardington is a beautiful conservation area village. remote position makes accessibility to Wardington unsuitable for larger development; approached by narrow country lanes. The A361 itself, from which lanes lead to the village, is not a good road for the traffic it already carries; another potential 900 vehicles will not help matters. Should the land adjacent to the A361 be needed for a bypass in the future, it will not be possible if the land is developed. Development should be sustainable. Wardington has no school, no village shops, no medical centre. Sewerage would be required. Access for builders would be difficult and disruptive. A development of this size is out of scale to the size of the village, almost doubling it, and would fundamentally change the character of the village. Our conservation status should overwhelmingly inform any intended development. Given the encroaching urbanity of Banbury and the unfortunate spread of giant warehouses across to the north east side of the M40, the need for nature conservation in the surrounding areas of nearby villages has never been more important. Whilst accepting the need for small scale, appropriately designed development to accommodate the housing needs of local people, Wardington should be not be a candidate to accommodate district development needs, such as can be met by continuing development at places like Upper Heyford.
LPR-B-149	Julian Oakley	Hanwell	Concerns re encroachment of the village from Banbury to the south of Hanwell. The proposed development would erode the physical gap of open countryside between the village which would have an impact on the rural effect and character of the village. further development would lead to a greater impact of traffic through the village threatening the safety of the residents as the roads were not designed for the amount of traffic currently seen. Consideration should also be given to the loss of arable farmland, sustainability and the ability to grow food for the population in general. Development of brownfield sites should be considered/undertaken first ahead of looking to develop greenfield sites. The loss of arable farmland will have a dramatic impact on our ability to grow and sell fresh produce, let alone destroy natural wildlife habitats currently in place (which takes us further away from our conservation area status). The character of the village will be lost and would change beyond recognition. The infrastructure is not in place to support further development.
LPR-B-150	Fay Hand	LPR-A-214	passionate about the encroachment of the town on the village. The village is already badly affected by the close proximity of the town. The light pollution and loss of horizon views are an obvious starting point but, along with that, we also now have vastly increased amounts of people traffic traipsing over the fields to the village, not sticking to the footpaths, littering in the churchyard of the 12th century church, dog mess and noise pollution. The very small children's playground in Hanwell is overrun with people at times and simply cannot cope with the influx. Hanwell is a small and very historic village. It seems that there are more obvious locations in Banbury that you could build on to reach your quota which would not have such a destructive impact on the wildlife and conservation area surrounding this village. Surely there must be some consideration in your plan for wildlife and countryside preservation at the very least, especially given the current climate crisis?
LPR-B-151	Carl Portman	Hanwell	Hanwell is but a couple of fields away from being connected to the town of Banbury and it must not proceed any further. defensible boundary was preciously set and agreed at Dukes Meadow Drive and there it must stay. I have had enough. Residents here have had enough, and our simple and clear message is, 'no more.' Hanwell Fields, Hanwell View, Hanwell Chase has already led to a massive increase of traffic, including people using the village as a rat run. It is dangerous and unacceptable. The roads and infrastructure have not been improved, and have eroded. Existing new development has resulted more of a draw on resources and utilities here in terms of water, electricity and telephone. There is no regular bus. The Conservation Area must be protected. Residents here paid a lot of (extra) money for their properties because of the location and standing. reject completely the very idea of more building here. The deleterious effects on nature, wildlife, land value and indeed the naturally occurring views from this ancient village will be trashed forever. rural villages must be retained. The respondent will use a variety of means to fight for the village and bring the ideas proposed to the world if necessary. there are plenty of brownfield sites that can still be developed. It is heresy to pull up more trees and kill more wildlife (flora and fauna) around this area. unequivocally reject the plan to build more houses north of Banbury, especially any closer to Hanwell Village. Recent development has already made living here worse than it ever did with more traffic, more restrictions, stolen views around my village and a negative impact on utilities and services.
LPR-B-152	Karen Holloway	LPR-A-175	Srtongly oppose. majority of the village at present sits within a conservation area and accepting this proposal could potentially double its size. Any increase in size will cause problems with the existing infrastructure such as, water supply, excess traffic on the A361, which is already an accident hotspot, additional traffic has already increased due to HS2, and other planning developments off the A361, there are no schools or Doctors surgeries or even a shop. Our existing power is currently intermittent along with low water pressure within the village, also no mains gas. wildlife and natural beauty of the land that could be irreversibly spoiled by any building of homes, changing the character and historical heritage of the village. Agricultural land is key to our children's future, we should keep it as such protecting our eco balance.
LPR-B-153	Tina Phipps	LPR-A-175	The services provided for Wardington are barely adequate for its current size, be they sewerage, water supply or school. The proposal would potentially triple the size of the conservation area village designated as such for its historical significance and beauty. The proposal within the Cherwell Local Plan Review, specifically LPRA-175, most certainly does not meet the requirement of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. no objection to small, gradual and sympathetic growth to the village but as presented, the very obvious potential for extreme and destructive growth of this proposal is unacceptable.
LPR-B-154	Susanne Holdsworth	Hanwell	further development of Dukes Meadow Drive will no doubt have a huge impact on the villagers here causing further traffic chaos which already exists due to the failure to provide adequate speed restrictions, and destroy this wonderful village which has history going back some 800 years. Green spaces will no longer exist if the council carries on in this way, and there will be no green spaces left for the children and grandchildren to enjoy.

LPR-B-155	Nora McGloin	Hanwell	devastated that the council is considering more development which will threaten the village status of Hanwell. Surely, you can leave us in peace to enjoy what is left of the countryside and protect that for future generations. We had to cope with the construction of M40 which was unwelcome on many levels although understandable but further encroachment of housing on the village is not justifiable or warranted. Hanwell is a delightful village with a castle and 12th century church and this must be protected and conserved as a matter of heritage preservation. I urge you to reconsider and respect the boundary between Banbury and Hanwell.
LPR-B-156	Sheila Palmer	Hanwell	further development of Dukes Meadow Drive will no doubt have a huge impact on the villagers here causing further traffic chaos which already exists due to the failure to provide adequate speed restrictions, and destroy this wonderful village which has history going back some 800 years. Green spaces will no longer exist if the council carries on in this way, and there will be no green spaces left for the children and grandchildren to enjoy.
LPR-B-157	Pauline Winterborn	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-157	Pauline Winterborn	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-157	Pauline Winterborn	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-157	Pauline Winterborn	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-157	Pauline Winterborn	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-158	Bev Oakley	Hanwell	Previously led to believe that there would be no further encroachment on the village in the future following the development of Hanwell Fields, north of Dukes Meadow. village is located in a conservation area. The plans would have a serious effect on the character of the village. Since the development of Hanwell Chase and the Sainsburys Local, the village has become even more of a rat run. The pavements are narrow and some sections of the road, which run through the village, are not wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass. This already has an impact on villagers' lives. worries surround the loss of arable farmland, sustainability and the ability to provide food. Another concern is the loss of wildlife habitat and this would have an impact on our conservation area status. should the council consider converting brownfield sites before eroding the ability of our farmers to feed the local population. believe that further development could lead to a potentially dangerous environment within the village. I would urge that the Planning Policy Team reject the consideration and look instead at brownfield sites where there is a much better infrastructure already in place.
LPR-B-159	Arnold Bailey	Hanwell	The current discussion document if implemented would effectively see the end of Hanwell as a village separate from Banbury, as it would narrow the gap to circa 100 metres. One of Cherwell District Council's core strategies in the preservation of the rural landscape. This would totally contradict that strategy. Once the rural nature of Hanwell is lost, it is lost forever and is therefore lost to future generations.
LPR-B-160	Sally Manning	Wardington	small village and this will change the character and conservation of our beautiful village. What about schools? One small primary school in Cropredy really isn't enough. The doctors at Cropredy are already full to capacity and not taking on anymore patients. The A361 is already notorious for traffic accidents. your proposal will only increase the amount of traffic and thus making the road more hazardous. I am totally against this proposal.
LPR-B-161	Karen Rose	LPR-A-185	strongly object. Banbury development has had a devastating effect on the countryside that surrounds the town. Opening of the M40 has created noise and pollution; further warehouse development would add more noise and pollution and would wipe out local nature and wildlife. Nature is vital to our wellbeing and survival and should be looked after. Development would impact those who use Nethercote Lane; used to safely walk home from Banbury. Other walking routes in the area have become busier and dangerous to walk on as there is no footpath, number of vehicles has increased and vehicles drive too fast. Nethercote Lane is used to walk safely and a number of footpaths cross fields which are also accessed from the lane. Concerns that the proposed development would impact the safe use of Nethercote lane and other walking routes in the town.
LPR-B-161	Karen Rose	LPR-A-034	strongly object. Banbury development has had a devastating effect on the countryside that surrounds the town. Opening of the M40 has created noise and pollution; further warehouse development would add more noise and pollution and would wipe out local nature and wildlife. Nature is vital to our wellbeing and survival and should be looked after. Development would impact those who use Nethercote Lane; used to safely walk home from Banbury. Other walking routes in the area have become busier and dangerous to walk on as there is no footpath, number of vehicles has increased and vehicles drive too fast. Nethercote Lane is used to walk safely and a number of footpaths cross fields which are also accessed from the lane. Concerns that the proposed development would impact the safe use of Nethercote lane and other walking routes in the town.

LPR-B-161	Karen Rose	LPR-A-168	strongly object. Banbury development has had a devastating effect on the countryside that surrounds the town. Opening of the M40 has created noise and pollution; further warehouse development would add more noise and pollution and would wipe out local nature and wildlife. Nature is vital to our wellbeing and survival and should be looked after. Development would impact those who use Nethercote Lane; used to safely walk home from Banbury. Other walking routes in the area have become busier and dangerous to walk on as there is no footpath, number of vehicles has increased and vehicles drive too fast. Nethercote Lane is used to walk safely and a number of footpaths cross fields which are also accessed from the lane. Concerns that the proposed development would impact the safe use of Nethercote lane and other walking routes in the town.
LPR-B-162	Christopher Gibbons	Hanwell	Objects to development. Development would effectively turn the historic village in to a suburb of Banbury. The character of the village would be destroyed if the development goes ahead. Village is a conservation area. Previously assured that the south of the village would not be used for housing development. Development would destroy valuable farmland and the paths around which are used by the local residents. The site is home to a variety of wildlife. The country already imports 40% of food from abroad; erosion of farmland will worsen the situation.
LPR-B-163	Paul Manning	LPR-A-175	Objects to proposal. Development will upset and ruin the village. Existing roads could not cope with additional level of traffic, especially the A361. No school to accommodate the new children, only one doctors surgery which is at capacity with no room for new people to the area. Proposal is totally out of scale with the village and the land would be needed for any future bypass
LPR-B-164	Philip Hilton	Sibford Gower	development has the potential to more than double the existing population which is wholly inappropriate and extremely damaging to the welfare of the village and local environment. village already struggles with traffic along Main Street / Acre Ditch; more residents in the village would bring the main thoroughfare through the village to a standstill. Concerns re the ability of the electrical, water and drainage services/provisions cope with the increase in requirements. The social infrastructure (school, church, village hall, pub) would implode with the population doubling. large housing development scheme that is totally disproportionate to the size of the existing village. Questions why it is acceptable to build on rural green field sites close to AONB, the council should seek to ensure that the integrity and richness of the country's historic character and natural environment are valued and conserved and limit growth in rural areas and direct development to larger and more sustainable towns and villages. Council should be legally bound to preserve, wherever possible, the natural environment and habitat in order to maximise the storage and absorption of carbon. Over development of Sibford Gower would go against the key objectives of the local plan. Development in rural areas has to be sympathetic and proportionate to the needs of the local community, whilst mitigating its impact on the environment. strongly urge you to withdraw them from the Local Plan in their entirety, or significantly reduce the size of any development such that it only serves the needs of the Sibford community
LPR-B-165	Colin Campbell	LPR-A-175	Objects to proposal. inappropriate development for a small village and is not proportional to the size of the village today. The village has conservation status and is adjacent to important historical battlefields, the development is clearly an unsuitable expansion given that it could potentially double the number of houses in the village, changing the character of small village by significantly increasing traffic and straining current very limited services.
LPR-B-166	Trish Fennell	Adderbury	Proposals would fly in the face of the Adderbury Neighbourhood plan 2018. Before the CDC plan and neighbourhood plan, Adderbury experienced a circa 20% increase in housing developments. Plan was to develop Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and protect the villages. Adderbury does not have adequate infrastructure to support the increased housing and school places. The development would severely damage what defines a village - its community, individual identity, charm and history.
LPR-B-167	John Hamer	Adderbury	Objects to proposed increase of developments in the village. Adderbury has contributed to more than enough new developments over the past few years, especially when other villages appear to contribute little or nothing. Increasing at this proposed rate will certainly mean eventually the village of Adderbury will be lost and eaten up into Banbury's growth to disappear for ever. Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan seems to have been ignored or acknowledged. Village does not have the infrastructure to support the increase. Village does not have the infrastructure to support the increase. More houses would create more traffic and more tailback and more pollution on Oxford Road. Additional housing will increase traffic on the recently installed traffic calmed Milton Road
LPR-B-168	Barbara Spicer	Little Bourton	Strongly objects to development at the end of Chapel Lane. presence of large numbers of new homes is entirely inappropriate as it would adversely affect the character; The roads in the village are often single-track width and could not sustain an increase in vehicles; There are no amenities to support more residents eg. no shop, no post office, no community hall, no school; Transport connections are poor; Access is poor and the village would be unable to sustain an increase in traffic; Large farm machinery need access and more parked carts build be unsustainable; Developments would have an unjustified and detrimental effect on wildlife.
LPR-B-169	Robert Sawala	LPR-A-196	I feel strongly that the above site should be kept as a valuable green site for sport and recreation. The site is centrally located and is in close walking and cycling for most Bicester residents. It means that most Bicester residents can walk or cycle to take part in or spectate in sport or recreational activities. This makes it accessible to the majority of people and thus minimises traffic, noise, and pollution, and thus encourages general exercise. The Oxford rd sports facilities have an extremely important and significant attachment to local residents. They were purchased by public subscription by residents of Bicester and intentionally put into a trust by a committee of notable residents and sportspeople in order to safeguard them from development and in the long term interests of future generations. Oxford rd has been used for public events and hosts one of the oldest amateur football league finals.
LPR-B-169	Robert Sawala	LPR-A-122	strongly object to the suggestion put forward of developing the Oxford rd pitches in central Bicester. These should be kept as local green spaces as proposed by the Bicester town council. The Oxford rd have been used by generations of Bicester residents to play, spectate or meet friends at sporting or other community events. It is well located within walking and cycling distance of the majority of Bicester residents. To lose one of the few remaining green areas in central Bicester, to be used by visitors from mostly long distance away, makes little sense, when there are plenty of development sites around Bicester and in the district that are more accessible and of little value as local green spaces

LPR-B-169	Robert Sawala	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	The Oxford rd sports ground (should be specifically protected through the Local Plan).
LPR-B-169	Robert Sawala	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	Strongly support the saving of the Oxford rd sports and recreation facilities as local green space. The Oxford rd ground are centrally located, in close walking and cycling distance for the majority of Bicester residents. The location means that most people can walk or cycle , to participate or spectate in sports events. This makes it accessible to more people, and active travel to the site, minimise traffic, noise and pollution and encourage general exercise. The Oxford rd sports ground has an extremely important significance for local people. It was purchased by public subscription by residents of Bicester and intentionally put in to a trust by a committee of notable residents and sports people, in order to safeguard them from development and in the long term interests of future generations. Many generations of residents have played football, hockey, cricket, athletics and tennis on the pitches, or watched friends and neighbours representing their town. Historically the ground have been used for many public events. Their is ever significant pressure on sporting and recreational green spaces which is lacking in central Bicester. Preservation of the Oxford rd as a local green space is essential for the well being of local residents.
LPR-B-170	Andrew Steven	LPR-A-175	Strongly objects. Wardington is a conservation village and the scale of the proposal is out of all proportion and would fundamentally change the character of the village. Furthermore, the provision of services are inadequate at present, let alone should there be significant additional houses. There is one single pub, no shop, no school, and the village is on the A361, a highly dangerous and overused road that was, until relatively recently, a B road. Water pressure is also intermittent. Local schools and doctors surgery dont have capacity for new development and would result in additional car journeys putting pressure on the local roads and villages. Serious doubts over the ability of the canal bridge at Cropredy having the capacity to cope with existing traffic never mind the doubling the size of Wardington. The A361 is significantly over capacity at present, not least because of HS2 construction traffic; it is a particularly unsafe road. In addition, the congestion at the M40 roundabout is significant even today, and the pressure of so many additional houses would make travelling in to Banbury even more intolerable. Site is totally unsuitable.
LPR-B-171	Mary Rose	LPR-A-185	strongly objects. An industrial building development such as that proposed would completely destroy the Nethercote community. development would have a very significant negative impact on way of life and properties in Nethercote. Residents would also all suffer increased noise from industrial processes, potentially 24hrs a day and a large increase in light pollution in to what is a rural dark area. There would undoubtedly be a further increase in traffic noise and pollution from the proposed new road and also an increase in traffic taking, for example, the new alternative route to Chalker Way from the A422 so as to avoid the bottle neck on J11 and the roundabout at the bottom of Hennef Way. The proposal should not be accepted to go any further as it is absolutely not in keeping with the area and wholly inappropriate.
LPR-B-171	Mary Rose	LPR-A-034	strongly objects. An industrial building development such as that proposed would completely destroy the Nethercote community. development would have a very significant negative impact on way of life and properties in Nethercote. Residents would also all suffer increased noise from industrial processes, potentially 24hrs a day and a large increase in light pollution in to what is a rural dark area. There would undoubtedly be a further increase in traffic noise and pollution from the proposed new road and also an increase in traffic taking, for example, the new alternative route to Chalker Way from the A422 so as to avoid the bottle neck on J11 and the roundabout at the bottom of Hennef Way. The proposal should not be accepted to go any further as it is absolutely not in keeping with the area and wholly inappropriate.
LPR-B-171	Mary Rose	LPR-A-168	strongly objects. An industrial building development such as that proposed would completely destroy the Nethercote community. development would have a very significant negative impact on way of life and properties in Nethercote. Residents would also all suffer increased noise from industrial processes, potentially 24hrs a day and a large increase in light pollution in to what is a rural dark area. There would undoubtedly be a further increase in traffic noise and pollution from the proposed new road and also an increase in traffic taking, for example, the new alternative route to Chalker Way from the A422 so as to avoid the bottle neck on J11 and the roundabout at the bottom of Hennef Way. The proposal should not be accepted to go any further as it is absolutely not in keeping with the area and wholly inappropriate.
LPR-B-172	Georgina Rawson	LPR-A-175	Objects. village is a conservation area and new houses would be damaging to the character of the area which is supposed to be protected. The size and scale of the development would also detract from the village. This is not in line with the purpose of designating somewhere as a conservation area. village has no school or GP and it seems likely that other local services would be overwhelmed if so many houses were built. It is rare that housing developers put in the infrastructure required to support these developments, which would directly impact not just Wardington but also Cropredy and other surrounding villages. If the proposed housing expansion goes ahead A361 would become more dangerous, on top of which any potential for a bypass to preserve the road safety in the village is lost if the land is turned over for housing.
LPR-B-173	Karra McFarlane	Option 30	Development of housing in rural areas need to be proportionate. A much smaller offering of fewer houses proportionate to the current size of the village would be more appropriate.
LPR-B-173	Karra McFarlane	North Newington	Small village that does not have the infrastructure of a larger village. Shutford Road has traffic issues and cant take more cars. More homes would mean more requirements for access to schools and preschool. Access to the preschool would be primarily by car as there is no footpath link. Too many parking issues at present in the village. Changes required to infrastructure to allow development to happen would have a huge impact on all residents and costs would be high. Existing residents paid a premuim to live in a quiet village
LPR-B-173	Karra McFarlane	LPR-A-004	The change to the village footprint if the plans for Plot LPR-A- 004 went ahead would be huge and the village infrastructure as it is would not cope.
LPR-B-173	Karra McFarlane	Option 31	Option 3 seems to be the best option but it's important that all affected are made aware of the plans in good time. These plans heavily affect the lives of local residents and they have a right to make their opinions heard.

LPR-B-173	Karra McFarlane	Option 32	Both options equally important. particularly in the case of a small village like North Newington, the existing village infrastructure needs to be the prime consideration. North Newington has narrow roads, very limited parking, no direct access by footpath to the preschool, no safe access by foot to town/shops, unsafe pavements that don't run continuously around the village, extremely low water pressure, regular power outages, storm flooding, is inaccessible in snowy conditions, no regular bus, no village hall, a very tiny children's play area and no safe cycle routes. All of this would need to be addressed before any significant increase in housing could be considered. The development of conservation areas also needs to be a serious consideration. The nature and character of the village should be considered and this should be considered as a high priority.
LPR-B-174	Nicholas Rawson	LPR-A-175	Strongly oppose. Scope of development is entirely out of character due to its high density and lack of scale relative to other buildings. The purpose of a conservation area is to preserve the character and history of an area. This development would irreparably damage the character of the village. The village also does not benefit from any services such as a school, medical care facilities or shops. The development location would require owners to use their car, which is not environmentally acceptable, but will also increase traffic density on the already dangerous and 'unsuitable for development' A361. Further housing would contribute to the existing issues at the M40. The use of this land would also prevent the development of a future bypass that I strongly support. There are far more suitable locations for the development of this scale that are not in well preserved conservative areas or subject to the other issues raised above. The housing needs of the council should utilise these areas.
LPR-B-175	Bernard Wimbury	Little Bourton	No infrastructure in the village; makes as much sense to build houses in the middle of nowhere and not destroy existing villages. Respondent has seen villages get swallowed up in to towns, and towns swallowed up by cities in Manchester. The Council should identify if they intend to remove villages and thier communities so it can be voted on. Villages have lanes to walk down and visit, communities that are small enough to act together and are an asset to all in the area; removing it means it can never be recreated
LPR-B-176	Jane Wimbury	Little Bourton	Merging the village in to greater Banbury will take away the very nature of village life. The village has only one pub and shars village halls and parish church with Great Bourton; neither village has a shop. Parking is mostly on street and the narrow lanes are used by the farming community with large vehicles. No infrastructure capacity for hundreds of new homes. Internet connection is very slow. May soon be getting a small bus service but preferred travel to Banbury's amenities would be by car. Plans will erod he countryside to the point of extinction.
LPR-B-177	Joanne Gasson	LPR-A-175	Strongly objects. 2015 Local Plan identified that Cat B villages would not be suitable for larger scale developments; the proposed allocation would increase the number of houses by 300450; this is not a minor development. Proposals would result in a change of character to the conservation village and would be out of scale to the existing village. Village has minimal services; one pub and one church. Development is not suitable due to the lack of services. The proposals would result in the increase of the village by nearly 50% which is not sustainable given the lack of services. Nature conservation shouldnt be taken lightly; the development would remove nature and increase cars in the village/increase air pollution. The land is needed for any future plans for a by-pass.
LPR-B-177	Joanne Gasson	LPR-A-168	Strongly objects. The development is unnecessary; warehouses already being built between M40 and A361; further warehouses would be out of character with the town. The roundabout on junction 11 of the M40 is often congested; further development of this area would increase the traffic and would create even more congestion. the A361 will clearly not be fit for purpose if the change of usage is approved and further warehouses are built as this would significantly increase the traffic further. a significant increase in traffic which will increase the air pollution in an area which is already one of the most polluted areas in Oxfordshire. Air pollution shouldnt be taken lightly; it has a negative impact on climate change. Nature conservation should not be dismissed. development would remove nature and increase the number of vehicles/air pollution. CDC should be looking to brownfield sites.
LPR-B-177	Joanne Gasson	LPR-A-034	Strongly objects. The development is unnecessary; warehouses already being built between M40 and A361; further warehouses would be out of character with the town. The roundabout on junction 11 of the M40 is often congested; further development of this area would increase the traffic and would create even more congestion. the A361 will clearly not be fit for purpose if the change of usage is approved and further warehouses are built as this would significantly increase the traffic further. a significant increase in traffic which will increase the air pollution in an area which is already one of the most polluted areas in Oxfordshire. Air pollution shouldnt be taken lightly; it has a negative impact on climate change. Nature conservation should not be dismissed. development would remove nature and increase the number of vehicles/air pollution. CDC should be looking to brownfield sites.
LPR-B-178	Pete Butterworth	Islip	Appalled by the plans. Unacceptable to consider destroying the character and identity of the village to turn it into another commuter village. Too obvious that the wishes and needs of the local communities are of secondary importance. Anyone supporting these plans will have a tough time convincing the local communities that they have thier best interests at heart.

LPR-B-179	James and Anne O'Neill	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-179	James and Anne O'Neill	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-179	James and Anne O'Neill	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-179	James and Anne O'Neill	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-179	James and Anne O'Neill	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	Option 30	recognise the challenges faced at national and regional levels in meeting housing demand and that all communities need to contribute. Oxfordshire rural areas are in the main well connected to major conurbations and all villages fall within reasonable commuting distance (compared to other more rural/disconnected regions of the UK). For this reason, villages cannot be treated as closed economies where development is limited to local needs (CDC proposed option 1) since external factors will always come into play and defining local needs will be open to ambiguity. This does not lead to the only other option offered of proportionate development in rural areas (CDC option 2). It is our view that the options provided are too narrow considering the adverse impact they may have for thousands of existing rural residents unless explored holistically against the wider Local Plan Review document. Our urban centres such as Banbury have already changed beyond any recognition of boundaries of even twenty years ago. The focus has been on the development of easy green field sites. This outward expansion has not been balanced by the redevelopment of brownfield sites within urban centres. These areas offer genuine affordable housing provision and for those of diverse demographic and financial status they offer access to vibrant town centre living. The suburban sprawl towards Bloxham, Hanwell and Adderbury has already placed strain on our rural places. Developments are being marketed as offering rural living (Banbury Rise (Bloor Homes), Bloxham Vale (Redrow), for example) and yet it appears the sites are not recognised as rural development by Council Officers in this consultation. We would go so far as to suggest that the rural areas are already making a considerable contribution to housing demand and the resultant impact of faster deterioration of our rural roads, beauty spots, increased flytipping and walkers straying from public rights of way. We do recognise there are benefits to rural businesses that counter some of the negatives mentioned. This doesn't mean that rural communities should be exempt from development, but rather proportionate to the size of village. It is our view that proportionate and appropriately located development infill allows for the organic growth of communities. The options presented are too limited and fail to recognise the impacts upon rural communities that already exist as a result of urban expansion into areas once considered rural spaces. Urban spaces already have the critical mass and through effective placemaking can make a substantial contribution to meeting housing demands supplemented by considered site by site appraised development in the remaining rural areas.
LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	North Newington	a danger that in providing additional housing within villages to those seeking greater access to the countryside, the very reasons for seeking rural lifestyle such as quietness, community and visual amenity etc are destroyed for all. Proposed development at LPR-A-004 would result in excess of 20 houses sharing a boundary with the new development which would de-value properties and privacy and wellbeing would be substantially adversely affected. The development proposed is not proportionate development; would see a 2030% increase in the village size which is well in excess of the 5% delivered during the current plan period. Should all north newington proposals come forward that would see a 200% increase which is unreasonable.
LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	Option 31	option 3 seems most appropriate whereby there is a combination of Local Planning Authority and Parish Council consultation to make informed decisions. Asking Parish Councils to agree a figure for each area would be disastrous. The potential to split a community with accusations of exploiting positions of authority and 'nimbyism' come immediately to mind. Allowing Local Planning Authorities to act in isolation to set Parish targets suggests <u>an autocratic approach and the high potential for local representations to be ignored</u>
LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	The current local plan review has not been well published and does not set a good example for appropriate engagement and only acts to erode the faith in Council Officers that they will listen to the views of those best placed to understand the impacts on communities..



LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	Option 32	support the development of a rural settlement hierarchy but with additional weighting given to those areas with appropriate infrastructure services and facilities. This would suggest a common sense approach as we shift our world to a more sustainable place. As a generalisation, rural public transport to villages does not seem to be economically sustainable unless subsidised. Public accounts are becoming more stretched and developments in rural areas are often not of sufficient scale to enable developer contributions (\$106 or CIL) of any significance. It would therefore suggest that rural development outside of already established regular public transport routes would be problematic. Safe cycle and walking routes to places of work and play are certainly beneficial. The rural road network is not safe for those modes of transport particularly at night which again suggests that the hierarchy for development is skewed towards established communities with immediate or nearby access to a safe cycle network. Other services for consideration would be sustainable transport modes for accessing primary and secondary schools and with sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demands proposed. Additional housing requires increased capacity from power, water, drainage and communications infrastructure. Small scale rural developments could incrementally place excessive demand upon existing limited utility services. Resilience testing of the networks should be a consideration at this early stage of consultation. The Local Plan review also mentions how Banbury has great access to the M40 and rail connections north and south. This remains the case for those living to the east of the town but for those to the west, access is becoming increasingly poor due to the outward expansion of the suburbs to the west. Geographical location of settlements in relation to the major transport nodes should also carry suitable weighting rather than sweeping statements about the fantastic connectivity of our towns.
LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	LPR-A-004	Land north of Broughton Rd): It is difficult to comment on this site due to its distance from the village, other than to say that any increase in dwellings to the west of Banbury has a transport impact on rural communities further west and that any development on this site needs to be considered in the statistical assessment on how many dwellings are being proposed within the Parish.
LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	LPR-A-004	(Land within N. Newington village): Any development on this plot will have an adverse impact on the community. Emphasise that under the current Local Plan, 'backland' development of our village was not supported by policy and would advocate that this policy remains appropriate.
LPR-B-180	Richard Martinson	LPR-A-135	development on this site is within the village footprint and may be considered infill development depending on the scale and form of development proposed. Infrastructure capacity checks should accompany any application for development in order to protect existing resident services which are already felt to be declining (water pressure, drains, internet connectivity). Also question the energy strategy for new developments since the village is not served by gas (legislation will mean gas boilers in new dwellings won't be permitted), therefore an allelectric solution is likely and this will place more strain on the current supply network. it is evident that the 'call for sites' has brought forward more sites than the existing rural infrastructure can accommodate without leading to a detrimental effect on the immediate communities and areas 'downstream' when multiple development sites are completed; the increased number of vehicle movements affect all communities on the routes to our urban centres, not just the village in question.
LPR-B-181	S Perham	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-181	S Perham	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-181	S Perham	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-181	S Perham	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-181	S Perham	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-182	Roderick Stell	LPR-A-175	Objects. Concerned that a change of use could result in the development of approx.300 homes which would irrevocably change the character of the village and more than double the population. Existing village facilities comprise a church, a pub, a Memorial Hall, a children's play area and a single cricket/football field. Site lies in the path of the proposed bypass which is urgently needed. The plan would open up the possibility of mass housing which would be severely detrimental to the character of the village. Proposals conflict with the future bypass.
LPR-B-182	Roderick Stell	Option 31	does not object to the principle of additional housing in the village and would be happy for Option 31, referred to in the review (working with communities) to be pursued.
LPR-B-183	Sarah Crothers	Shutford	Cat C village where insufficient local services have already been recognised. Bus service recently withdrawn and residents have to travel by car to access Banbury, Oxford and Stratford. Housing developments at either site would require significant groundworks which would be hampered by the bedrock. Development on Thistle Hill would block light to the properties on Lower End, Ivy Lane, and to those houses on the opposite side of the village- most notably Malthouse Lane and Cooks Hill. Additionally, those properties would also experience a significant change in their view and reduce the property values for many residents' homes and have a negative effect on Shutford's unique identity, charm and desirability. negative impact that the developments would have on the roads through and around the village. Roads throughout the village and outlying areas are narrow and unsuitable for the increased usage from new residents and construction traffic. Construction traffic would have difficulty accessing the sites; significant pinch points and dangerous junctions. Many roads in the village dont have pavements, therefore there would be no safe access to the few amenities (pub, play ground and village hall) from the new sites, and no scope to add pavements. Insufficient parking at present; further pressure on amenities. The proposed development would impact greatly on many species of wildlife.
LPR-B-183	Sarah Crothers	North Newington	Expansion of Shutford would exacerbate the traffic problems that already blight North Newington.

LPR-B-184	PM Clancy	Sibford Ferris	Approved development on the edge of Sibford Ferris has not resulted in any obligation for CDC to improve roads or footpaths nor for Severn Trent Water to upgrade the sewage treatment facility to ensure extra demand is accommodated. Three sites proposed in the village on good agricultural land. Village has few employment opportunities resulting in the need to travel to work, shops, schools, etc by car. Village roads cannot accommodate an increase in usage. Public transport is not seen as an option as people prefer to travel at times that suit them. the plan fails to include any provision for extra infrastructure and no obligation on service providers or schools to improve the existing facilities which the increase in the number of people and cars will require. cannot be expected to take these proposals seriously unless they are accompanied by a comprehensive, far reaching development plan for the village; but expect that there would still be strong opposition.
LPR-B-184	PM Clancy	Option 30	Existing rural roads are dangerous due to erosion from the increase in usage resulting from commercial and farm vehicles.
LPR-B-185	Melinda Ziff	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-185	Melinda Ziff	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-185	Melinda Ziff	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-185	Melinda Ziff	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-185	Melinda Ziff	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-186	Matilda Davidson	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPRA-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-186	Matilda Davidson	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPRA-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-186	Matilda Davidson	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-186	Matilda Davidson	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-186	Matilda Davidson	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-187	Cllr Douglas Webb	LPR-A-152	Development would spread Banbury to the middle of nowhere; unless plan is to include Drayton into Banbury so the villages loses its character. although continues the Banbury line, the Farm house is listed and part of village character. no improvements to main infrastructure. this side of Banbury gets jammed up because nothing has been done, travelling to train station Motorway, unless the flow is improved for buses cars deliveries etc. Supports all the comments of the parishes and fellow ward members.
LPR-B-187	Cllr Douglas Webb	LPR-A-214	goes with in 100 m of Hanwell, the boundary was supposed to be Hanwell Chase ,this goes against all saved polices saved in Local plan that are there to protect the identity of the village therefore it is unsustainable ,impact the village and alter the character. although the line follows persimmon devilment it is altering to character of the parish therefore having an impact. no improvements to main infrastructure. this side of Banbury gets jammed up because nothing has been done, travelling to train station Motorway, unless the flow is improved for buses cars deliveries etc. Supports all the comments of the parishes and fellow ward members.
LPR-B-187	Cllr Douglas Webb	LPR-A-229	the sewerage/water system is at max cap with it not coping and spilling out the other side of alkerton to shutford and at Balscote this can not be sustainable, as always with all these in all parishes the infrastructure cannot cope with these developments
LPR-B-187	Cllr Douglas Webb	General	Do not think parishes have had enough time to consult as some needed to see on paper/people to meet even I had requested paper format had to wait until it was near the end.

LPR-B-188	Robert Grigbsy	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-188	Robert Grigbsy	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-188	Robert Grigbsy	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-188	Robert Grigbsy	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-188	Robert Grigbsy	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-189	Tracey and Derek Boshier	LPR-A-001	strongly oppose any access through the The Lane, Hempton, as this is a narrow single track road and unsuitable for additional traffic to use. Great concern, as this is a quiet no through road, which is the reason why we have chosen to live here. Also any development on south of Hempton Road, would again be opposed due to the traffic and if the access onto Hempton Road were to be close to the one way point, this will cause a number of problems, as it is a dangerous part of the road already.
LPR-B-189	Tracey and Derek Boshier	LPR-A-150	strongly oppose any access through the The Lane, Hempton, as this is a narrow single track road and unsuitable for additional traffic to use. Great concern, as this is a quiet no through road, which is the reason why we have chosen to live here. Also any development on south of Hempton Road, would again be opposed due to the traffic and if the access onto Hempton Road were to be close to the one way point, this will cause a number of problems, as it is a dangerous part of the road already.
LPR-B-189	Fraser S Allan	LPR-A-175	Strong objection. already a lack of infrastructure and services for the existing villagers. The road system around the village is inadequate even before the impact of HS2. Residents experience regular power cuts sewage problems and low water pressure. The amenities are already struggling to support the existing villagers. The Doctors surgery in Cropredy is oversubscribed, there is no school or shop and a limited bus service. proposed development is completely out of scale/proportion with the rest of the village which has only 350 residents. It would undoubtedly change the character of this historic village most of which is in a conservation area This would set a precedent for further development and expansion without further consultation. support the proportionate development of the village in keeping with its scale and character, this proposal is totally inappropriate
LPR-B-190	Gordon Polson	LPR-A-152	Disappointed with continuous development from Banbury towards Hanwell; proposals would be the final straw in the loss of hanwell's identity from Banbury. The proposals would not retain local, rural identities. Proposals would result in unnecessary merging of the village with Banbury, resulting in loss of identity. Proposals would result in local traffic congestion, increased traffic through Hanwell, Hanwell being used as a rat run to avoid other traffic calmed routes, Hanwell has narrow streets with no pavements. Hanwell's identity and conservation status will be detrimentally impacted.
LPR-B-191	Gordon Polson	LPR-A-214	Disappointed with continuous development from Banbury towards Hanwell; proposals would be the final straw in the loss of hanwell's identity from Banbury. The proposals would not retain local, rural identities. Proposals would result in unnecessary merging of the village with Banbury, resulting in loss of identity. Proposals would result in local traffic congestion, increased traffic through Hanwell, Hanwell being used as a rat run to avoid other traffic calmed routes, Hanwell has narrow streets with no pavements. Hanwell's identity and conservation status will be detrimentally impacted.
LPR-B-192	Lesley Smith	Hanwell	Alarmed by encroachment on the village from Banbury. Led to believe that there would be no further development north of Dukes Meadow Drive, but this principle has been eroded and clear that it is contemplated for it to be eroded again
LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Option 1	Support the vision of the plan.
LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Option 8	support the introduction of a policy for nationally described space standards as a minimum requirement for new development.
LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Option 10	do not consider further sustainable design standards should be set in the Cherwell Local Plan and that these should be left for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan.
LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	support the principle of the 20 minute neighbourhood in urban areas. Whilst the principle of an active neighbourhood can be applied to rural areas the adoption of the concept would require careful consideration.

LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Option 30	Support a policy to direct more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet the wider district needs and support sustainable communities across the district. support the existing and proposed approach to deliver housing in existing urban areas, the existing approach has not delivered housing to meet the identified need with the district currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing (4.7 year supply 2021 - 2026 according to the 2020 Monitoring Report). In contrast the existing Policy 2 Villages which limits the number of homes to be delivered in villages has <b>been exceeded (approximately 2,000 homes completed or have planning permission in the rural areas)</b>
LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Option 31	Current policy provides a single housing figure for all rural areas. This has not provided a plan led approach with the policy leading to disparity in provision in rural areas based on developer interest and options on sites. Considers a combination of the allocation of specific sites and a parish level figure provides an appropriate balance between a plan led approach to growth whilst also not preventing sustainable and available sites that may come forward over the plan period. Finmere is a popular sustainable village with access to Bicester, Banbury and neighbouring Buckingham. Development of new homes would provide social and economic benefits by contributing to the five year supply of housing and providing construction opportunities to the district and supporting rural businesses and services. We have submitted site adjoining the village off Fullwell Road via the call for sites form that we consider is suitable for development of up to 10 dwellings and should be allocated for housing. The proposed form and quantum of development proposed would relate well to the traditional pattern of development whilst delivering sustainable growth to the rural areas.
LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Option 32	consider that weight should be attached to the availability of services and facilities in villages with a Primary school being one of the most important considerations. In addition, access to urban centres and particularly those of adjoining districts is equally relevant in developing a settlement hierarchy
LPR-B-193	ID Planning OBO NYC Estates Ltd	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Fulwell Road, Finmere	Land at Fulwell Road, Finmere is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA415. A Vision Document has been supplied.
LPR-B-194	Charles Holbech	LPR-A-175	Development of 300-400 homes would fundamentally change the nature of the conservation village in a rural area. The potential for a further 1000 residents would represent a fundamental change, in scale and character, to the nature of the village. It would be inconsistent with Wardington's status as a conservation area. One of the parcels of land is used for walking by local residents. The village has no shop, only one pub, and no school and could not sustain the large increase in residents. Increase in traffic through the village due to HS2 construction traffic and new developments on the A361 by M40. Concerned about safe access to and from property with increased traffic. Issues with drains and clanking manhole covers on the A361 will be exacerbated by increased traffic. If there is to be any additional housing in Wardington, it should be in conjunction with the construction of a bypass. The A361, as it passes through Wardington, is not suitable for heavy traffic.
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	Safeguarding Concerns	Four areas of interest for the MOD. DIO safeguarding have areas of interest in RAF Weston on the Green, RAF Barford St John and RAF Croughton. The authority area of Cherwell District Council encompasses areas within the Statutory Height and Technical Safeguarding Zones surrounding Weston On the Green and the Technical Safeguarding Zone surrounding RAF Barford St John and RAF Croughton. RAF Croughton is adjacent to the North of Cherwell District Council local authority area. The aerodrome height and technical safeguarding zones serve to protect the airspace above and around aerodromes to maintain an assured, obstacle free environment for aircraft manoeuvre and ensure that line of sight navigational aids and transmitter/receivers are not impeded. This airspace needs to be kept free of obstruction from tall structures to ensure that aircraft transiting to and from or circuiting the aerodrome can do so safely. where development falls outside designated safeguarding zones the MOD may also have an interest, particularly where the development is of a type likely to have an impact on operational capability. Examples of this type of development are the installation of renewable energy generation systems and their associated infrastructure. The MOD has, in principle, no issue or objection to renewable energy development though some methods of renewable energy generation, for example wind turbine generators or solar photo voltaic panels can, by virtue of their physical dimensions and properties, impact upon military aviation activities, cause obstruction to protected critical airspace encompassing military aerodromes, and impede the operation of safeguarded defence technical installations. In addition, where turbines are erected in line of sight to defence radars and other types of defence technical installations, the rotating motion of their blades can degrade and cause interference to the effective operation of these types of installations with associated impacts upon aviation safety and operational capability. the MOD would wish to be consulted within the Cherwell District Council Developing our Options Consultation Paper of any potential development within the Aerodrome Technical Safeguarding Zones surrounding RAF Weston on the Green, RAF Barford St John and RAF Croughton and any potential development within the Aerodrome Height Safeguarding Zones surrounding RAF Weston On The Green which consists of structures or buildings exceeding 45.7M Above Ground Level.
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	Option 11	In order to provide a more broad representation of MOD interests, and to ensure prospective developments are aware of the implications of developing within an area containing MOD safeguarded zones, it is requested that the diction of Renewable Energy Policy 5.5.13 is supplemented with a statement that explains that applications for development that would not compromise, restrict or otherwise degrade the operational capability of <b>safeguarded MOD sites and assets will be supported.</b>
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	Question - Development Management Policies	Suggested policy on MOD Establishments: POLICY Military Establishments: New development at military establishments that helps enhance or sustain their operational capability will be supported. Redevelopment, conversion of change of use of redundant MOD sites and buildings will be supported. Non-military or non-defence related development within or in the areas around a MOD site will not be supported where it would adversely affect military operations or capability, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a defence or military need for the site. DIO has previously provided detailed plans to the Planning Authority of the MOD's land ownership across the District. But a summary plan of the sites is also included for the Bicester Area for ease of reference.



LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	LPR-A-095	Site is immediately to the East of St David's Barracks Bicester shown in the Ambrosden CP map. There is a need to ensure that any such proposals do not impact adversely on existing MOD operations or capabilities. We are therefore very concerned by these proposals and would wish to work with the Planning Authority in respect of those sites.
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	LPR-A-143	Site is immediately to the East of St David's Barracks Bicester and north of the MOD owned Railway line. There is a need to ensure that any such proposals do not impact adversely on existing MOD operations or capabilities. We are therefore very concerned by these proposals and would wish to work with the Planning Authority in respect of those sites.
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	LPR-A-011	Site is immediately to the South of MOD owned land at Arncott. There is a need to ensure that any such proposals do not impact adversely on existing MOD operations or capabilities. We are therefore very concerned by these proposals and would wish to work with the Planning Authority in respect of those sites.
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	LPR-A-103	Site (three parcels) immediately to the North and West of St George's Barrack and shown on the Arnott CP map. There is a need to ensure that any such proposals do not impact adversely on existing MOD operations or capabilities. MOD was consulted previously about proposals for development at sites LPR-A-103 at St George's Barracks in 2015; that consultation identified that proposal if developed, could impact on Nationally Significant and Unique Training Resources at MOD Bicester. Significant issues arising including overlooking, noise and vibration impact, noise impact, adjacency, economic and military use impact and drainage. that We are therefore very concerned by these proposals and would wish to work with the Planning Authority in respect of those sites.
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Neighbourhood Plans - It should be noted that separate legislation applies to the Crown estate and the operational military nature of MOD sites means that engagement and enacting of Neighbourhood plans to cover the area would not be appropriate. It is therefore suggested that designated Neighbourhood Plan areas should exclude MOD establishments.
LPR-B-195	MOD-DIO	General	Further background provided in relation to MOD development. Transport- Many MOD establishments have specific operational access requirements, in particular logistics. The dimensions and weights of some of the vehicles used by the MOD can be beyond that normally used by public/ commercial vehicles. When designing schemes which affect key access routes to MOD establishments it is therefore recommended that this should be noted that the controls on levels of noise arising from MOD establishments are not the same as for other properties. These noise levels can vary significantly according to operational needs. It is therefore important to consider the possible impacts on proposed adjacent development of such noise and the need to incorporate appropriate mitigation (if possible). It would be good practice for Planning Authorities to consult DIO on all significant planning applications within at least 250 metres of the boundary of an MOD establishment. Single Living Accommodation (SLA) & Service Families Accommodation (SFA)- SLA is provided to meet operational needs on MOD establishments and is ancillary to its use. SFA is provided to meet a specific need, has no commercial value and is subject to national guidance on its location, use and provision of supporting facilities. It is recognised that SFA directly provided by the MOD should be considered in the same way as affordable housing provided by a Registered Provider. In both instances, there is an element of subsidy, which sets it apart from housing that is either sold or rented, without restriction, through the open market. Both parties recognise that the SFA to be developed by the MOD will not be a commercial proposition and can only be delivered with substantial amounts of public funding. As such, there is no commercial viability in its provision. It is therefore logical given the considerations discussed within this statement that SFA should have a zero charge for CIL, following the practice that is applied to affordable housing. Such an approach accords with the definitions in the NPPF of affordable housing and essential local workers. SFA will not be released onto the open market or use for any other purpose than for SFA without the approval of the planning authority. This will ensure that the SFA 'housing' is developed and managed for its intended purpose, rather than open market housing. Such an obligation would also ensure that if the SFA becomes surplus to MOD requirements and is released in the open market the need to provide for affordable housing would be triggered.
LPR-B-196	Chris Cudahy	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. Respondent is an owner of a LB and is not adverse to progress through considered development of small sites which build houses with character and aesthetic of the village. Developments where profit is put first and quality, landscaping and design as an after thought impact LBs and thier environment. 825 homes approved in 2021 at Lonford Park; this makes sense; why propose to ruin a village with multiple new building sites. Requests data to explain why more sites are needed in a village. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding. Infrastructure is not available for new housing estates. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare.
LPR-B-196	Chris Cudahy	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. Respondent is an owner of a LB and is not adverse to progress through considered development of small sites which build houses with character and aesthetic of the village. Developments where profit is put first and quality, landscaping and design as an after thought impact LBs and thier environment. 825 homes approved in 2021 at Lonford Park; this makes sense; why propose to ruin a village with multiple new building sites. Requests data to explain why more sites are needed in a village. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding. Infrastructure is not available for new housing estates. This proposed development site in particular is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare.

LPR-B-196	Chris Cudahy	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. Respondent is an owner of a LB and is not adverse to progress through considered development of small sites which build houses with character and aesthetic of the village. Developments where profit is put first and quality, landscaping and design as an after thought impact LBs and thier environment. 825 homes approved in 2021 at Lonford Park; this makes sense; why propose to ruin a village with multiple new building sites. Requests data to explain why more sites are needed in a village. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding. Infrastructure is not available for new housing estates. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare.
LPR-B-196	Chris Cudahy	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. Respondent is an owner of a LB and is not adverse to progress through considered development of small sites which build houses with character and aesthetic of the village. Developments where profit is put first and quality, landscaping and design as an after thought impact LBs and thier environment. 825 homes approved in 2021 at Lonford Park; this makes sense; why propose to ruin a village with multiple new building sites. Requests data to explain why more sites are needed in a village. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding. Infrastructure is not available for new housing estates. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare.
LPR-B-196	Chris Cudahy	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. Respondent is an owner of a LB and is not adverse to progress through considered development of small sites which build houses with character and aesthetic of the village. Developments where profit is put first and quality, landscaping and design as an after thought impact LBs and thier environment. 825 homes approved in 2021 at Lonford Park; this makes sense; why propose to ruin a village with multiple new building sites. Requests data to explain why more sites are needed in a village. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding. Infrastructure is not available for new housing estates. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare.
LPR-B-197	John and Enid Frost	LPR-A-041	Strongly object to the potential planning sites. The neighbourhood plan (3 years old) has seemingly been thrown out the window after much time and money spent preparing it. Site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary, set out by the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and so contravenes Policy AD1. The developments already up and running in the village have begun to change the rural character. We already have substantial traffic volume, parking and speeding problems, which will only be exacerbated by yet more houses
LPR-B-197	John and Enid Frost	LPR-A-086	Strongly object to the potential planning sites. The neighbourhood plan (3 years old) has seemingly been thrown out the window after much time and money spent preparing it. Site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary, set out by the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and so contravenes Policy AD1. The developments already up and running in the village have begun to change the rural character. We already have substantial traffic volume, parking and speeding problems, which will only be exacerbated by yet more houses
LPR-B-197	John and Enid Frost	LPR-A-146	Strongly object to the potential planning sites. The neighbourhood plan (3 years old) has seemingly been thrown out the window after much time and money spent preparing it. Site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary, set out by the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and so contravenes Policy AD1. The developments already up and running in the village have begun to change the rural character. We already have substantial traffic volume, parking and speeding problems, which will only be exacerbated by yet more houses
LPR-B-197	John and Enid Frost	LPR-A-218	Strongly object to the potential planning sites. The neighbourhood plan (3 years old) has seemingly been thrown out the window after much time and money spent preparing it. Site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary, set out by the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and so contravenes Policy AD1. The developments already up and running in the village have begun to change the rural character. We already have substantial traffic volume, parking and speeding problems, which will only be exacerbated by yet more houses
LPR-B-197	John and Enid Frost	LPR-A-258	Strongly object to the potential planning sites. The neighbourhood plan (3 years old) has seemingly been thrown out the window after much time and money spent preparing it. Site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary, set out by the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and so contravenes Policy AD1. The developments already up and running in the village have begun to change the rural character. We already have substantial traffic volume, parking and speeding problems, which will only be exacerbated by yet more houses
LPR-B-198	Jean Scouse	Sibford Gower	Praises Sibford Gower PC for raising most salient of issues related to a large development in the village; this would have a disaterous effect on the rural community. Key points are important Siting on high ground thereby spoiling skyline; Access – roads already inadequate; Infrastructure – water supply struggles already; Loss of agricultural land and country aspect of the lane; Inappropriate transport links; and Environmental damage.

LPR-B-199	Gillian Round	Hanwell	Strongly object the proposal to extend the housing development north of Dukes Meadow. Entitled to maintain the current green field areas that define the village as a village and not as a suburb of Banbury. Hanwell is a Cat C village where only infill and building conversions are permitted to preserve the nature of the village. Development would have additional impact on the countryside, wildlife and increased traffic and direct impact on the chosen lifestyles of residents. Villages are a quintessential part of the fabric of Great Britain and should not be swallowed up by yet another faceless housing development. Bodicote, Neithrop, Easington, Ruscote, Hardwick and Grimsbury have already been lost to Banbury sprawl. Villages do not often provide affordable accommodation anymore (which needs to be addressed) and can be viewed as only for those privileged few who can afford to live there but the countryside is for everyone, not just for those who choose to live and work in rural communities. This housing development will destroy yet another swathe of green fields and wooded areas along with the public footpaths that both those in the village and in nearby Dukes Meadow / Hanwell fields enjoy using (especially in recent times).
LPR-B-200	Lindsey Shotton	Hanwell	Object. Expresses immense concern regarding the proposed encroachment on the village of Hanwell. Previously led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Given the current global climate context of COP26; amazed that there is discussion about removing large amounts of conservation areas leading to further destruction of our wildlife habitats. Completely understand the need to create housing in towns like Banbury given population growth, but struggles with the rationale of eroding what is most special about Oxfordshire village life and landscapes. Particularly with places like Hanwell village which is over 800 years old, surely need look to retain these locations to create aspirational places as a draw for people moving to Banbury. If we end up with villages like Hanwell consumed by newer housing estates (like in Bodicote), we risk not only the destruction of wildlife habitats but also the desire for people to want to move here in the future. There are multiple other locations which should be reviewed as options which don't have the same level of impact on society, wildlife and the special nature of Oxfordshire villages.
LPR-B-201	Paul and Cynthia Miller	Option 32	Preference to Option 1 (Give additional weight to the availability of certain services and facilities). The principal considerations are enumerated under option 32.
LPR-B-202	Nigel Bankes	LPR-A-175	Objects. It would destroy the landscape and character of a Category B Conservation village; the scale of the proposal is out of proportion to the existing village; no current services in the village which would overwhelm local services such as the GP surgery and Primary School in the vicinity; impact on local roads, essentially single track roads and additional traffic on the A361. Wardington should not be a candidate to accommodate district level development needs
LPR-B-203	Joanne Evans	LPR-A-175	Object. Wardington is a small village with very few amenities and this level of development would not be sustainable. New residents would have little or no access to schooling, employment or sports and leisure activities that would not require private transportation. The number of houses proposed would be out of scale with the character of the village. This level of development would have an adverse impact on the character of the village which is within a conservation area and has a number of listed buildings. The village falls across the busy A361 and does not seem to be a natural fit for a substantial number of new houses with a resulting increase in traffic and decrease in pedestrian safety. There is often flooding between the M40 junction and Wardington. This could be exacerbated by building on the proposed scale on what is currently farmland.
LPR-B-203	Joanne Evans	LPR-A-034	Previously been a clear delineation between the town of Banbury, including its industry and commercial infrastructure on one side of the M40 junction and the appealing rural nature of the land adjacent to the A361. The warehouse, already built, is an eyesore and a proliferation of this type of building would, in our view, be extremely detrimental to the surrounding landscape and to the wider environment.
LPR-B-204	Norman Hudson	LPR-A-175	Object. The majority of Wardington is designated as a Conservation Area and the proposed development would be out of scale with the existing village, and change its character. The existing infrastructure is stretched with a considerable number of electricity cuts; and the pressure of the mains water supply is erratic. Cropredy school would not have the capacity to accommodate additional places required without significant expansion. There has been a strong case for Wardington being bypassed because of the substantial increase in traffic on the A361 and the bends on the road as it passes through the village. A bypass will be required in the future and the obvious route would traverse one of the proposed sites. Any development of this site would either eliminate the possibilities for a bypass or make one substantially more expensive. Existing and proposed Commercial development, either side of the A361, on the Wardington side of the M40 junction 11 will increase traffic on the A361. It is accepted that additional housing is required in Oxfordshire (understood that CDC are currently exceeding targets). The present Local Plan allows for some expansion of Wardington through conversion, infilling and extension which is reasonable. There are other areas where a development of the scale would be better suited. I do not believe that the landowner understood the resulting scale of development when the land was put forward, were it to be included in the Local Plan, and now says he is less happy to have done so.
LPR-B-204	Norman Hudson	LPR-A-168	Banbury sits within the countryside which noticeably and to visual advantage stretches away up from the lower ground of the motorway to the higher ground approaching Northamptonshire. The M40 provided a physical and visual border to eastward expansion. Now with commercial development between the M40 and the A361, the A361 provides that important boundary. Any breach will negatively impact the approach and visual setting of Banbury, from the A361 and A422. Frequent congestion at the M40 J11 is already a deterrent from using the services and retail in Banbury. North and east of Banbury, Brackley and Daventry are more easily accessible with further development to the east of the A361 exacerbating this. Is there justification of the need for this allocation? When Banbury cattle market, was closed it seemed logical that this or the adjacent site could provide an appropriate alternative with low visual impact with the demand for a cattle market no longer exists.
LPR-B-205	Juliet Bankes	LPR-A-175	Object. The size of the development is inappropriate to the settlement of Wardington as it stands today. The main objections are: access to the development would significantly increase the traffic and pollution on the A361 and surrounding very minor roads; increased congestion on the J11 M40; population of Wardington would increase by 300% which is unsustainable with no amenities in Wardington; and, the village is on the county boundary of Northamptonshire and Oxfordshire increasing difficulty of access to primary and secondary schools and other amenities. Developments of this size next to a conservation village are not in line with the Oxfordshire 2050 in achieving a carbon neutral target
LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	Option 12	Did not understand the meaning behind the option and therefore struggled to respond. Similar to other Options were just the same.

LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	Question - Settlement Boundaries	I would strongly support defining settlement boundaries or have an overall population figure to provide an upper limit for development, and use this limit together with settlement boundaries to maintain a realistic definition of what 'village' and 'rural' mean. Small villages are in the longer term better placed to increase their size. If rural settlement based on existing villages was capped by either settlement boundaries or upper population figures then it might become necessary to consider the development of new settlements
LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Neighbourhood Plans should be used as the correct basis for deciding where new growth should occur. It would be good for the District Council to maintain a role as 'referee' in order to ensure that the decision making process is made in as objective and democratic way as possible when it comes to Neighbourhood Planning.
LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	Question - Transport & Connectivity	There was a lot of reference to the need for minimise carbon based transport but no recognition given to the advent of all electric cars and commercial vehicles. This should be factored in to planning assumptions. This could reduce congestion without any effect on carbon emissions. Active travel is unnecessary jargon for walking and cycling. Place shaping is initially off putting bit of jargon and needs to be replaced with something more understandable.
LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The advantages of new settlements building in area heating schemes, ensuring good design, planning for employment and services, improving the biodiversity compared with the monoculture fields that they would be built on.
LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	Question - Local Green Spaces	Green and blue spaces need to be defined.
LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	Option 30	Growth should take place in areas of the country where it is needed and can more easily be accommodated and managed, and do less environmental damage. The main stumbling block for rural development is that there are very few employment opportunities in the villages. Most people in villages either commute or work from home. It is difficult to make a case for 'local housing need' in any one particular village. Continuing and significant housing growth in the villages undermines the reason for village existence and harms rural life
LPR-B-206	Steve Waterman	General	There is a massive underlying assumption for significant levels of growth in this area and it is a major failing of this document that such assumptions have simply been accepted without any evaluation. There is no opportunity to challenge this growth. If Cherwell is hamstrung by the prospect of major population and housing requirements forced upon it, it seems to be wrong for the document simply to accept and even apparently to rejoice in these figures. Sustainability, what does this word actually mean as used in the document? The use of the word sustainable has lost its core meaning and become a buzz word. The word should only be used when it can properly be seen as conveying its original and easy to understand meaning.
LPR-B-207	Wardington Parish Council	LPR-A-175	Objects. If developed intensively it has the potential to increase the number of houses in Wardington by 300% and for the parish as a whole by 200. It would increase pressure on the A361, the side roads to Cropredy and Chacombe and the congested J11 M40. Wardington residents are against this potential development. Cherwell District Council are likely to insist on between 20 and 30 new houses per hectare if it is to be accepted disproportionate to the size of the village. There was great concern about the permanent harm such a development would do to the village and its character. The land is outside the village boundaries. The lack of services in the village means development is not sustainable. Losses of water and power with the capacity of the sewerage system limited. The control of surface water, particularly on the A361, gives constant problems. The A361 is used as a main route between the M1 and the north and the M40 north and south. The A361 runs through the centre of Lower Wardington which is narrow with blind corners. Lorries struggle to pass by each other. The pavement is narrower than legally required. There are frequent accidents on the A361 close to Wardington. For other vehicles there are no convenient diversions and none which heavy lorries can use. Despite being an A road it is, in reality, more like a dangerous country lane. Extra development would increase the pressure on the A361 making it more dangerous. Traffic on it is increasing by 6% a year without taking account of HS2 construction vehicles. M40 Junction 11 is already a problem at busy times and one of the most air polluted locations in Oxfordshire. These problems will get worse because of the commercial developments at Banbury 15 and any major new housing development. The only feasible route for a bypass round Wardington is threatened by this development. The local side roads, mainly single track, will be increasingly used as rat runs which will adversely affect the quality of life of other communities and increase the dangers to other users. The quality of local nature for recreation and biodiversity will become increasingly important and new substantial development around Wardington would threaten this. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its Conservation Areas. Development would destroy the character and Category B Conservation Village. The proposal does not meet the requirement of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Planning Areas) Act 1990.

LPR-B-208	Caroline Pigden	LPR-A-152	Object. Led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. The Authority appears to be resiling on its word. The countryside around Banbury is under threat. There have already been several significant housing developments recently. Any more development will leave just metres between the edge of the conservation area down Gullicote Lane and track. New housing will not be shielded from the sight of the village by any significant natural border, such as currently exists with the trees which hide the current Banbury 5 development. Hanwell is a village with significant historical antecedents. The village boasts a thriving rural community. The housing stock is predominantly 300 years or more old. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village. Development of the site is contrary to the Local Plan. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community. The development of site would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages. There are precious few villages such as Hanwell in the environs of Banbury which must be preserved for heritage. The wildlife (flora and fauna) that currently thrives in the countryside surrounding Hanwell is under threat. It is in the public interest to retain the fields, footpaths, woodland and waterways lying between the urban sprawl of Banbury and Hanwell. The general public use the land for recreation. Please consider the health, and wellbeing of Hanwell residents and the historic character of the village before committing to the irreversible annihilation of the landscape and the community as a whole.
LPR-B-208	Caroline Pigden	LPR-A-214	Object. Led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. The Authority appears to be resiling on its word. The countryside around Banbury is under threat. There have already been several significant housing developments recently. Any more development will leave just metres between the edge of the conservation area down Gullicote Lane and track. New housing will not be shielded from the sight of the village by any significant natural border, such as currently exists with the trees which hide the current Banbury 5 development. Hanwell is a village with significant historical antecedents. The village boasts a thriving rural community. The housing stock is predominantly 300 years or more old. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village. Development of the site is contrary to the Local Plan. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community. The development of site would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages. There are precious few villages such as Hanwell in the environs of Banbury which must be preserved for heritage. The wildlife (flora and fauna) that currently thrives in the countryside surrounding Hanwell is under threat. It is in the public interest to retain the fields, footpaths, woodland and waterways lying between the urban sprawl of Banbury and Hanwell. The general public use the land for recreation. Please consider the health, and wellbeing of Hanwell residents and the historic character of the village before committing to the irreversible annihilation of the landscape and the community as a whole.
LPR-B-208	Caroline Pigden	Option 18	Development is most appropriate to the East or South of Banbury where there is lesser prospect of incursion on neighbouring villages.
LPR-B-208	Caroline Pigden	Option 19	Support Option 2 to limit development at Banbury and protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.

LPR-B-209	Alex Jeyes	LPR-A-041	<p>Object. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011, where 1064 dwellings were registered. Owing largely to post-2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011, before any further development is considered. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. Many residents would be devastated by the only fields left adjacent to them being built on. The site contravenes the policies in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on a presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, the site would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury, and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. Congestion will worsen where queues at other junctions inevitably increase. West Adderbury is distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development is unsustainable and encourage private car use. The extra traffic brought by development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area. Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is of concern to nearby residents and those whose children attend Christopher Rawlins School. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. There are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking at drop-off and pick-up times. Although the school isn't currently at capacity, for example, 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats: the destruction of hedgerows, pasture and scrubland is intrinsically linked with the depletion of numbers of birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. Concerned about the effects that water runoff from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. If housebuilding takes place in areas adjacent to it, as several of the proposed sites are, the floodplain may not be able to cope. We need to ensure that floodplain requirements are regularly re-assessed and allowed buffer zones to cater for the increased frequency of flooding. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. The site contains popular rural public footpaths and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates will render them less safe and pleasant to use. The presence of fossils will be greatly diminished. Adderbury has limited light pollution and substantial additional development will diminish the dark sky. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few.</p>
-----------	------------	-----------	--

LPR-B-209	Alex Jeyes	LPR-A-086	<p>Object. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011, where 1064 dwellings were registered. Owing largely to post-2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011, before any further development is considered. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. Many residents would be devastated by the only fields left adjacent to them being built on. The site contravenes the policies in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on a presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, the site would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury, and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. Congestion will worsen where queues at other junctions inevitably increase. West Adderbury is distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development is unsustainable and encourage private car use. The extra traffic brought by development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area. Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is of concern to nearby residents and those whose children attend Christopher Rawlins School. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. There are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking at drop-off and pick-up times. Although the school isn't currently at capacity, for example, 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats: the destruction of hedgerows, pasture and scrubland is intrinsically linked with the depletion of numbers of birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. Concerned about the effects that water runoff from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. If housebuilding takes place in areas adjacent to it, as several of the proposed sites are, the floodplain may not be able to cope. We need to ensure that floodplain requirements are regularly re-assessed and allowed buffer zones to cater for the increased frequency of flooding. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. The site contains popular rural public footpaths and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates will render them less safe and pleasant to use. The presence of fossils will be greatly diminished. Adderbury has limited light pollution and substantial additional development will diminish the dark sky. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few.</p>
-----------	------------	-----------	--

LPR-B-209	Alex Jeyes	LPR-A-146	<p>Object. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011, where 1064 dwellings were registered. Owing largely to post-2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011, before any further development is considered. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. Many residents would be devastated by the only fields left adjacent to them being built on. The site contravenes the policies in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on a presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, the site would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury, and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. Congestion will worsen where queues at other junctions inevitably increase. West Adderbury is distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development is unsustainable and encourage private car use. The extra traffic brought by development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area. Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is of concern to nearby residents and those whose children attend Christopher Rawlins School. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. There are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking at drop-off and pick-up times. Although the school isn't currently at capacity, for example, 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats: the destruction of hedgerows, pasture and scrubland is intrinsically linked with the depletion of numbers of birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. Concerned about the effects that water runoff from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. If housebuilding takes place in areas adjacent to it, as several of the proposed sites are, the floodplain may not be able to cope. We need to ensure that floodplain requirements are regularly re-assessed and allowed buffer zones to cater for the increased frequency of flooding. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. The site contains popular rural public footpaths and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates will render them less safe and pleasant to use. The presence of fossils will be greatly diminished. Adderbury has limited light pollution and substantial additional development will diminish the dark sky. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few.</p>
-----------	------------	-----------	--



LPR-B-209	Alex Jeyes	LPR-A-218	<p>Object. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011, where 1064 dwellings were registered. Owing largely to post-2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011, before any further development is considered. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. Many residents would be devastated by the only fields left adjacent to them being built on. The site contravenes the policies in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on a presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, the site would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury, and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. Congestion will worsen where queues at other junctions inevitably increase. West Adderbury is distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development is unsustainable and encourage private car use. The extra traffic brought by development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area. Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is of concern to nearby residents and those whose children attend Christopher Rawlins School. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. There are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking at drop-off and pick-up times. Although the school isn't currently at capacity, for example, 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats: the destruction of hedgerows, pasture and scrubland is intrinsically linked with the depletion of numbers of birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. Concerned about the effects that water runoff from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. If housebuilding takes place in areas adjacent to it, as several of the proposed sites are, the floodplain may not be able to cope. We need to ensure that floodplain requirements are regularly re-assessed and allowed buffer zones to cater for the increased frequency of flooding. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. The site contains popular rural public footpaths and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates will render them less safe and pleasant to use. The presence of fossils will be greatly diminished. Adderbury has limited light pollution and substantial additional development will diminish the dark sky. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few.</p>
-----------	------------	-----------	--

LPR-B-209	Alex Jeyes	LPR-A-258	Object. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011, where 1064 dwellings were registered. Owing largely to post-2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011, before any further development is considered. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. Many residents would be devastated by the only fields left adjacent to them being built on. The site contravenes the policies in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on a presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, the site would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury, and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. Congestion will worsen where queues at other junctions inevitably increase. West Adderbury is distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development is unsustainable and encourage private car use. The extra traffic brought by development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area. Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is of concern to nearby residents and those whose children attend Christopher Rawlins School. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. There are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking at drop-off and pick-up times. Although the school isn't currently at capacity, for example, 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats: the destruction of hedgerows, pasture and scrubland is intrinsically linked with the depletion of numbers of birds, insects, mammals and amphibians. Concerned about the effects that water runoff from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. If housebuilding takes place in areas adjacent to it, as several of the proposed sites are, the floodplain may not be able to cope. We need to ensure that floodplain requirements are regularly re-assessed and allowed buffer zones to cater for the increased frequency of flooding. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. The site contains popular rural public footpaths and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates will render them less safe and pleasant to use. The presence of fossils will be greatly diminished. Adderbury has limited light pollution and substantial additional development will diminish the dark sky. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few.
LPR-B-210	Philip Styan	Option 21	Regular bus service from villages would reduce car travel. North Newington had the bus service removed – 25th October 2021 and now have to always drive into Banbury town centre.
LPR-B-210	Philip Styan	Option 30	Development in rural areas should be limited to local needs, but due consideration should be given to the services that are available to support any development. Any development needs to be considered in the wider context of the character of a village and the relevance of conservation area status.
LPR-B-210	Philip Styan	Option 31	Meaningful consultation is always welcome and so point 3 above would be best. Meaningful consultation means involving the whole community affected by any changes/developments.(many villages still have poor internet connections using out of date copper wire connections!)
LPR-B-210	Philip Styan	Option 32	There are a range of services that need to be considered when looking at rural villages, such as narrow roads, on street parking, lack of pavements. Infrastructure needs to be considered, such as drainage, waste water treatment, mobile phone coverage and broadband speeds. North Newington had the bus service removed on the 25th October 2021 and cycling into Banbury is not a safe option as no cycling lanes are provided.
LPR-B-210	Philip Styan	LPR-A-004	This proposal is backland development which is not supported by the policy in the current plan. The area identified is steeply rising ground outside the village footprint and will dominate the skyline on that side of the village and properties will over look directly into the properties on Main Street. Main Street is an important part of the village conservation area.
LPR-B-210	Philip Styan	LPR-A-135	This proposal is backland development which is not supported by the policy in the current plan. The area identified is steeply rising ground outside the village footprint and will dominate the skyline on that side of the village and properties will over look directly into the properties on Main Street. Main Street is an important part of the village conservation area. Support service are an important criteria, however this particular parcel of land is within the village boundary and if the village is to expand and if the infrastructure is provided to support it then this development could be considered.
LPR-B-211	Simon Gibbs	LPR-A-175	Having been a resident in Wardington for almost 10 years, I am greatly concerned by the suggestion that the village could almost double in size. Wardington is a beautiful conservation village which should be protected and to double its size would change its character. Wardington has one church, one pub, a village hall and a garden centre that just meets the needs of the current population. It does not have the infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate an increasing population. All basic utilises would be put under pressure and add to existing traffic congestion.

LPR-B-212	Catriona Geber	Hanwell	Strongly object. More housing that would essentially almost encroach and envelop Hanwell village. Apart from all the environmental fall out; destruction of wild life habitats, damage to ecosystems, generation of more traffic, it will essentially erode village life. I request that all our appeals are carefully considered and the plans for housing rejected. The council previously advised there would be no further developments north of Dukes Meadow. This commitment clearly has been disgracefully defaulted upon once; to do so again is simply unacceptable and cannot be tolerated.
LPR-B-213	Hannah Gibbs	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. The village could almost double in size. Wardington is a beautiful conservation village which should be protected and to double its size would change its character. Wardington as a small village with one pub and a garden centre, simply does not have the infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate a increased population. Basic facilities such as sewerage would be put under pressure. The local area already suffers from huge increases in traffic due to the new developments proposed for the A361/M40 access. HS2 is also a factor, any further development works and disruption would be terrible for the local residents.
LPR-B-214	Diane Hanney	LPR-A-034	Strongly Object. The area will encroach into our green fields around Banbury, taking away the natural enviroment. There will be an unacceptable amount of heavy traffic joining the A361, already coping with with increased traffic from HS2, and warehouses currently being built. Never mind a hotel, garage etc that has been applied for. It can at times take 45 mins to travel from Chacombe or Wardington now, which is totally unacceptable for the local economy and pollution levels. Banbury should not keep developing residential or commercial areas without any improvements to infrastructure. <u>Permissions should not be granted for any more of the grotesque buildings that are being already built on the A361</u>
LPR-B-214	Diane Hanney	LPR-A-168	Strongly Object. The area will encroach into our green fields around Banbury, taking away the natural enviroment. There will be an unacceptable amount of heavy traffic joining the A361, already coping with with increased traffic from HS2, and warehouses currently being built. Never mind a hotel, garage etc that has been applied for. It can at times take 45 mins to travel from Chacombe or Wardington now, which is totally unacceptable for the local economy and pollution levels. Banbury should not keep developing residential or commercial areas without any improvements to infrastructure. <u>Permissions should not be granted for any more of the grotesque buildings that are being already built on the A361</u>
LPR-B-215	John Henshaw	LPR-A-091	Object. Bodicote has already been surrounded by new housing developments leading to continual traffic congestion and pollution with insufficient green spaces against National Planning Policy. The traffic problems in Banbury have worsened considerably recently as a result of overdevelopment and this has had a detrimental impact on Bodicote
LPR-B-216	Gordon Paxton	Hanwell	Strongly Object to the possibility of more houses encroaching on the boundaries of Hanwell Village. Hanwell is a small community and the residents would like it to remain this way. We have a beautiful 12th century church right on the edge of the village. Please vote against this planning proposal and allow Hanwell to keep its charm and village status.
LPR-B-217	Hazel Paxton	Hanwell	Object. Surprised by the proposal to build more houses nearer to Hanwell Village. The village will be use even more of a rat run, and as there are now cars parked at curb side it will be much more dangerous to walk in the village. I moved into the village a long time ago and love living here but if these plans go ahead the village atmosphere will be will be lost and we will be just another suburb of Banbury with an historic castle on the edge of village, which must not happen.
LPR-B-218	Chris Douglas	Hanwell	Object. New proposals would lead to the eventual engulfing of the village of Hanwell. The beauty and character of England is in a large part down to the quaintness of villages like Hanwell. Villages with an identity in place for 100's of years and encourages villagers to aspire to live a more tranquil lifestyle. In 2003, we were told that there would be no more development North of Dukes Meadow. The traffic and and congestion has increased due to more development. This village is surrounded by beauty and teeming with wildlife. The road through the village is small and in parts only suitable for one vehicle - by potentially engulfing the village with surrounding estates, then the likelihood of traffic increasing and becoming a rat run grows. The road and pavements are not designed to cope with that. There are brownfields sites, unused industrial areas or areas dotted on the outskirts which could be turned into their own new villages, as opposed to just expanding Banbury and erodes the identity and tranquility of an already established community.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Hanwell	The villages of Hanwell are very concerned that the proximity of housing from Banbury should not be encouraged and a clear seperation should be maintained between the villages and Banbury.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Drayton	The villages of Drayton are very concerned that the proximity of housing from Banbury should not be encouraged and a clear seperation should be maintained between the villages and Banbury.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 1	Support KO5 and KO9.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 2	Consider the following most important: KO29, KO23, KO9, KO5 and KO4.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 3	Employment should be focus on urban areas and previous developed land
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?

LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible - compensation measures should be as close to the site as possible.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 14	For children's play, the use of small areas dotted about should be avoided and in villages the Local Parish Council should be involved in play provision. Village facilities should be enhanced rather than another small site.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. Use contributions to both enhance and build modern facilities Astro type pitches that can be used in all weathers
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20min neighbourhood is impractical in most rural areas.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The car is essential for rural areas it is impossible to place it at the bottom of the transport hierarchy. Eventually electric or hydrogen vehicles will replace petrol but this type of transport will always be needed as neither public transport nor walking or cycling will replace it.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Developers should provide all the infrastructure needed for digital connections
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Question - Transport Policies	There must be provision for car transport in rural areas.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Must protect and maintain the separation of villages from Banbury.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 19	Consider sites to the south, east and west of town for reasons of sustainability. Site to the north should be discarded.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 20	Banbury must be steadfast in becoming a 'destination' town centre. If not Castle Quay 2 and Canal side will be pointless and homes may not get built at Canalside. Appropriate increasing of cycling is good. If this strays to 'shutting off' the town as a destination except for cyclists this will be incoherent and harmful for the towns future
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Canalside needs to be developed for housing. It is a brownfield site and if used for housing will protect greenfield. Policies need to be in the plan to ensure this area is developed as soon as possible
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Banbury's road infrastructure must be improved. We cannot continue to build houses and industrial units without improvement to the roads. Banbury is at cross roads of several A roads and needs roads for both local and more regional transport.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for). Rural areas have already supplied 90% of the rural allocation development should be limited to local needs
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 30	My major concern is the outlandish scale of many of the sites 'promoted' in villages around Banbury. Village meetings have been held by many Parishes which are well attended with residents shocked at the scale of development proposed. There has been balance with support for development within the current policies but people who would support the new starter home scheme find promotions for land that at policy density would require over 600 houses on some sites and hundreds on many more. There is no need for such scale of housing in the rural setting. Many 'villages' would effectively be consumed into Banbury with 'rural' losing its meaning. The consultation has been a major concern amongst the villages in the Ward with large village meetings. Large housing estates will be stuck on to villages many of whom are very unsustainable with very little amenities and public transport. Most village accept infill and conversions as they are within the policies of Cherwell. I also notice that 90% of the planned rural housing has been delivered and see no need for large rural sites, other than those that comply with the policies. Should permission be given for an estate of any size attached to a village there should be policies to ensure it is integrated with the village not cut off as a separate neighbourhood. Concern has raised that conservation areas were not marked on the maps as these areas have been designated as important to the setting of villages and need to be protection. It seems Conservation area does not mean anything now as an input in to this consultation. Parish councils should be involved on compensation decisions. We have cases where this has not happened and long term division and ultimately extra cost will be forced on the Parish
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 31	Work with communities to provide limited sites preferable small infill plots.

LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 32	Give additional weight to the availability of certain services and facilities (which do you think are the most important?)- build where there are facilities but again even villages without may be able to take infill and conversions
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Question - Settlement	As village boundaries should be carefully looked at and I suspect that I would support this policy.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district and define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance. The countryside must be protected and if a village has a conservation area outside the built up limits then this need a separate policy protecting it from development.
LPR-B-219	Councillor Phil Chapman	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	I have to question the value of neighbourhood plans unless they have planning teeth and are not ignored after only 23 years.
LPR-B-220	Sarah and John Cochrane	Sibford Gower	Object. There have been 3 neighbouring properties carrying out renovations and extensions which has already caused power cuts; damage to the banks and verges; and, chaos and road closures on Pound Lane. The disruption of building additional houses to those living in Sibford Gower would be catastrophic. It is a quiet, rural location with a "dark sky". There is not the infrastructure in place for increasing population. The impact on electricity, telecoms and sewage/ water would be immense, and as you are suggesting the development be sited at a high point in the village which would reduce the natural soakaways. Any heavy rainfall will flood the village as already evidenced by the amount of debris on Pound Lane from recent heavy rains. The roads are inadequate to allow for access and movement of additional vehicles and people. There is no local employment, which would require commuting. Colony Road is a single carriageway and almost impassable with potholes and destroyed verges, and could not accommodate further traffic. It would be irresponsible and dangerous to even consider it. This is without the environmental impact: additional vehicle and energy pollution, noise pollution, skyglow pollution, loss of agricultural green fields and mature trees, the effect our hedgerows and our abundant wildlife.
LPR-B-221	Andrew and Brigitte Boyd	LPR-A-107	Strong object. The site is part of the beautiful and valuable countryside surrounding the village of Sibford Gower and would not be suitable for a housing development. It is neither sustainable nor does the necessary infrastructure exist within the village to support it. The ambience of this ancient village, would be ruined by adding more housing along Pound Lane. Sibford Gower is a 'dark sky village' which would rule out street lighting and building large paved areas at the highest point of the village would add to the evergrowing risk of flooding elsewhere. Access to the development would be very problematic. Pound Lane is a narrow rural lane of great character which would be incapable of coping with the extra traffic. Developing the site would seem to violate many Key Objectives of the Cherwell Local Plan.
LPR-B-221	Launton Parish Council	Option 1	The vision is at odds with the approval of the gas fired power station (19/00163/F) at the village in the spring of 2019.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 2	Objectives KO5 and KO8 are important to Launton.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. On sites already allocated but not developed (south of Tesco, Bicester)
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above - But without retail as this should be sited in urban locations/town centres.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Supporting	Support for home working, particularly providing reliable, fast internet connections.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 5	Neither – stop building out of town retail which is closing high street shops.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	A Central Government Business Rate review is urgently needed with an outcome which enables businesses to be able to afford to stay to support town centres.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 6	Not enough experience or information to comment.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 7	Not enough experience or information to comment.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 8	All new dwellings should meet the nationally described space standard.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	Supports a policy on separation distances.

LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 9	Rely on Building Regulations – stay focussed on making them work.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Travelling Communities	No specific locations are available within the Launton district
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 10	Not set further standards. Building Regulations should be adhered to.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Historic buildings should not be 'set in aspic' but should be developed and improved to make sure that they can be used and are fit for the 21st century. The whole issue needs a review, particularly the environmental impacts.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 11	Specific sites - installation of PV panels should be a planning requirement, particularly for warehousing, which frees up land for farming and food.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	While the northern boundary of the Green Belt finishes at J9 of the M40, the whole of the Green Belt should be reviewed as it is not fit for purpose. While it purports to protect Oxford, none of the villages surrounding the other large towns outside Oxford are provided any such protection. There should be miniGreen Belts protecting the villages surrounding the larger towns in Cherwell to stop the potential for coalescence.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible or Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district. If biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved on site, it is the wrong site? Better liaison between bodies before allocation would be more appropriate.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play. The focus should be on play areas which are of a sensible size, well-designed and easily maintained. Smaller play parks with two or three pieces of equipment are not fit for purpose. Larger areas are usually easier to maintain and are more popular both with children and carers.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 15	A mixture of continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites and seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Many of the features of a 20-minute neighbourhood would work in Launton.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Infrastructure for car charging should be more widely available including provision for on street charging points in rural villages to encourage electric car use. Low carbon/hydrogen/ electric public transport for village use and more cycle paths.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	A policy to consider the solutions for the Bicester London Road level crossing. Implementation of road infrastructure should be completed before any development is started.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy and look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are?
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Bringing back the Magistrates Court and a Job Centre to Bicester would reduce car dependency for those who have to travel to Banbury from Bicester and the surrounding villages for these things.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Reduce coalescence between the town and the surrounding villages.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 23	Before building on greenfield sites, the currently allocated brownfield sites should be completed.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 24	Neither suggestion. A broad conversion of shops and restaurants to residential use on the high street would necessitate the out of town shopping which could negate the 20 minute neighbourhood policy. Certainly not all shops should be converted to residential use. A full review of what a high street is and what it is for, together with a review of facilities should be undertaken
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 25	Yes to both suggestions (Community and cultural facilities).
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	It is presumed that the town centre areas such as St Edburg's, Dovecot, Causeway are already protected. The historic area around and over Graven Hill should be protected, as it is presumed to be of significant importance to Bicester's Heritage (see Battle of Graven Hill in AD 871).
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Don't build on Bicester open space and provide more funding/S106 to maintain and update them – suggest a Green Spaces Champion.

LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	More green space should be provided.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car dependency in Bicester	Proper cycle lanes and a decent bus service with accessible facilities (including GP surgeries, Job Centre and Magistrates' Court) within the town centre rather than out of town.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. Many parishes have not been encouraged or are not able to instigate Neighbourhood Plans, particularly due to the cost, the amount of work and volunteer time it requires. The previous iteration of the Local Plan had made it clear that Local Plan Part 2 would include a 'Villages section' and would protect the villages surrounding the larger conurbations. But this appears not to be included, much more consideration should be given to how villages can be sympathetically developed.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 32	The 20-minute neighbourhood principle should be applied. Then the availability of services such as schools, shops, GP surgeries etc and then accessibility to urban centres.
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 33	A combination
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Option 34	A combination of both. Surely the valued landscapes have already been defined?
LPR-B-222	Launton Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Smaller villages (even Category A) were assured that there was no need for the expense and effort of producing a village Neighbourhood Plan as the Local Plan Part 2 villages section was due to be developed which would encompass this. It is far more sensible for planners to work with the villages to develop neighbourhood plans in conjunction with the emerging Local Plan.
LPR-B-223	Thelma Spratt	Hanwell	Object. It is a very special village with a lovely community which upholds a traditional view of country life and village community events. The proposed development will erode the spirit of a village which is a conservation area with its 800 year old church surrounded by its country landscape and wildlife habitats. Our local authority has led me to believe that this would all be protected and it is unthinkable that it would allow us to lose what can never be replaced if lost. The local authority should feel proud to have guardianship.
LPR-B-224	Simon Pigden	LPR-A-152	Object. We were led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. It appears that this principle has been eroded. The Authority appears to be resiling on its word. The countryside around Banbury is under threat. There have already been several significant housing developments in recent times. Any more development will leave just metres between the edge of the conservation area down Gullicote Lane and track. New housing will not be shielded from the sight of the village by any significant natural border, such as currently exists with the trees which hide the current Banbury 5 development. Hanwell is a village with significant historical antecedents. The Castle and St Peter's Church are iconic. The village boasts a thriving rural community. Hanwell attracts visitors to the mediaeval Church and local events and festivals. The housing stock is predominantly 300 years or more old. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village. Development of the site is contrary to the Local Plan. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community. The development of site would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages. There are precious few villages such as Hanwell in the environs of Banbury which must be preserved for our heritage. The wildlife (flora and fauna) that currently thrives in the countryside surrounding Hanwell is under threat. It is in the public interest to retain the fields, footpaths, woodland and waterways lying between the urban sprawl of Banbury and Hanwell. The general public use the land for recreation. Although Hanwell is a small community and cannot field large numbers when it comes to objecting please consider these points. Please consider the health, and wellbeing of Hanwell residents and the historic character of the village before committing to the irreversible annihilation of the landscape and the community as a whole.

LPR-B-224	Simon Pigden	LPR-A-214	Object. We were led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. It appears that this principle has been eroded. The Authority appears to be resiling on its word. The countryside around Banbury is under threat. There have already been several significant housing developments in recent times. Any more development will leave just metres between the edge of the conservation area down Gullicote Lane and track. New housing will not be shielded from the sight of the village by any significant natural border, such as currently exists with the trees which hide the current Banbury 5 development. Hanwell is a village with significant historical antecedents. The Castle and St Peter's Church are iconic. The village boasts a thriving rural community. Hanwell attracts visitors to the mediaeval Church and local events and festivals. The housing stock is predominantly 300 years or more old. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village. Development of the site is contrary to the Local Plan. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community. The development of site would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages. There are precious few villages such as Hanwell in the environs of Banbury which must be preserved for our heritage. The wildlife (flora and fauna) that currently thrives in the countryside surrounding Hanwell is under threat. It is in the public interest to retain the fields, footpaths, woodland and waterways lying between the urban sprawl of Banbury and Hanwell. The general public use the land for recreation. Although Hanwell is a small community and cannot field large numbers when it comes to objecting please consider these points. Please consider the health, and wellbeing of Hanwell residents and the historic character of the village before committing to the irreversible annihilation of the landscape and the community as a whole.
LPR-B-224	Simon Pigden	Option 18	Development is most appropriate to the East or South of Banbury where there is lesser prospect of incursion on neighbouring villages.
LPR-B-224	Simon Pigden	Option 19	Support 2) to limit development at Banbury and protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-225	Gemma Davis	Hanwell	Object. The village is already under threat from the numerous estates and developments that have seen the identity of the village eroded considerably. The village has become a 'ratrun' for traffic passing from the A422 to the A423 and vice versa (Warwick Road/Southam Road). The existing infrastructure cannot cope with the burden of all the developments that have transformed the appearance of a once rural area into a sprawling housing estate. The village is seriously under threat of becoming absorbed as a suburb of Banbury which must not happen. The establishment of yet another development that encroaches closer to the village is a disgrace, destroying conservation areas, replacing them with yet another estate that contributes towards traffic chaos and pollution.
LPR-B-226	Robert Davis	Hanwell	Object. The village is already under threat from the numerous estates and developments that have seen the identity of the village eroded considerably. The village has become a 'ratrun' for traffic passing from the A422 to the A423 and vice versa (Warwick Road/Southam Road). The existing infrastructure cannot cope with the burden of all the developments that have transformed the appearance of a once rural area into a sprawling housing estate. The village is seriously under threat of becoming absorbed as a suburb of Banbury which must not happen. The establishment of yet another development that encroaches closer to the village is a disgrace, destroying conservation areas, replacing them with yet another estate that contributes towards traffic chaos and pollution.
LPR-B-227	Allan and Gillian Hunt	LPR-A-041	Object. This site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021 there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Road. (90 houses already build plus outline for 40 and the community centre on Berry Hill Road/Milton Road in less that one mile). These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural with limited number of more modern houses. West Adderbury is a distinct area, distant from the vast majority of facilities listed in the Parish Proville. The proposed sites would double the size of West Adderbury which is inappropriate for an area with no facilities and would put an massive pressure on local schools and local facilities nearby.
LPR-B-227	Allan and Gillian Hunt	LPR-A-086	Object. This site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021 there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Road. (90 houses already build plus outline for 40 and the community centre on Berry Hill Road/Milton Road in less that one mile). These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural with limited number of more modern houses. West Adderbury is a distinct area, distant from the vast majority of facilities listed in the Parish Proville. The proposed sites would double the size of West Adderbury which is inappropriate for an area with no facilities and would put an massive pressure on local schools and local facilities nearby.
LPR-B-227	Allan and Gillian Hunt	LPR-A-146	Object. This site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021 there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Road. (90 houses already build plus outline for 40 and the community centre on Berry Hill Road/Milton Road in less that one mile). These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural with limited number of more modern houses. West Adderbury is a distinct area, distant from the vast majority of facilities listed in the Parish Proville. The proposed sites would double the size of West Adderbury which is inappropriate for an area with no facilities and would put an massive pressure on local schools and local facilities nearby.



LPR-B-227	Allan and Gillian Hunt	LPR-A-218	Object. This site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021 there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Road. (90 houses already build plus outline for 40 and the community centre on Berry Hill Road/Milton Road in less than one mile). These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural with limited number of more modern houses. West Adderbury is a distinct area, distant from the vast majority of facilities listed in the Parish Provision. The proposed sites would double the size of West Adderbury which is inappropriate for an area with no facilities and would put an massive pressure on local schools and local facilities nearby.
LPR-B-227	Allan and Gillian Hunt	LPR-A-258	Object. This site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021 there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Road. (90 houses already build plus outline for 40 and the community centre on Berry Hill Road/Milton Road in less than one mile). These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural with limited number of more modern houses. West Adderbury is a distinct area, distant from the vast majority of facilities listed in the Parish Provision. The proposed sites would double the size of West Adderbury which is inappropriate for an area with no facilities and would put an massive pressure on local schools and local facilities nearby.
LPR-B-228	Nigel Buttler	LPR-A-091	Strongly object. There remains very little land in the current parish boundary which has not already been allocated for residential use, and which can be used for recreational and agricultural use, following the granting of planning applications for residential use of land both to the north of the parish (The Pavilions- currently under construction) and to the east of the Oxford Road (Longford Park). Land at Longford Park was subsequently transferred to Banbury by Cherwell District Council. To the east of Bodicote only those existing properties lying to the east of Oxford Road (including the Rugby Club site), those in Merlin Close and some three or four in Canal Lane remain in the Parish of Bodicote. Even Tappers Field (corner of Oxford Road and White Post Road) has been granted planning permission for residential use. The loss of agricultural land would deprive residents of Austin Road, Deers Farm, Keyser Road, Sefton Place, and Wards Crescent and any visitors with the site popular with ramblers, a view across the countryside looking towards Adderbury. There would also be a large loss in bird life currently being experienced in these areas. Thus the open nature of the south boundary of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape.
LPR-B-228	Imogen Davis	Hanwell	Object. The village is already under threat from the numerous estates and developments that have seen the identity of the village eroded considerably. The village has become a 'ratrun' for traffic passing from the A422 to the A423 and vice versa (Warwick Road/Southam Road). The existing infrastructure cannot cope with the burden of all the developments that have transformed the appearance of a once rural area into a sprawling housing estate. The village is seriously under threat of becoming absorbed as a suburb of Banbury which must not happen. The establishment of yet another development that encroaches closer to the village is a disgrace, destroying conservation areas, replacing them with yet another estate that contributes towards traffic chaos and pollution.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 1	Supports the suggested Vision which appears to be closely matched to the overarching vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. We welcome the ambition to have energy efficient, well-designed homes, sufficient in numbers, location, type, size, tenure and affordability, to meet the needs of our growing economy, young people, residents and future generations in Oxfordshire. Vistry, as a major house builder, is well-placed to support the Council. We are particularly keen to explore what is meant at point 12) of the draft Vision in regard to how Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington are 'reshaped and adapted' to maintain their roles as attractive, vibrant, retail, cultural and social centres for communities and visitors. We agree with the text at 1.1.8 that the Plan needs to reflect the NPPF amendment requiring a possible 30 year time horizon for strategic sites. We also agree that the impacts of COVID are significant. However, it is difficult to predict how long term these may be, and whether the Plan should be significantly informed by them or reflect a 'tapering' in impacts. The climate emergency and the approach that we take to our lifestyles including: where we live and work, how we meet our demand for resources, such as food, water and energy, and the infrastructure for the way we travel, is likely to have a greater impact than that created by the pandemic in the coming years. We would be interested to understand the scope of the capacity of the transport network and the sensitivity of the landscape study and town centre and retail study, and how the work has been framed, as soon as details are available.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 2	The Key Objectives all appear to be supportable principles, although we would suggest there are quite a lot of them and that, perhaps, these should be rationalised and simplified. The most important objectives are: KO1, KO10, KO11, KO13, KO16, KO23, KO24, KO26, KO28, KO29, KO30 AND KO31.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 3	Recent comments by the Prime Minister, about the desire not to build any unnecessary housing on green field sites, has had a ripple effect with motions passed by SODC and Cherwell to await further news on national legislation. We consider that the general spirit of making best use of previously developed land will remain. However, it is the degree to which that land can absorb the necessary levels of growth that is key, and previous studies of Cherwell's available brownfield land have presented significant limitations. There should certainly not be a blanket embargo on developing greenfield sites just because they are not previously developed land. Some brownfield sites present greater richness in biodiversity, and present greater constraints in terms of contamination, flood risk etc. Oxfordshire has shown stronger resilience to the pandemic than many areas, and is well placed for a faster recovery, especially along the 'knowledge spine' (which runs centrally through Wantage/Didcot, Oxford and Bicester). A review of the settlement hierarchy seems sensible to recalibrate and understand the carrying capacity of settlements, and their relationship within the wider spatial options that will fall from the 2050 Plan. Overall, Vistry supports option 1 and, in order to support sustainable growth, a similar focus for residential development on those centres. Cherwell has commissioned an Employment Land and Needs Assessment, to complement the OGNA, but we would need to see the details of this to comment further. Changes to the Use Classes Order and increased flexibility in Class E will also be important in the emerging strategy, especially for town centres and business parks.

LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 4	Taking account of the Oxfordshire Industrial Strategy and the associated Delivery Plan, there is a strong ambition to drive up the provision of R&D space and to increase employment skills to better respond to local demand and provide people with longer and more flexible careers. Oxfordshire lacks flexible laboratory and innovation space as well as Grade A office space, which are critical to attracting foreign investment and secure international business headquarters. The desire to create a world-leading ecosystem for high-growth businesses requires a support network of business spaces to assist in commercialising technologies, grow to scale, and export. Trends towards increased provision of distribution space on main transport nodes indicates the importance of B8 uses in this part of the County. The approach to identifying employment land should recognise the need for a mixture of business spaces, as well as the importance of improved physical, training and digital infrastructure needed to support this. Part of the offer should include flexible business space, associated with local community hubs, and where people can be part of local employment networks <u>without having to travel away from their local area.</u>
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. We would support increased flexibility for different town centre uses, including residential development, but recognise the importance that the retail, tourism and leisure role that town centres play and how <u>this needs to be protected.</u>
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 6	It is difficult to comment on this meaningfully without wider viability evidence around new policy aspirations for affordable housing provision. Vistry has a strong track record of affordable housing delivery as both Vistry Housebuilding and Vistry Partnerships and would welcome further engagement <u>with the Council in this regard.</u>
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 7	It is difficult to comment without the evidence base, but Vistry would suggest that it is reasonable to retain the same tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Plan.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 8	Support, introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? With a view to supporting housing internal space standards unless there are site specific or viability reasons why this is not <u>achievable in any particular development and so any future policies should retain flexibility in this regard</u>
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Separation Distances	The imposition of minimum separation distances would be arbitrary, and not take account of local conditions and design ingenuity. There are better ways of ensuring good design that is neighbourly and protects amenity, through compliance with the principles of the National Model Design Code and any local design code or SPD that is in place.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 9	Vistry would advocate continuing to rely on the Building Regulations, a per 2) above – but if Cherwell is minded to proceed with 1) it should be reflected in the Council’s viability evidence, and set at a <u>appropriate level to meet identified needs (i.e. not required for all properties)</u>
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Housing Policies	We consider that there is no need for a policy relating to Modern Methods of Construction – and that it would be more appropriate to let the market <u>resolve this, in the context of meeting other sustainability requirements and legislation</u>
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 10	Section 5.5.7 highlights that the Government will shortly amend the Building Regulations to improve the energy efficiency of new homes. The Future Homes Standard should ensure that all new homes-built from 2025 will produce 75-80% less carbon emissions than homes delivered under current regulations. The Government is proposing to consult on a Future Building Standard which will look at measures to improve the energy efficiency of non-domestic buildings. We would emphasise that policies should align with, and not necessarily exceed, national targets. The term ‘net zero’ will require careful definition. Vistry has committed to collaborate through the Future Homes Delivery Hub, which has been developed by the Home Builders Federation. The Future Homes Delivery Hub will support the industry in meeting Government targets to ensure that homes are zero carbon ready from 2025 through the Future Homes Standard, and that production and construction methods are net zero by 2050. For these reasons we support Option 2 <u>in relation to sustainable construction.</u>
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 11	Both options should be pursued. The identification and potential allocation of specific sites for renewable energy generation involves a complex approach to a range of environmental, engineering and economic issues, and would require the detailed involvement of the energy network companies, landowners and communities, as well as a careful assessment of network capacity and infrastructure requirements. It is sensible to seek to make some strategic decisions about where the best areas for solar, wind, and associated energy storage plant, may be best situated, but that should not preclude individual applications that may fall outside those areas, where criteria based policy and assessment of impacts and benefits can also be used.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We cannot know how changes in technology, resources and society as a whole may affect things, and so there needs to be flexibility built into the policies as the context may change during the plan period, especially for strategic locations.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 12	We don’t see these options as mutually exclusive. We will need some flexibility on compensatory and proactive measures, whilst all parties learn to deal with Biodiversity Net Gain, particularly if the Council is to seek standards higher than those to be mandated through the emerging Environment Bill.

LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 13	Without a standardised methodology for Environmental Net Gain, it will be extremely difficult to measure and prove at this point. Until the Environment Bill becomes statute, and the measures in the legislation are translated into the NPPF and guidance it is difficult to make an objective comment on this question. The EIA Regulations require the assessment of significant environmental effects for schemes that trigger certain thresholds, already cover a key component of what might be required, and could be adapted to reflect the need to consider natural capital. The development industry needs to find its feet with assessing and proposing Biodiversity Net Gain, before moving onto the next step. The answer to the above should be Option 3, not to require natural capital assessment.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 14	The current Cherwell policy approach to play provision lacks flexibility and finesse. We agree that option 3 seems a more progressive approach, and Vistry would support this.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 15	Vistry suggests that a blend of seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements and use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use is helpful to deliver meaningful sports and recreation facilities in the best locations for communities. Option 1 is also appropriate where strategic development is of a scale to warrant on-site provision, and where no facilities exist locally that can be upgraded. The 2017 CDC Sports and Recreation Assessment should be updated to reflect latest needs and supply issues.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Local Green Spaces	Vistry considers that Local Green Space designations should not be used to frustrate development, as per the National Planning Policy Guidance. Plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making. Local Green Space may be a more useful designation for Neighbourhood Plans to consider.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Achieving good design and 'beauty' can be best supported by avoiding ambiguity between National Model Design Code and local codes/guidance, thus providing developers with certainty. If the Council intends to produce a Local Design Code, any standards must reflect this Local Plan process to ensure that they do not negatively impact upon the viability of developments, thus compromising the deliverability of the plan.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	We are supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principles.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Vistry agrees with the proposed transport and connectivity approach. We support the aims of moving towards a net zero transport network and agree that spatial planning has a clear role in supporting a decarbonised transport system. Sites such as those being promoted by Vistry to the north of Caversfield, on the edge of Bicester, have the opportunity to make a significant contribution to this agenda, compared to more rural or isolated sites.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing) as a reasonable aim in relation to digital infrastructure but consider that it may be difficult to make policy requirements mandatory, depending on location and infrastructure networks, and the ability to predict emerging technology.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Transport Policies	We support the range of policies and documents identified, but note the additional work that Cherwell has commissioned on transport network capacity. We will await more information to make more detailed comment
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 17	We would advocate an overhaul of the methodology that is used to assess social and environmental benefits, in line with Option 1 and then use this to inform the approach to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 18	Vistry supports the opportunity for further urban extensions to Banbury, as per Option 1 and notes that Cherwell studies will include assessment of landscape sensitivity.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 19	Vistry supports sites to the north of Banbury, as per Option 1 and is promoting land for approximately 200 units in that area (LPRA-214).
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 20	Vistry accepts that it may be appropriate to remove certain permitted development rights within the town centre to protect the vitality and function of town centres. It is important to note though that the recent changes to the Use Classes Order simply re-classify a group of previous uses in order to optimise flexibility of use, and that those changes are not capable of being limited by Article 4 Direction.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 22	Vistry supports further major urban extensions into the open countryside and development at an existing or new settlement(s) well connected to Bicester given Bicester's role as a key employment and housing growth area, and its location on a sustainable transport corridor. The existing allocations indicate that areas under construction are mainly to the south, and some to the west, based on the connectivity and access to sustainable travel, and growth at Bicester Heritage, new allocations to the north and east would help balance the delivery. Delivery of the Eco Town and some of the allocations has slowed, and that there may be concerns about the ability to deliver existing and further commitments alongside each other. Vistry currently has two live sales outlets in Bicester: Kingsmere (Bovis Homes brand) and Hawkswood (Linden Homes brand). These have been very popular sites, providing a mix of 25 bedroom properties of varying design. Sales rates have been strong, considered in part to relate to Bicester's excellent service offering and good connections to Oxford and further afield. Availability has been challenging, having sold many plots in advance. The proximity of other developers building and selling nearby has not been a constraint to sales which indicates a demand for new homes. Progress is being made in respect of other major development sites around Bicester, including the recent EIA Scoping Opinion in respect of land at North West Bicester, allocated in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. The Council should recognise that whilst strategic sites can take some time to be delivered through the planning system, the benefits of directing growth to sustainable locations such as Bicester, remain. The land to the north of Caversfield represents the next logical extension of Bicester, and is controlled by a house builder with a strong track record of delivery. Vistry Group would be pleased to discuss their proposals with officers and consultees in order to provide an indication of a development programme and anticipated rates of delivery.

LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 23	Strongly supports growth to the north of Bicester, in particular land at Dymock's Farm, Caversfield (LPR-A-147), and where there are opportunities to provide a range of services, sustainable transport and community facilities that would support the existing community, as well as new residents. The Vision Statement for that site sets out the proposals in some detail, and is supported by a substantial amount of baseline evaluation work. We have received direct support from Stagecoach, in terms of the opportunities to consolidate and improve local bus services and connections. We have included a copy of a letter of support from Stagecoach. There is an opportunity for connectivity with the Bicester Motion initiative, which is a key area of regeneration and growth for employment, tourism and innovation. This could include making connections and better use of former quarry workings for public recreation and access on land to the east of the A4421 Buckingham Road, which is also controlled by the owner of Dymock's Farm.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 24	Vistry accepts that it may be appropriate to limit permitted development rights in order to protect the function and vitality of Bicester Town Centre.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	The creation of sustainable new neighbourhoods, which are walkable, well-serviced and which support the 20 min neighbourhood principle, would significantly reduce the need to make trips by private car in Bicester. Our Vision Statement for Dymock's Farm sets out the credentials of the local movement network, the opportunities for betterment to services, and the ability to stitch this scheme into the existing fabric in a manner that supports sustainable growth.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 30	Vistry considers that the approach set out in Option 1 would be the best approach, in order to meet the vision and key objectives of the 2040 Plan, which are much better served through continuing to focus development at urban centres
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 31	Use a combination of the above, the best approach for delivering housing needs in rural areas is a combination of partnership working and high level guidance for Parishes in preparing community led plans.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 32	Vistry would advocate an approach aligned with Give additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling, where the urban centres and the connectivity available to them is given additional weight, as these centres provide the greatest range and choice of facilities and services.
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	Option 34	Support a review of landscape sensitivity. The consideration of landscape capacity and sensitivity needs to be reasonably detailed however, or otherwise a lack of granularity could risk opportunities for development being ruled out
LPR-B-230	Savills OBO Vistry	LPR-A-147	Representation is supported by a letter from Stagecoach and a Vision Statement promoting the allocation of the site for residential use. Vistry is promoting a strategic site as suitable for residential development to the north of Bicester which provides the opportunity to incorporate flexible business space in line with new working patterns. As part of our work to support proposals at Dymock's Farm, Caversfield, Vistry has looked carefully at the network of uses and connections that will support the existing community and create a new walkable neighbourhood. Strongly supports growth to the north of Bicester, in particular land at Dymock's Farm, Caversfield, and where there are opportunities to provide a range of services, sustainable transport and community facilities that would support the existing community, as well as new residents. The Vision Statement for that site sets out the proposals in some detail, and is supported by a substantial amount of baseline evaluation work. We have received direct support from Stagecoach, in terms of the opportunities to consolidate and improve local bus services and connections. We have included a copy of a letter of support from Stagecoach. There is an opportunity for connectivity with the Bicester Motion initiative, which is a key area of regeneration and growth for employment, tourism and innovation. This could include making connections and better use of former quarry workings for public recreation and access on land to the east of the A4421 Buckingham Road, which is also controlled by the owner of Dymock's Farm.
LPR-B-231	Hazel Skwirzynska	Hanwell	Object. The historic village will be consumed with this development. At the last stage of the development plan the residents of Hanwell were assured that there would be no more development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. This principle was eroded and it would appear that it is yet again under threat. It is a dreadful situation when the integrity of our village community, a conservation area, is put at risk. The traffic disruption is already awful without adding to this with further development. Furthermore the infrastructure is not in place to support further development. Schools and GP practices have waiting lists. I am passionate that this Village must be protected for the future. Please do not consider future developments that will cause this small and historic Village to be lost.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 2	KO 16 is one of the most important objectives for addressing the climate emergency. Policies should discourage development in locations where residents will be largely dependent on the private car as a mode of travel, especially for commuting. If there is a bus service nearby, the timetable, route, and actual usage should be critically analysed to assess its viability for commuting. KO 23: There is only one reference to brownfield land in the entirety of the LPR consultation document. Development in the Rural Areas should meet local needs and be sustainable. Imposing wider district housing needs on the rural areas would raise significant sustainability issues. Sustainability factors to be considered, amongst others, would include transport sustainability credentials, infrastructure capability (including schooling, health care, not just drains etc.), impact on the environment and digital connectivity. The rural area of Cherwell is thriving, but it does not need spoiling by unnecessary or inappropriate development. To make more efficient and effective use of land, apart from the need to develop more brownfield sites, development in urban areas, in particular within walking distance of transport interchanges, should be high density. KO 25: This objective is particularly important in the case of the rural areas if the environment and landscapes in north Oxfordshire, and the setting and character of our villages, are to be conserved for the benefit of generations to come rather than spoiled by overdevelopment.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 3	Support at our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and at significant transport interchanges. Transport routes are focused on main urban centres.

LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 6	This is a complex issue. To what extent have the targets in the 2015 Local Plan been met by developers ? Would higher targets be economically viable ?
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?. Should 30% Social Rent instead read 30% affordable homes to buy?
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 8	All new homes should meet national internal space standards as a minimum.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Question - Separation Distances	Separation distances would be appropriate in the Rural Areas to help to preserve local character.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 11	A criteria-based approach would be more appropriate.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. To make mitigation of harmful effects on biodiversity meaningful, any measures need to be as close to the site as possible.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Consistent with Key Objectives on the Challenge of Climate Change.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 15	Use financial contributions to enhance existing facilities near new sites. This will serve to reduce the need to travel.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Question - Local Green Spaces	We support the identification and designation of Local Green Spaces to help to maintain local character. These are also coming forward under the neighbourhood planning process.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). This will help to facilitate home working and reduce the need to travel.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy?. The current methodology would benefit from being reviewed.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 18	None of these options appears particularly attractive.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs- Imposing wider district housing needs on the rural areas instead of meeting truly local needs, would raise important sustainability issues, and be the ruination of some villages. Under 2)- instead of delivering sustainable development, villages would be placed at risk of over-development, with consequent harm to local character and the environment, pressure on infrastructure, and more road congestion and pollution from additional commuting. This would be contrary to the Key Objective of combatting climate change.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 31	It is Government policy to encourage 2), since it makes sense to take advantage of local knowledge in assessing and allocating sites through the neighbourhood planning process.

LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 32	Weighting formulae are necessarily subjective and thus risk being arbitrary. Support No. 2 as more likely to address the Key Objective of meeting the challenge of climate change. Any Transport assessment should take account of the following: distance of settlement from main employment areas and major retail centres; distances travelled from individual settlements to work destinations, average network distances, and proportion of workers travelling to each identified destination; accessibility, timetabling, routes, usage and cost of any rail services in the vicinity (rail being the most sustainable form of public transport available); accessibility, timetabling, routes, usage and cost of local bus services (often little if barely used for a variety of reasons); limited capacity, and the condition, of rural roads; and, likely degree of dependence on the private motor car as a mode of travel, and consequent effect on meeting net zero carbon ambitions.. Assessed using methodology similar to the <u>Cherwell Rural Area Integrated Transport and Land Use</u> .
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Defining settlement boundaries provides greater certainty for developers and the community as to what is acceptable in planning terms. This is also supportive of a planned approach to development. It protects the countryside from unnecessary development such as ribbon development, and it is easy to identify a 'settlement' from 'open countryside'. It would help to ensure that development takes place in the most suitable locations in terms of accessibility and infrastructure, as well as protecting local character and the landscape. The Neighbourhood Plans for Adderbury and Mid-Cherwell have adopted settlement boundaries. Settlement boundaries are an understood and accepted planning tool for guiding and controlling developments. It is understood that Cherwell is one of the few LPAs which does not define settlement boundaries.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 33	Criteria-based policies are more focused and flexible.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Option 34	Support both options. It is vital existing policies should not be diluted. Defining valued landscapes per 2) would add focus and provide useful additional protection.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Being proactive in guiding, and providing information (e.g. housing targets) to neighbourhood planning groups.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Sustainability Appraisal	representation provides an extract of table 3.5 from the sustainability appraisal and notes that the table is difficult to understand and interpret. Comments provided in relation to table 3.5 1. Air and wider env'l quality – This must be made worse by higher growth. The negative should be shown against Option 2. 2. Biodiversity – Higher growth means greater loss of habitat. Significant negative should apply to option 2. 3. Climate change mitigation – agree their finding. 4. Climate change adaptation- ? 5. Communities – Higher growth puts greater stress on services and infrastructure, which are not increased in proportion. Therefore a negative against higher growth. 6. Crime – more people means more crime, so moderate negative against Option 2. 7. Digital infrastructure = 8. Education and skills - = 9. Employment and Economic Growth – Higher growth means more car dependence and commuting, as employment prospects are not increased – significant negative against Option 2. 10. Flood risk - = 11. Health – Health services are not increased to match higher growth, so services will be more stressed. Negative against Option 2. 12. Historic environment. – Higher growth has an adverse effect on the historic environment. Significant negative against Option 2. 13. Homes – the only positive for Option 2 14. Land and soils – development means loss of agricultural land. Significant negative against Option 2. 15. Landscape – Development must cut off views of the landscape. It can't improve it. Significant negative against Option 2. 16. Poverty etc = 17. Transport – Significant negative against Option 2. 18. Waste – The local rivers are already polluted by sewage discharge. Higher growth will increase this. Significant negative against Option 2. 19. Water- Higher growth means greater demand for scarce resource. Moderate negative against Option 2.
LPR-B-232	Deddington Development Watch	Parish Profile - Deddington	LPR site submissions: The list, and map, of sites submitted are defective. 4 of the 5 sites submitted by Ridge & Partners on behalf of M&G have been omitted. Public house/restaurant/take away: The list needs updating as follows: Otters in Market Place is closed. May Fu 2 in New Street has closed. The Crown & Tuns in New Street is closed, the "Pie Pub" having relocated to premises in Milton. Flooding and Pollution: According to a report on flooding and pollution in Oxfordshire published by CPRE Oxon on 4th November 2021, one in five Oxfordshire towns and parishes face flooding and pollution issues. The findings in relation to Deddington are as follows: Deddington: Serious and frequent flooding issues and serious sewerage infrastructure issues. Whenever the sewage treatment plant suffers a "pollution event" the effluent has to be tankered offsite. Occasionally the surface water flooding has overwhelmed the sewage treatment plant leading to untreated flooding surrounding farm land, fish ponds and paddocks
LPR-B-233	Mr and Mrs M Wilkinson	LPR-A-175	
LPR-B-234	Kevin Briggs	Question - Settlement	There should be community boundaries to limit development. Developments outside of these community boundaries should not normally be permitted in the interests of environmental protection.
LPR-B-234	Kevin Briggs	LPR-A-091	Object. With Longford Park and Cotefield near completion, Bodicote is now overdeveloped. By doubling the number of houses in the village, the council has ensured that the character of the village has been completely changed despite government regulations. Now there is a further element of development being proposed, these fields need to be protected from development on the grounds that the village is already over-developed and does not require further housing.

LPR-B-235	Mark Stapley	LPR-A-104	<p>Object. My objections can be summarized as follows: the proposed site does not benefit from any existing access and will require significant new road construction; there is no obvious place for any new thoroughfare as where Chapel Close ends there is only a narrow bridleway which is unlikely able to accommodate more than single lane traffic; there is no room for pavement on the bridleway which will impact user safety of a popular bridleway part of the Deddington Loop; and, Chapel Close is narrow in places and unsuitable for more than single lane traffic in relation to environment: Chapel Close already channels storm flood water run off; the site is sloping with a lake/large pond above it, and Thames Water Sewage Treatment plant below it requiring careful assessment; the site has been known to suffer flooding from the nearby Sewage Water Treatment plant which only has adequate capacity to deal with existing volumes; impact on wildlife will be severe with a variety of animals using the site as a habitat; development would result in a significant increase in light pollution with all its consequential impacts on the countryside; and, embedded environmental costs of construction of between 40-50 dwellings plus associated infrastructure will be greater than other sites which already have more immediate access to existing infrastructure. In relation to local impact Clifton is a small village/hamlet that has no existing amenities (beyond a pub) to support its existing community let alone an expanded one; Clifton is a rural community with no/limited infrastructure to support access to nearest larger communities (ie Deddington, Aynho); and, no bus service to connect Clifton with these communities meaning that any development will increase vehicle journeys, especially shorter ones to these communities, with its higher consequential environmental impact. Clifton has very little existing light industry or similar operations that could provide local employment meaning any residential development in Clifton will only result in an increased volume of commuter journeys with its consequential impact on the environment: The main road in Clifton (from Deddington to Aynho) is difficult to navigate at various times in the day and any development would only exacerbate this. As a rural village, Clifton does not have the capacity, infrastructure or the amenities to support material development and would certainly not be able to support a near doubling of the housing stock (given existing planning permission) that any development would entail. I do not consider that the site is inherently a suitable plot for development with a high environmental impact which would have a disproportionate impact on the Clifton community.</p>
LPR-B-234	Kevin Briggs	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	<p>There should be more flexibility in allowing energy conservation in listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas. For example, electric vehicle charging points can be installed in these buildings without the need for planning consent and similarly for replacement windows. If the point about charging points cannot be catered for by virtue of the Town and Country Planning Act, then the council needs to provide public charging points to facilitate the extent of electric vehicle ownership that the UK Government envisages by 2030</p>
LPR-B-235	Cherwell Development Watch Alliance	Question - Green Belt	<p>It is acknowledged the the Green Belt 'is highly valued by residents' yet neither the consultation flyer nor the consultation poster mention that this review considers 'whether exceptional circumstances remain for further small-scale Green Belt release to meet employment needs'. The flyer and the poster are the documents most likely to be seen by residents. The omission in these documents, of any mention of further Green Belt release (even if considered by the Council to be 'smallscale'), is a woeful omission. The Green Belt is highly valued by many residents and they are concerned for its future, particularly in the light of the already very substantial Green Belt Release in the Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review to 2031. We believe the abovementioned omission will have led to significant under-representation of the views of residents on further Green Belt release. The statement in 5.4.4 pre-supposes the outcome of OP2050 which is still being prepared, will be subject to further consultation and will not be adopted for at least a year which is not acceptable. Neither is it acceptable to base this review on a pre-supposed scenario but one where the number of homes being planned for is not actually known. There is already an extremely high level of growth committed to in existing Oxfordshire Local Plans including the Cherwell one. This growth is significantly in excess of real need for local people and is based on what we believe are unrealistic ambitions for economic growth and attracting people to move into Oxfordshire. Cherwell District Council should insist, via its input to OP2050 and via this Partial Review, that the housing requirement for Cherwell is kept to the lowest level possible. For Cherwell this will be the Standard Method figure of 716 dwellings per annum. This is already above real need but we acknowledge that it is the minimum set by Government. Cherwell District Council should ensure that the housing requirement in OP2050 is also kept to a minimum ie it should be based on the Standard Method.</p>
LPR-B-236	Cherwell Development Watch Alliance	Question - Green Belt	<p>The inter-relationship between this review and Oxfordshire Plan 2050 (OP2050) is unclear. However, this review seems to choose to assume that any new strategic matters relating to the Green Belt will be addressed by OP2050. But the review then suggests that it will need to consider whether there is a need to release further land in the Kidlington area for employment purposes. Either further Green Belt release is a matter for OP2050, or it is not. Neither is the current situation where there is no meaningful understanding as to the interrelationship between OP2050 and this review is not acceptable. This lack of clarity severely curtails the ability of this consultation to be meaningful. Substantial areas of Green Belt have already been allocated for development around Kidlington, Yarnton, Begbroke and north of Oxford. There should be no further development of the Green Belt in this area, or indeed in any part of Oxfordshire. National policy states that Green Belt is a permanent designation and that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. As the Green Belt boundaries have only just been established through the Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review, to change them now would be to ignore the National Policy in respect of the Green Belt. Whilst it was claimed that the percentage area of Green Belt released in the Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review was very small, this approach overlooked the fact that the effect around Kidlington, Yarnton, Begbroke and north of Oxford was considerable and indeed overwhelming for these relatively small communities. The areas of land left as separation between settlements is generally very small and this will lead to the effective coalescence of this large area and its communities. There should be no further release of Green Belt in Cherwell, or indeed in Oxfordshire as a whole.</p>
LPR-B-236	Cherwell Development Watch Alliance	Option 26	<p>There are very substantial proposals for further employment land such as at Salt Cross (Eynsham – 24ha) and Oxford North and Begbroke and Langford Lane and elsewhere. These have the potential for very large numbers of jobs – 4,500 at Oxford North alone. Existing employment areas, despite having been available for development for many years, are still far from fully occupied. An example is Oxford Science Park which already has further plans for significant expansion as part of the 'Grenoble Road' development.</p>

LPR-B-237	Brian Joynes	LPR-A-107	Object. Any development on this site is inappropriate, undesirable and contradicts many Government Policies, and a number of 'Key Objectives'. There is no significant employment or senior education, in the area therefore would be a daily commuters, and return, by car, to nearby, and distant, places of work and education. The infrastructure; water, sewerage, electricity, roads and footpaths, already undersupplied, would need major works. The village is a 'dark village' new residents would be likely demand street lighting. In the case of commercial development, all the above apply, plus, commuting workers, a match between new residents and employment opportunities being unlikely, and commercial traffic
LPR-B-238	Jill and Frank Eden	Milcombe	Object. We understand the need for more homes but the existing residents quality of life must be considered. ,There has been a negative impact on the landscape with the 2nd phase of oak farm estate which is totally out of character and has been amended multiple times. The impact is yet to be seen. Trying to house so many people in a small area is problematic. The mains water and sewerage pipes in the main road are struggling with existing amounts, drains are blocked and the smell sometimes is not nice. The impact on the doctors, and schools are struggling to deal with the existing population, especially with the planned builds in Adderbury and Bloxham which will also have an impact .Any building within the village would have a direct impact. The field by the church is a historic fallow field, which floods every year. The field in paradise lane has no access and only through Oak farm. The field has already been affected by the new houses as it does not drain properly. There is also farm access across the field to the hill fields. <u>Both fields have been used for village events and are used for recreation. There would be an impact to wildlife. There is no need to develop in the villages</u>
LPR-B-238	Jill and Frank Eden	LPR-A-119	Object. We understand the need for more homes but the existing residents quality of life must be considered. ,There has been a negative impact on the landscape with the 2nd phase of oak farm estate which is totally out of character and has been amended multiple times. The impact is yet to be seen. Trying to house so many people in a small area is problematic. The mains water and sewerage pipes in the main road are struggling with existing amounts, drains are blocked and the smell sometimes is not nice. The impact on the doctors, and schools are struggling to deal with the existing population, especially with the planned builds in Adderbury and Bloxham which will also have an impact .Any building within the village would have a direct impact. The field by the church is a historic fallow field, which floods every year. The field in paradise lane has no access and only through Oak farm. The field has already been affected by the new houses as it does not drain properly. There is also farm access across the field to the hill fields. <u>Both fields have been used for village events and are used for recreation. There would be an impact to wildlife. There is no need to develop in the villages</u>
LPR-B-239	Rudi Sellers	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 20152021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPRA-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-239	Rudi Sellers	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 20152021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPRA-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.



LPR-B-239	Rudi Sellers	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-239	Rudi Sellers	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-239	Rudi Sellers	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-240	Dr Stephanie Cloete	Option 25	I moved to Bicester recently, attracted by what I read about its commitment to a Green Town policy. Consequently I would be deeply disappointed if this aspect of life in Bicester were to become less prominent. The presence of green areas within and close to the town gives Bicester a great opportunity to be a leader in the vital work of protecting biodiversity at this crucial time. Bicester can set a valuable example proving that a town can maintain prosperity while also fostering and protecting the natural environment
LPR-B-240	Dr Stephanie Cloete	LPR-A-204	Support the designation of Langford Community Orchard as a local green space. I discovered Langford Community Orchard after I moved to Bicester and it has been a delight, providing opportunities both for quiet reflection in nature and for learning about agricultural methods past and present. It offers excellent opportunities for community participation; there is a great sense of camaraderie amongst the enthusiastic group of volunteers who maintain it to a high standard.
LPR-B-240	Dr Stephanie Cloete	LPR-A-125	Support the designation of Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site as Local Green Space. Gavray Meadows is a rich wildlife site, supporting rare species of butterflies and newts. So many areas like this, with meadows, hedgerows and other features dating back to medieval times, have been lost. It has been one of the joys of moving to Bicester for me to discover that there is still this presence of local history and biodiversity so close to town. Not only is it a precious remnant of England's heritage but an established protective environment for threatened species. To lose it would be a tragedy.

LPR-B-241	Buckinghamshire Council	General	Cherwell is covered under the Oxfordshire authorities' agreement to meet all development needs within Oxfordshire therefore we will not be asked to accommodate any unmet development needs from Cherwell. Buckinghamshire is at a very early stage of plan making on a new local plan and so hasn't undertaken the evidence on need and capacity to know if there will be any request from us to Oxfordshire or other areas during the preparation period of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan to accommodate our unmet development needs. England's Economic Heartland Needs to be part of Duty to Co-operate Discussions as they provide the region's voice on strategic infrastructure and services. They are the sub-national transport body for the region covering more than Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire and can ensure strategic infrastructure is focused on making sure investment in transport, digital and utilities infrastructure is 'joined up'. The Council supports the approach to the Strategic Matter on Homes Needed in the Area on page 6. The Council would appreciate an explanation of why each issue identified in Table 1 is a strategic Duty to Cooperate Matter between Buckinghamshire and Cherwell Councils within Page 11. The Oxfordshire Plan commits Cherwell to meeting development needs within Oxfordshire and not Buckinghamshire. Unless there are specific proposals in Cherwell not already identified in proximity to Buckinghamshire then these may not all be Strategic Matters for the Duty to Cooperate. The Council is not aware of areas where flooding is of a significant concern between Buckinghamshire and Cherwell. The Council is not aware of any crossboundary utility issues to discuss. However, we would like to keep such matters under review as our Local Plan strategies develop further. Flood risk is identified as a strategic matter in Table 1 on page1213. Buckinghamshire has established a county-wide flood risk management group that includes the Environment Agency, Drainage Boards and Water Companies. Such a forum may be useful for Oxfordshire if it does not already exist. Table 3, page 14, despite Table 1 listing all strategic matters affecting Buckinghamshire and Cherwell there is no joint working listed in Table 3. We have suggested in our Local Plan options paper response the need to have joint working between planning and highway authorities on transport impact from growth along the A41 between Bicester and Aylesbury for example. Table 5, page 17, we look forward to meeting with officers at the stages set out in the table, and welcome discussions on any Statement of Common Ground from the Draft Plan stage. It would make such Statements more effective at the plan examination if they are signed by all DTC bodies affected by an issue: e.g. transport on the A41 from Bicester to Aylesbury would be signed by both planning and highway authorities; or flooding would have the Environment Agency signing as well as other local lead flood authorities and the Council.
LPR-B-241	Buckinghamshire Council	Option 2	The council supports objective KO1 to allocate sufficient land in the plan to meet Cherwell's housing and employment needs (p.25). There is a typo on objective KO14 'Secure' and it is considered there is a missed opportunity in KO14/KO26 to consider 'networks' not merely provision and mitigation of Blue and Green Infrastructure. Such networks may well be wider than a single Council area so could be a matter for Duty to Co-operate and involve <u>Local Nature Partnerships</u> .
LPR-B-241	Buckinghamshire Council	Option 3	Bicester is the location where growth proposals could potentially have impacts into Buckinghamshire of increased traffic levels, air quality or pollution depending on the scale, type and location of employment land. Employment land allocations falling within Use Class B8 Storage or Distribution on a large scale could generate significant regular traffic movements and would in principle be better located closer to the M40 motorway junctions. <u>Impacts on a sensitive route like the A41, which does not bypass villages en-route to Aylesbury, should be avoided.</u>
LPR-B-241	Buckinghamshire Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The diagram on p.24 showing the spatial and connectivity elements should include the A41 as this is a key link between Cherwell and Buckinghamshire. With significant growth proposed/committed/under construction at both Bicester and Aylesbury, there needs to be a joined up approach to the growth impacts on the A41 corridor – we would expect Cherwell/Oxfordshire district and county planning authorities to be working with Buckinghamshire Council on developing the approach for this corridor. The A41 Corridor is also home to the Westcott Venture Park which is expanding and developing its space related industrial provision as identified in the Buckinghamshire Local Infrastructure Strategy. The nearby provision of rail access from Oxford to Bicester provides a potentially important link for the business park. The document makes no reference to England's Economic Heartland (EEH) and its adopted Transport Strategy nor the connectivity studies which will develop proposals to improve both east-west and north- south connectivity. EEH should be listed as a further body to be involved in duty to cooperate discussions. In relation to economic growth, the Buckinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership should also be consulted as the LEPs in this area are ultimately contributing toward economic growth strategies for the OxfordMilton Keynes- Cambridge corridor. We have passed the consultation to them for their awareness.
LPR-B-241	Buckinghamshire Council	Option 23	p.80 – There needs to be an assessment of infrastructure capacity particularly road infrastructure before a preferred option for direction of strategic growth is taken. The impact of further traffic on the A41 corridor to Aylesbury should be considered comprehensively. We recommend that a density and capacity evidence study be undertaken to maximise the potential from brownfield sites with links to public transport and the town centre, so <u>reducing any requirement for greenfield land further out from the town centre</u>
LPR-B-241	Buckinghamshire Council	Option 34	p.99 – In Buckinghamshire we have locally designated landscapes as well as landscape character and nationally designated landscapes. We consider it is important to consider the issue of landscape impact from development beyond the Cherwell district boundaries and so take account of Landscape Character Assessments to define the value, key qualities or detracting features regardless of <u>which district/council they fall within.</u>
LPR-B-242	Aleks Skwirzynski	Hanwell	Object. Living in this historic village is very special and I'm concerned that the plans to further develop the area past Dukes Meadow will consume Hanwell and lose forever the historic integrity of our village, my home but also the beauty of the 12th century church and churchyard are at risk, as the <u>natural habitats in and around the village.</u>
LPR-B-243	Heather Jakerman	Hanwell	Strongly object. Development could absorb the beautiful village of Hanwell. We were led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive, but this principle has been eroded and it is now clear that it is contemplated it will be eroded again. Hanwell is a peaceful rural countryside which is being threatened. Development would destroy wildlife, habitats and countryside views. We have many old houses in the conservation area with a castle and it's landscape gardens which have recently had very successful archaeological digs. Having walked around the village and surrounding fields for many years what a sadness to think a lot will disappear. The additional traffic in the village, as it would be used as a cut through, would cause chaos and <u>be an serious problem with the narrow winding roads.</u>

LPR-B-244	Robert Jakeman	Hanwell	Strongly object. Hanwell is a peaceful rural village and a joy to live in, with its 12th century Church, a castle, pub and many old houses in this conservation area. The threat of this housing development to our small village is very alarming which could end village life as we know it. Having enjoyed the rural life with its many walks and fantastic views also the abundance of wild life it would be a very sad loss indeed. We were led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive, but this principle has been eroded.
LPR-B-245	Stuart Yeatman	LPR-A-077	Object. About 20-years ago this land was the subject of a planning application to redevelop farm buildings for residential development (I supported that planning application). The consequent planning permission was implemented. If I recall correctly (please advise if my recollection is incorrect), the planning permission was tied to a legal agreement restricting the development of the remaining land, thus protecting the character and appearance of this part of the Adderbury Conservation Area. My question is, would those same considerations prevail today?
LPR-B-246	Pamela Jones	LPR-A-175	Object. An exponential increase in housing numbers in Wardington will have a negative impact on the existing infrastructure, many of the roads into and through the village are narrow and difficult to negotiate with current levels of traffic. The addition of a large number of new houses will fundamentally change the character of the village and is not in keeping with much of the established village which falls in a conservation area. There are currently no facilities in the village and those in the surrounding area are over subscribed such as GP Surgery, schools and so on. The village already struggles at times with water and electricity supplies and a development of the size proposed would put further strain on these services. A large housing development would invariably put more strain on the A361 and traffic movements in and out of Banbury; the M40 roundabout and access onto and off the A361 and flow of traffic through the main road section of the village. I am not against development and the building of new housing but believe that it needs to be proportional to the area where it is proposed. Otherwise, it is like giving permission for a "new town" to grow on the <u>green fields beyond where a village once stood.</u>
LPR-B-246	Pamela Jones	LPR-A-034	Object. Development will significantly impact on the spread of Banbury to the east of the M40. It will destroy the appearance of the approach to Banbury and would be development of a greenfield site and would have the inevitable consequence of destroying countryside and wildlife habitat. As we are supposed to be more sustainable society, demand for large distribution warehouses will diminish. Banbury does not have a large workforce-in- waiting who would fill the jobs generated by a new development. New businesses or housing would generate more traffic. The M40 roundabout is already badly congested and Hennem Way is one of the most polluted roads in the country. The building of distribution warehouses or offices (in addition to those currently being constructed) would result in extending the area of pollution currently suffered. Less people are going to Banbury due to traffic issues. Banbury is acquiring the reputation of being an unattractive and unpleasant place to live, work or visit. Development would add to that reputation. The Council has a responsibility and duty of care to ensure that developments such as this on greenfield sites and countryside are ruled out of Cherwell's local plan for the future of <u>this town and that it adopts this approach when considering other, similar proposals.</u>
LPR-B-247	Angela Douglas	LPR-A-152	Object. We have are devastated to learn that neighbouring fields may be built upon. We moved to Hanwell because of its historic beauty and wildlife. Further developments may spoil the beautiful landscape and views around the village as increasing the traffic on a small, narrow rural road (causing <u>danger to people and wildlife</u> ). <u>The sense of community will be lost if the plans go ahead</u>
LPR-B-247	Angela Douglas	LPR-A-214	Object. We have are devastated to learn that neighbouring fields may be built upon. We moved to Hanwell because of its historic beauty and wildlife. Further developments may spoil the beautiful landscape and views around the village as increasing the traffic on a small, narrow rural road (causing <u>danger to people and wildlife</u> ). <u>The sense of community will be lost if the plans go ahead</u>
LPR-B-247	Angela Douglas	LPR-A-154	Object. We have are devastated to learn that neighbouring fields may be built upon. We moved to Hanwell because of its historic beauty and wildlife. Further developments may spoil the beautiful landscape and views around the village as increasing the traffic on a small, narrow rural road (causing <u>danger to people and wildlife</u> ). <u>The sense of community will be lost if the plans go ahead.</u>
LPR-B-247	Angela Douglas	LPR-A-047	Object. We have are devastated to learn that neighbouring fields may be built upon. We moved to Hanwell because of its historic beauty and wildlife. Further developments may spoil the beautiful landscape and views around the village as increasing the traffic on a small, narrow rural road (causing <u>danger to people and wildlife</u> ). <u>The sense of community will be lost if the plans go ahead</u>
LPR-B-248	Antony and Louise Harwood	LPR-A-107	Object. Our very small village does not have the infrastructure to support growth on this scale e.g. sewage, public transport, size and quality of roads etc etc. Development cuts directly against Cherwell's own stated policy of protecting rural areas. The site borders an area of outstanding natural beauty, Sibford Gower is a gem that should be preserved. Any development would be at a huge environmental cost, when we all should be striving to reduce the carbon footprint. Cherwell is bound to ensure its local plan contributes to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change, it must surely <u>restrict development to urban areas.</u>
LPR-B-249	Seaton Price	Hanwell	Object. I am appalled and dismayed at the proposal to build more houses on the metropolis that is Hanwell Fields. The intention to increase the Northern boundary of the development to reach within a few hundred yards of Hanwell village is preposterous. Historic and characterful settings like Hanwell retain their character, value and appeal by being villages. How can a village retain its character and feeling when it is the length of a football field from thousands of homogeneous new homes? Hanwell Fields is akin to one giant ocean of bricks and mortar, devoid of history and character. Does Hanwell have to be consumed by this encroaching development and completely swamped before you will abate this policy? I understand the need to provide housing for an expanding population (albeit I am confused as to why you allow Banbury to be so blighted at each plan review). If you have to find new land for development why not look to the East of the town near Junction 11 where there are no villages nearby. There is plenty of land near recent commercial developments that could be surely be developed for housing. The Council should stop allowing Banbury to be developed at the rate that it is currently being developed. I moved here 15 years ago when it was a relatively small and quaint town on the edge of the Cotswolds. Today it is becoming a characterless and congested town with less and less appeal. I very much hope that you will do more to preserve the character, history and value of the beautiful villages that surround it.

LPR-B-250	Sir Stephen Gomersall	Option 10	Ensure that all new buildings, including those built by the private sector, conform to the highest emission and space standards. I support the suggestion that Oxfordshire/ Cherwell should aim higher than what is nationally prescribed. This is because buildings which are attractive to live and work make people happier and more productive, and will have a longer economic life. Good buildings contribute to civic pride.
LPR-B-250	Sir Stephen Gomersall	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	Thank you for a high-quality Consultation Document. New development is necessary for growth. Though Sustainability is highlighted in the document, it could be more strongly stated in the final Plan as a principle for consideration of new development. A key aim for the next two decades will be brownfield redevelopment. This principle already exists within the Oxfordshire plan, but in practice the percentage of new builds achieved relative to target in the urban areas is less than in the rural ones. This should be reversed with a view to carbon reduction and regeneration of town centres. There is evidence everywhere of the "hollowing out" due inter alia to the decline of shop retail, displacement to the periphery of towns etc. Allowing centres to further decline will have negative consequences for local identity, revenue (from tourism etc), health and social cohesion. Centres need to be made attractive again by conserving heritage buildings and a nucleus of retail and recreational facilities in a pedestrian environment while repurposing (or demolishing and rebuilding) disused or declining assets into housing, green space and public facilities such as schools, medical facilities, libraries etc.
LPR-B-250	Sir Stephen Gomersall	Option 2	Strongly agree with key Objectives 10, 15 and 16.
LPR-B-250	Sir Stephen Gomersall	Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris	The area to the West of Banbury stretching to the Warwickshire border has a long and continuing agricultural heritage, a fine landscape, and contains many villages of historical interest. This is a huge asset for tourism, recreation, agricultural production and health. The Plan should aim to conserve the unique character of this area, and should establish that growth in these communities will be permitted only for their organic expansion (new housing developments for people from outside the immediate area should not be permitted). It may be desirable for example to allow updating, insulation etc of existing buildings including listed ones, conversion of old buildings for housing or workshops providing local employment, to renovate schools, enlarge health facilities etc. There can be a case, subject to location and design, for facilities to generate renewable energy, providing that they do not adversely affect the landscape. Planning should no longer consider significant new housing developments on the fringes of small rural villages. With net zero by 2050 established as a major goal of the Oxfordshire and Cherwell plans, it does not make sense to construct greenfield developments on sites with poor transport, forcing more people to commute and bringing more cars into quiet lanes. These villages generally lack heating, power and drainage infrastructure. Taking away agricultural land threatens diversity, leisure, and a valued way of life. New developments should be concentrated in sites in and around the towns where amenities, transport and infrastructure are already in place.
LPR-B-250	Sir Stephen Gomersall	LPR-A-107	Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris do not constitute a "larger and more sustainable village" for the purpose of new housing. One new medium size development has already been approved recently with no improvement to an already basic infrastructure in the two small settlements. A large scale development would: be in contravention of existing and proposed planning policy; be unsustainable due to the carbon impact of fresh building in an area with no pre-existing infrastructure and very little public transport be totally out of scale and destroy the character of Sibford Gower; destroy a fine landscape which is an extension of the Cotswold AONB locating development in sustainable locations; harm wildlife and cause the loss of dark skies; and, be impractical and dangerous due to lack of safe road and pedestrian access. The site should not be developed for housing.
LPR-B-250	Spencer Cliff	LPR-A-175	Object. It would mean a fundamental change to the village, nearly doubling the population in a conservation area. There is insufficient services to support this level of change, the village has no school, shops etc. There would need to be a major overhaul of basic services, sewerage, water, electricity, which would cause major disruption to the village. It would increase in traffic on Mount Pleasant causing increased CO2 emissions. Plus the A361 already has increased traffic not helped by the HS2 construction which would only cause further delays and pollution. As a community we feel that the village needs to remain as is.
LPR-B-252	Henry Brougham	Question - Green Belt	Given the extent of the areas removed from the Greenbelt in the partial review, no further changes to the Greenbelt boundaries around Kidlington and the neighbouring villages should be considered in the period to 2040. Given the scale of economic development occurring or proposed in Kidlington and at Begbroke there is no need for a limited review of the Greenbelt for employment land
LPR-B-252	Henry Brougham	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries?
LPR-B-252	Henry Brougham	Question - Local Green Spaces	I support the designation of the sites put forward by Kidlington Parish Council and Kidlington Development Watch as LGS. In particular, the sites on the NE boundaries of the Village help preserve historic landscapes and preserve the setting of Grade 1 Listed St Mary's Church
LPR-B-252	Henry Brougham	Question - Transport & Connectivity	It is unfortunate that the proposals to close Sandy Lane LC make public transport links between Kidlington and the growth areas of Begbroke and Yarnton challenging. Replacement bridges at Sandy Lane and Yarnton Lane should allow unrestricted cycling and facilitate the passage of cargo bikes
LPR-B-252	Henry Brougham	Option 27	Investigate expanding the village centre to incorporate Exeter Close.
LPR-B-252	Henry Brougham	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Improve pedestrian and cycle links across and along the Banbury Road.
LPR-B-252	Henry Brougham	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington.
LPR-B-253	Laszlo Fikner	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Is it possible to build a pedestrian route between Banbury and Overthorpe as the road is very dangerous to walk? When you arrive from Banbury, before the road turn left your speed used to be shown. I speed camera should be put in its place. 80% of the drivers don't care about the speed limit which is very annoying, noisy and dangerous. Sometimes when I try to park to my driveway they come after me very fast and make my mind crazy.

LPR-B-254	Anne Skowronska	LPR-A-107	Object. The scale of development would swamp the village and be completely out of proportion to the existing community. The proposals are inconsistent with existing and proposed planning policy. This development would destroy the character of the village and surrounding countryside. Cherwell is legally bound to make sure the local plan contributes to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change. How can building on such a large scale in a small village like Sibford with few employment opportunities and poor public transport services be a good green option which is not in line with Key Objective 15. New residents would have no option but to use private cars to commute for work so going directly against Key Objective 16 of the existing plan. Surely a more suitable site for new homes would be on brownfield sites on the outskirts of bigger communities such as Banbury where there are already good public transport links and the infrastructure already exists. I hope Cherwell District Council will resist this attempt by the land-owner to make money at the expense of the countryside and our unique historic village taking no effect of the importance of a carbon negative future.
LPR-B-255	Lisa Cliff	LPR-A-175	Object. This is a conservation village and it would fundamentally change the character and closeness of it. We do not have the infrastructure to support with no shop, school and lack of services (sewage etc.). Traffic passing through the centre of the village would increase pollution and the level of traffic would negatively impact the A361. We need designated land for a future bypass traffic. At the moment HS2 lorries are a regular occurrence and this is set to continue for the next few years, extra building works is not what is needed for the environment and our village.
LPR-B-256	Antoni Skwirzynski	Hanwell	Strongly object. Previous assurances regarding no development outside of the Dukes Meadow Drive are being ignored. Land between Hanwell and Banbury seems to be available for development. The level of new building close to Hanwell has been at unprecedented levels over the past few years. The very essence of Hanwell being a village is being eroded away as new developments creep ever closer. Such development is destroying an intrinsic part of our rural life by turning Hanwell village into a suburb of Banbury rather than a rural Conservation area, supporting all manner of wildlife. Furthermore, where is the appropriate infrastructure to support such an extended development? The levels of traffic through Hanwell village are already at higher levels than before due to the recent expanding developments on the edges of Banbury. Where are the extra schools? The extra doctor's surgeries etc to support these extra dwellings??We have a beautiful and ancient village here with tremendous history by virtue of having a 12th Century church in our midst. It is at risk of being subsumed by a modern development which will be completely forgettable in the future. We owe this to future generations to be able to enjoy the tremendous history in its rightful setting that is here today.
LPR-B-257	Mrs C Martin	Bloxham	Strongly object. I have strong concerns over the planned developments. The small village is already congested and the increase in traffic congestion and pollution will have a negative impact on the village. The increase in road use through the village is a huge concern. The increase in village population would put the village services under lots of pressure which is a particular concern for key services which are at capacity. There are two district wildlife sites located in the village of Bloxham including The Slade Nature Reserve which has obtained status under the National Parks Act 1948. The Slade is used as a vital educational resource which must not be jeopardised by planned housing developments. Bloxham includes a Conservation Area with buildings which have considerable heritage sensitivity - this historical part of the village will be negatively threatened by the increase in housing developments planned for Bloxham. The increased risk of flooding would be escalated by the planning developments putting existing houses and properties in danger which is unacceptable. Extending the Bloxham boundary by further building of housing developments is detrimental to the current families living and working in Bloxham.
LPR-B-258	Lienza Phipps	Adderbury	Object to the suggested size of housing development proposed. It would see a huge increase in the current size of the village and soon there will be no boundary between Adderbury and Bodicote. The roads are frequently gridlocked and at capacity.
LPR-B-259	Neil Forbes	LPR-A-175	Object. A substantial increase in housing numbers in Wardington would have a negative impact on the existing infrastructure- many of the roads into and through the village are narrow and already difficult to negotiate with current levels of traffic. The addition of a large number of new houses would fundamentally change the character of the village and is not in keeping with much of the established village which is a conservation area. There are currently no facilities in the village and those in the surrounding area are over subscribed- GP Surgery, schools, etc. The village already struggles at times to maintain adequate levels of water and electricity supply, and a development of the size proposed would put further strain on this infrastructure. A large housing development would put more strain on traffic in and out of Banbury, especially the M40 roundabout and access onto and off the A361. I am not against development and the building of new housing per se but believe that it needs to be proportional to the area where it is being proposed.
LPR-B-259	Neil Forbes	LPR-A-034	Object. Development will significantly impact on the spread of Banbury to the east of the M40. It will further destroy the appearance of the approach to Banbury and would be development of a greenfield site. It is bizarre that during the COP26 I am writing to object to a plan which would have the inevitable consequence of destroying countryside and wildlife habitat. The outcome of the development could have a detrimental impact upon the environment. As we are supposed to be moving towards a less consumerbased, disposable society we can only hope that the need for land for large distribution warehouses will diminish. Banbury does not have a large workforce in- waiting to fill the jobs generated. New businesses would generate more traffic. The M40 roundabout is already badly congested and Hennef Way is one of the most polluted roads in the country. The building of distribution warehouses or offices (in addition to those currently being constructed at the bottom of the A361) would surely result in extending the area of pollution currently suffered on Hennef Way. I believe that the Council has a responsibility and duty of care to ensure that developments such as this on greenfield sites and countryside are ruled out of Cherwell's local plan for the future of Banbury, and that it adopts this approach when considering other, similar proposals.

LPR-B-260	Simon Gear	Hanwell	Object. When I moved here I spoke to a member of Cherwell planning team as I wanted to check there were no plans for development like this to happen. I was told categorically that Banbury would always be separate to Hanwell village. This planning proposal clearly goes against this promise and shows clear encroachment on the village. Hanwell village has a clear and distinct history, including the castle and historic church. To preserve this must be a priority, and being engulfed by Banbury will further erode this unique history. Hanwell is already a traffic cut through, leading to traffic issues given the narrow nature of the road through the village. To add even more housing, and the inevitable increase in cars and deliveries, to the village surroundings will cause chaos in the village, along with the risk of harm to the residents of the village. This side of Banbury has already had vast housing development and to continue this towards Hanwell village, would be a huge mistake. I hope that you will see the need to maintain villages in the area as separate dwellings to preserve the landscape, vital ecological habitats and history that this brings.
LPR-B-261	Joanna Wilford	LPR-A-214	Strongly object. Hanwell Village is a historic village which has previously been designated an Area of High Landscape Value and a large part of the village falls within a Conservation Area. There are two Grade I listed buildings and several Grade II listed buildings. Development will increase traffic in the village which is a single narrow road with several pinch points. Congestion is already a problem between the B4100 and the A423. The village is surrounded by good quality arable land which should not be used for housing to support the encouragement of plant based diets. Brownfield sites such as Bankside and Canalside are more suitable for housing. Town Centre development would work well alongside the new development of Castle Quay, giving life to the town centre itself. Development of these proposed sites would go against views you know to be held by the local community.
LPR-B-261	Joanna Wilford	LPR-A-152	Strongly object. Hanwell Village is a historic village which has previously been designated an Area of High Landscape Value and a large part of the village falls within a Conservation Area. There are two Grade I listed buildings and several Grade II listed buildings. The development of LPR A152 would leave just metres between the edge of the conservation area down Gullicote Lane and would not be shielded from the sight of the village by any significant natural border, such as currently exists within Hanwell Chase. Development will increase traffic in the village which is a single narrow road with several pinch points. Congestion is already a problem between the B4100 and the A423. The village is surrounded by good quality arable land which should not be used for housing to support the encouragement of plant based diets. Brownfield sites such as Bankside and Canalside are more suitable for housing. Town Centre development would work well alongside the new development of Castle Quay, giving life to the town centre itself. Development of these proposed sites would go against views you know to be held by the local community.
LPR-B-262	Dr Hazel and Prof David Jones	LPR-A-113	Object. If the fields were developed, it would link Chesterton with Kingsmere and developments north of the Middleton Stoney Road and negate the buffer between the village and Bicester. The fields should remain as pasture or be designated as recreational space. The suggestions that the hamlet could be surrounded by new development with no buffer are currently seriously affecting their wellbeing. This flooding is aggravated by an increase in storm water from the field labelled LPR-A-118 in the Chesterton Parish Profile. Because of a blocked drain, the drainage ditch on the east side of the lane overflows more frequently, flooding the lane and our land on the opposite side of the lane. Wendlebury has also experienced an increase in storm water from Chesterton because an existing ditch being used take surface water away from Alchester Park. The flow is along the boundary of LPR-A-118 and LPR-A-046, then on the LPR-A-225 land margin to LPR-A-046, following the curve and on through LPR-A-046 to pass under the lane from Little Chesterton into LPR-A-173 before flowing under the A41 and into Wendlebury. There should be no further building contemplated upstream of Wendlebury until the effects of the Great Lakes and Bicester Sports Association have been functional for at least ten years.
LPR-B-262	Dr Hazel and Prof David Jones	LPR-A-106	The Bicester Sports Association development will have a severe effect on the wildlife we have been recording since 2012, particularly the mammals and birds using camera traps. Six of the species recorded regularly have statutory protection: badgers, barn owls, muntjac, otters, polecates and roe deer. Additionally, we have recorded Stoats, Foxes, Grass Snakes, Frogs and the usual small mammals of grass and woodland. During surveys, other people have caught newts in the pond. The elimination of the foraging areas of these mammals and the covering over of the streams below the hamlet will lead to their local disappearance and unacceptable reduction in biodiversity. Any buildings between Little Chesterton and the A41 would cut off otters from the upper reaches of the stream that flows through our land and that to the west of the M40. That includes the Siemens buildings and carparks. There are a couple of badger setts used intermittently. The stream that flows through our land in Little Chesterton is the only storm water drain from both the Great Lakes site and the Bicester Sports Association. The proposed mitigation for these two sites is grossly inadequate because of climate change. After it leaves our land, this stream regularly floods the lane of Little Chesterton. A little further south, it joins another stream which starts near Simms Farm and flows under the M40 to pass through Wendlebury. The lower reaches of this stream (on the Little Chesterton side of the M40) and the lowest regions of the stream that flows through Little Chesterton are within the planned Siemens development. Thus, some major works would be needed to prevent increased surface water runoff to Wendlebury.
LPR-B-263	Chris Wild	Hanwell	Object. Local Authority informed that there would be no housing development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Hanwell has been an established village with its own cultural identity for more than 800 years and the planned development would impact this. There has been a significant traffic increase using Hanwell as a cut through since recent developments and the proposed development could significantly increase this causing congestion as the roads through Hanwell are narrow in places.
LPR-B-264	Simon Collins	Wardington	Object. Development would double the size of the village. Appears to be in direct contravention to the concept of a conservation area. Wardington lacks on street parking and has narrow roads with minimal borders and pavements. The village is served by an infrequent bus service and an over subscribed local doctors surgery. The A361 is congested and hazardous with an urgent need for a bypass through lower Wardington via this site. There are often power cuts and water leakage and pressure problems. The local services cannot cope with current demand and could not easily be upgraded to cope with a doubling of houses. Wardington cannot cope with the increase in people and traffic a large development would bring. Development would ruin the character and concept of the village.

LPR-B-265	Elaine Strachan-Hall	Hanwell	Strong object. The traffic through Hanwell village has increased and have been concerned about the destruction to wildlife and the overall impact on the surrounding countryside. Further development north of Dukes Meadow Drive is contrary to previous commitments. Any plans to develop would affect a beautiful area of downland and its wildlife, trees and scrub land including enveloping the wildlife area of Hanwell Fields. Any further development north of Dukes Meadow Drive threatens to encroach onto Hanwell village borders and change the nature of Hanwell; adversely affect this conservation area; reduce property value in the village; and, impact on the wellbeing of Hanwell residents
LPR-B-266	J I Hopkyns	LPR-A-266	Object. This village is adjacent to an area of outstanding natural beauty. There is no street lighting, the lane is narrow and without pavements. The village could double in size and destroy this lovely and quiet village. There are many brownfield sites within a 10 mile radius the developers should be encouraged to build on. The existing Cherwell Local Plan has a policy of 'limiting growth in our rural areas and directing it towards larger and more sustainable villages'
LPR-B-267	Lesley Collins	Wardington	Object. It will almost double the size of the village and hugely strain the minimal local services available. We have one over stretched local surgery and sometimes full local bus service. Where is the infrastructure to support this plan. Continual power cuts and water pressure problems that development could make worse. The roads accessing upper Wardington are single track and full of potholes already insufficient to support existing traffic. Its not okay destrou rural parts of Oxfordshire for new development. House building and over population has a distinct impact on the environment. The A361 will be further congested and ther is minimal oppff street parking in the village
LPR-B-268	Kenton Bromby	Hanwell	Object. Hanwell is a historic rural village with a strong community that Cherwell District Council has promised to protect on numerous occasions but is not honouring its commitments. Hanwell should be seperate from Banbury and latest proposal will eliminate the greenspace. The new developments north of Dukes Meadow Drive have already had a significant impact. New developments have destroyed what was farmland and meant that traffic through the village is at an all-time high. The traffic infrastructure is not capable of sustaining increases in traffic. Further increases to the traffic volume will surely lead to serious accidents and destroys the village character, increasing noise levels beyond those experienced. Our community benefits from reduced ambient light and future development would increase this. Coalescence with Banbury will force those who wish to live in a rural village to move. Cherwell committed to Dukes Meadow Drive being the urban limit on the north side of Banbury. That urban limit was carefully set by the Council's adopted 1996 Local Plan, and the Hanwell Fields Development Brief and Design Brief in 1997 as a "defensible boundary". Developing the new site would not honour the commitments when Hanwell was designated as a conservation area. The porposal is in direct conflict with Cherwell's Core Strategy. Cherwell has not only a commitment but also a moral responsibility to plant trees, preserve/improve the environment. There has been no evidence that Cherwell has pushed the development of brownfield land. Cherwell should better protect the environment and refuse developments in the countryside. The newly proposed sites north of Dukes Meadow Drive will be a step too far in the erosion of Hanwell, permanently and irreversibly destroying Hanwell's identity, semi-rural setting, character and community.
LPR-B-269	Jayne Allen	Sibford Gower	Object. The proposed sites for housing on Pound Lane are unsuitable for the following reasons: quantity of housing is disproportionate to the size of the village and could double the population; access road is unsuitable; site is prone to flooding; area is not sustainable and would create a disproportionate amount of commuter traffic damaging the environment and wildlife; currently a 'dark sky' village and this precious resource would be destroyed; and, attractive countryside would be lost. Three tree line as part of the previous development was meant to be the new boundary.
LPR-B-270	Greenway Group of North Oxford Golfers	Question - Green Belt	There must be no further land taken out of the Green Belt, and there needs to be concerted action to challenge the longstanding expansionist policy of Oxford City.
LPR-B-270	Greenway Group of North Oxford Golfers	General	There is a very high level of housing commitment around Oxfordshire, much of which has been on Green Belt. Planning and housing policy needs fundamentally to change to address the Climate Emergency and provide more green 'infrastructure' to the public health crisis. References to the Ox Cam Arc worsens concerns. As there was little consultation on this. Cherwell should be planning for only gentle and natural change, economic and housing growth and even then, planning contingently, particularly given the large housing and employment commitments (many not yet taken up) in the recent Local Plans. The housing requirement for Cherwell should be kept to the absolute minimum of real need (which would be below the unadjusted standard method; it is possible to demonstrate that under the NPPF), and all the policies and proposals in your 2040 Plan as it emerges, should reflect that. There are many more permissions and allocations available in Cherwell than needed for likely building rates. As a result of new Secretary of State recent announcements, there might be a redirection of growth to the North of England, and the current reduction of building rates. The Partial review did not adopt a contingent approach.
LPR-B-270	Greenway Group of North Oxford Golfers	Option 13	Support the principle of natural capital measurement, and note that it might have led to the omission of our golf course from the Partial Review.
LPR-B-270	Greenway Group of North Oxford Golfers	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Support the 20 (or better, 15) minute neighbourhood concept. The way to get there is by not accepting Oxford overspill, but pushing for building housing in the City. The City needs to release many of its underused or reserved employment sites for housing; this would achieve much better balance. This would help creduce commuting and emissions.
LPR-B-270	Greenway Group of North Oxford Golfers	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	In climate (and health) terms, rather than talk about 'connectivity' (which favours 'business as usual'), instead look at 'accessibility' which is a much greener approach.

LPR-B-270	Greenway Group of North Oxford Golfers	Question - Green Belt	Support the principle of green infrastructure; though we note it gets summary treatment in the consultation, and regret the loss of the golf course in this context. The Partial Review put all the Cherwell housing allocation in the Green Belt and will reduce separation to tiny bits of land. This also applies to the 6a and 6b (golf course) allocations which similarly reduces the separation of Oxford. Very worrying that you seem even to contemplate further employment or housing allocations in this entirely Green Belt area. The Plan should make no proposals for further housing or employment on greenfield sites over this whole area; not just because in practice the ravages of the Partial Review development will continue to be developed throughout the 2040 plan period, but critically that the very concept of the Green Belt is about permanence. Should develop only green infrastructure and recreation and open space uses in this area. That the Partial Review allocations 'will provide improved access to the countryside, new opportunities for nature conservation and enhancement, and improved provision for outdoor sport and recreation', the comment is risible.
LPR-B-270	Greenway Group of North Oxford Golfers	LPR-A-111	We see no mention of the reprovision of the golf course. Exeter College is still seeking 'mixed uses' on Frieze Farm (site 111) – and have concerns about that, in the light of these Specific, and General comments above. We hope that you will resist anything but golf and related facilities on that site.
LPR-B-271	Mr and Mrs Jackson	LPR-A-175	Object. Not sustainable because of lack of facilities and services ie no school, no shop and low water pressure. The roads are not adequate for more traffic and will increase the traffic along the A361 with all the new developments proposed on the M40 roundabout
LPR-B-272	JP Loof	Hanwell	Object. All those appeals are being lost by the growth of Banbury taking over the village. Developments threatens the fabric, nature, and the hard work Cherwell Council has done to protect the village as a conservation area.
LPR-B-273	Zoe Wesson	LPR-A-107	Object. Can you please confirm that the village will be given the opportunity to have its say about this proposal? Development could double the size of the village. The roads around the village are dangerous, full of potholes, difficult to navigate and at capacity. There are practically no buses. All the roads from the village to Banbury (B4035) are challenging and are dangerous. Pound Lane is very narrow. This proposal will ruin the beautiful village of Sibford Gower which is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and unique for its lack of street lighting. If houses are built with all the hard surfaces this will increase surface water levels. This development is at the highest point of the village and will change the landscape. There is no infrastructure in a rmeote village the number of houses proposed.
LPR-B-274	Jake Oliveira	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. Additional housing to a village with such limited services, supplies, amenities would have a significant detrimental impact to the village: A361 is congested and prone to accidents; no doctors surgery; no shop; limited bus service to Banbury; power issues; low water pressure; no school; countryside erosion and wildlife disruption; and, closure of ancient footpaths. The village is almost entirely a conservation area and must be protected. If the village expands it risks losing its identity. There are much better propositions for housing in the district with good services, like Bicester and/or Upper Heyford which are set up to receive more homes and provide all the amenities these require
LPR-B-275	Robert brown	LPR-A-175	Object. The size of Wardington could potentially double in size. Wardington has grown moderately in line with predominately specific local needs. It would be completely out of character to allow a large scale development harming the historic structure of the village. I am sure there are planning policies specifically designed to protect rural villages and I urge the council to use these policies to reject the above application.
LPR-B-276	Michael R Lovatt	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. Development would be out of proportion to the existing village. The roads in and around the village are barely adequate for the current traffic levels. The school does not have the capacity for a large influx of additional pupils. The doctors surgery would not be able to support a large influx of new residents. Any new development of such a size would have to comply with modern regulations and have street lighting whilst Sibford Gower is a "dark village". I am not sure that the electricity and water supply to the village could support a large increase in demand. The development would change the present character of the village.
LPR-B-277	Jeanette Brown	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. Wardington is historically a small histoical rural village with very little development. Even small infill plots have been turned down through planning policy. It would seem ludicrous ar large development could now be approved through change of use. I would expect the council to help in protecting the integrity of our village and use its powers and relevant planning policy to refuse this application.
LPR-B-278	Mr N Court	Sibford Gower	Strongly object. Development would double the size of the village and destroy the beauty and nature of the village. Pound Lane is a narrow road and has limited access for cyclists and pedestrians. There are little amenities in the village. Sibford Gower is a Dark Sky Village; Villagers voted to retain this natural aspect. Has Cherwell considered the significant damage to ancient hedgerows, mature trees, the water table and loss of agricultural land. This site is the highest in the village and is next to an area of outstanding natural beauty. There is a brownfield site that can be used.
LPR-B-279	Alexandra Oliveira	LPR-A-175	Object. Wardington is not the location for a large amount of new housing. There are no essential services in the village ie. doctors, shops, schools, post office. Residents currently have to travel to Cropredy for such services which are already limited and close to capacity. There is a limited bus service. We regularly experience power outages, low water pressure and bad phone signal. A lot of the roads are narrow and would worry how they would cope with extra traffic. The special qualities of this village need to be protected and preserved with the majority of the village a conservation area. A large new housing development would disrupt the tight knit community and deteriorate the special character of the village



LPR-B-280	Carl Watts	LPR-A-175	<p>Object. Development will completely destroy the character and the original “concept” of the village. The impact of adding these houses to Banbury or Middleton Cheney are negligible. I seriously doubt whether the numbers have been correctly assessed.</p> <p>Building close to a large population centre will have a 5 to 10 fold less impact on the environment than building near a village consider transport of people waste, deliveries, water, power distribution, sewerage etc. All will have disproportionate environmental cost compared when building close to a population centre. The removal of hedgerows containing habitats will have a devastating impact. I was advised that weight of numbers of respondents is a consideration in your assessment of this “scheme”. This must be patently incorrect, surely due to its size the village cannot get a decent number to make an argument. The argument should therefore not be down to the feelings of Wardington people. This plan is not aligned with traditional planning ethos.</p>
LPR-B-281	Debby Andrews	Option 30	<p>The two proposal statements are ambiguous. “Required to meet local needs” and “to meet the wider district needs” – these statements are open to interpretation. A third option should be offered:</p> <p><b>Development in rural areas must be in keeping with the size and character of the existing community</b></p>
LPR-B-281	Debby Andrews	Option 31	<p>Use a combination of the above. The Local Plan review was not well publicised and only a very short timescale has been given for response.</p> <p><b>Consultation needs to be open, honest and all views need to be listened to</b></p>
LPR-B-281	Debby Andrews	Option 32	<p>Give additional weight to the availability of certain services and facilities and give additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling are important. Public transport to villages has been cut considerably and does not seem to be economically viable. Development should take place where public transport is already available. North Newington has no such transport available.</p> <p>Transport via foot and cycle needs to be safe. North Newington has narrow roads and lacks footpaths. There is not even a footpath from the village to the nursery. A local school should be available, <b>one children can walk to is preferable. North Newington school is already over-subscribed.</b></p>
LPR-B-281	Debby Andrews	North Newington	<p>Possible development sites are not in keeping with the size and character of the existing community. If all the proposed sites were used, North Newington would double in size and the character of the village would be completely lost. Building in North Newington would go against these NPPF. Traffic would increase exponentially and add to already congested access road through the village. Cars have to be parked on the road as many houses do not have driveways and this leads to traffic congestion at busy times. Roads are narrow in places and this problem is already exacerbated by the parking of cars. Infrastructure in the village is limited. Public transport is minimal, the play area is very small and appropriate for only younger children and the playing field has minimal equipment. The village school is already over-subscribed and the roads surrounding the school are extremely busy at times. The Nursery is only safely accessible by car. Broadband connectivity is often poor due and mobile phone reception is terrible. There is no village shop or village hall. Much of the land next to the housing in North Newington is defined as being within the conservation area. This protects the character of the village contributing to well being. Taking agricultural land to build houses is not adhering to this environmental objective. Animal and wildlife habitats would be destroyed.</p>
LPR-B-281	Debby Andrews	LPR-A-004	<p>Object. The site is not suitable due to the increased traffic on Main Street. Existing properties would be overlooked as the proposed building plots would be built on higher ground. Flooding of existing properties could be an issue during heavy rainfall. Privacy would be lost and houses devalued.</p> <p><b>Well-being would be affected.</b></p>
LPR-B-282	Juliet Dessain	Hanwell	<p>Object. Hanwell is a small attractive Ironstone village in a conservation area with a 12th century church, a castle, some listed houses and lots of charm and character. The main road through the village is very narrow in places. During busy times of day, the village is used as cut through route.</p> <p><b>Development would ruin Hanwell’s identity as a village, add to the volume of traffic passing through the village on unsuitable roads</b></p>
LPR-B-283	Olivia Wilson	LPR-A-077	<p>Object. Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District’s housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. These proposals contradict Cherwell Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Indeed, Sufficient land has already been allocated in the district to meet predicted demand for the next 13 years. Development on these sites contradicts Policy ESD1. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. The local infrastructure, particularly the roads are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development of this land would be contrary to NPPG - Rural housing para 78. In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. The current supply of housing more than adequately provides for the housing demand, therefore no further need for housing. Continued development of land would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury’s natural heritage. lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development would be contrary to Policy ESD10. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. This area should remain free of substantial new build structures. Any new development would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell Conservation Target Area and according with Policy ESD11, development should not be permitted. Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in traffic. Increased traffic congestion substantially increased vehicle emissions and degraded ambient air quality. Further residential development in Adderbury does not support this objective. The Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury. Cherwell have confirmed that their “existing 2015 Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031.”Based on current build rates and planning consent together with existing available sites, Cherwell has over 13 years of underutilised supply to meet future demand. Any development would be contrary to Policy AD5. Proposals to increase residential development in Adderbury will place unnecessary and restrictive burdens upon the health, mental wellbeing and accessibility of the village. There is a lack of affordability of new developments in Adderbury. The fact that affordable housing is currently only sought on ‘qualifying’ sites, demonstrates the applicant’s non-compliance with this objective.</p>

LPR-B-284	Sue Lovatt	Sibford Gower	Object. Far too many new homes in a small village, this amounts to as many if not more houses than are currently in Sibford Gower. Such development would damage Oxfordshire's valuable countryside. The proposed development is at the highest point in the village and would be very damaging aesthetically. The current village roads are appalling and dangerous. There isn't any employment in Sibford Gower and new development would lead to commuting. The village is currently without street lighting but a new development of this size would incur street lighting and this would spoil the village with light pollution. The school does not have capacity for additional children that would require schooling. This is a huge consideration when considering this large development at Sibford Gower. There is already inadequate water supply, foul and surface water drainage, adding more would be a further burden leading to inefficiency of services. Such a vast development would cause loss of agricultural land, damage ancient hedgerows, mature trees and the water table
LPR-B-285	Williams Family	Hanwell	Object. Hanwell village has a unique environment. Closer development will have a negative impact for people, wildlife and ultimately the planet which is understood particularly in the light of COP26. We were led by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Think about: tree planting instead of development; traffic chaos; destruction of wildlife; Hanwell's 12th century church; and, Conservation Area Focus on Banbury's economy - the number of vacant commercial properties is a disgrace.
LPR-B-286	Ben Eden	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. Adding housing to a village with such limited services, supplies, amenities would have a significant detrimental impact to the existing village for a number of reasons: adding traffic to an already congested and accident heavy area of the A361; no doctors surgery; no shop or convenience store in the village; limited bus service to Banbury; power cuts; low water pressure; no school; countryside erosion and wildlife disruption; and, the closure of ancient footpaths in the area and area of historical importance. The village is almost entirely a conservation area and must be protected. If the village expands it risks losing its identity. There are much better propositions for housing in the district with good services, like Bicester and/or Upper Heyford which are set up to receive more homes and provide all the amenities these require
LPR-B-287	Andrea Keeping and Daniel Hill	Option 19	Banbury has seen so much development in the past few years, scores of farmland lost to housing, and no consideration for amenities and infrastructure. We do not think it is fair to try to play areas off of each other as you are doing by asking us to choose between greenfield sites. Banbury has already contributed enough. Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-287	Andrea Keeping and Daniel Hill	LPR-A-185	Object. This proposal is suggesting bulldozing a HGV route through the very heart of Nethercote and its fields, and surrounding homes with industrial units. The number of homes affected by this proposal is obscured on their documentation. There are ~15 homes in Nethercote and the proposals seek to split and isolate these homes. Development would destroy the Green Buffer 3: Nethercote. The plans are not coincident with the neighbouring local gap policy. The fields in the proposal all receive constant use for agriculture. The developers are trying to circumvent policies to protect agricultural land and soil, in particular, The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The complete lack of concern for local wildlife and their habitat. We have an array of local species, including deer, pheasants, bats, owls, weasels, badgers, woodpeckers and other birds. The plan not only removes over 96 acres of trees, hedgerows and pastures, it almost encircles/cuts off an area listed on the "Primary Habitat Inventory – Deciduous Woodland (England)", and "National Forest Inventory (GB)" lists. There are a number of streams and flowing ditches throughout Nethercote that handle the water from the hills. Many of the fields included in the proposal flood or become boggy in the winter. If these fields are built upon, would most likely flood the homes in Nethercote. The homes in Nethercote do not have access to the national sewage system. The current lane is single track in many places and there are drainage ditches. The roads are not accurately shown on the proposals. The proposals implies that the new roads will either be the same width as the current lane (not wide enough for HGVs), or that the current lane will be widened to match the new roads (and thus the destruction of the water courses and nature). Part of the lane is missing from the proposal maps. This makes the proposal deceiving. The straight roads proposed will encourage racer drivers to speed through. Proposal does not create further employment land, due to a lack of highways for staff to reach these commercial units and no inclusion of non-driving access for staff. Proposal will not relieve traffic at the M40 junction and the current bridge on Overthorpe Road over the motorway is not built to be able to take heavy traffic. Providing a new link road from the A422 into the existing employment areas would only help workers from towns in Northamptonshire. Seeks to destroy many public right of ways and a popular recreational area. Building commercial units in Nethercote will invariably encourage low level crime and antisocial behaviour. Nethercote residents have to suffer the monotonous sound of the motorway and the associated traffic fumes. Having HGVs and high traffic volumes right outside our homes will significantly worsen our quality of life. Banbury causes a lot of light pollution and more commercial units are going to make this even worse.
LPR-B-287	Andrea Keeping and Daniel Hill	LPR-A-198	Object. Since 1990, the building of the M40 has isolated Nethercote from Grimsbury and its amenities. The Bowling Green Pub is our last amenity within walking distance. Development would destroy the Green Buffer 3: Nethercote. The plans are not coincident with the neighbouring local gap policy. The complete lack of concern for local wildlife and their habitat. We have an array of local species, including deer, pheasants, bats, owls, weasels, badgers, woodpeckers and other birds. The plan not only removes over 96 acres of trees, hedgerows and pastures, it almost encircles/cuts off an area listed on the "Primary Habitat Inventory – Deciduous Woodland (England)", and "National Forest Inventory (GB)" lists. Proposal does not create further employment land, due to a lack of highways for staff to reach these commercial units and no inclusion of non-driving access for staff. The current bridge on Overthorpe Road over the motorway is not built to be able to take heavy traffic. Building commercial units in Nethercote will invariably encourage low level crime and antisocial behaviour. Nethercote residents have to suffer the monotonous sound of the motorway and the associated traffic fumes. Having HGVs and high traffic volumes right outside our homes will significantly worsen our quality of life. Banbury causes a lot of light pollution and more commercial units are going to make this even worse

LPR-B-288	Rosie Kite	LPR-A-091	Object. The high street is the main access road to Wards Crescent and struggles with existing levels of traffic. Due to the amount of cars parked , the road is not wide enough for two cars and would struggle with the volume of traffic for new houses. This would have a detrimental impact on the wider village. The field is locked by existing houses which presents no natural access point without making large changes to the current roads or fields in the area. Bodicote and the surrounding area has undergone significant development in recent years via Longford park and the developments near the cricket field. While Bodicote is a desirable place to live there is a limit to how much development should go in within one area. These fields are away from the main roads and are considered by many locally as an area that should be preserved for wildlife. The area is undeveloped and would cause disruption to many of the existing villagers.
LPR-B-289	Elsbeth and David Mackenzie	LPR-A-185	Strongly object. Development would impact upon the local wildlife and ruin what has always been a rural area. There has been significant development to the north of the Saltway and in Bodicote recently which sees loss in countryside . More housing in the areas proposed will only make things worse and we will see wildlife struggling to survive in an ever dwindling habitat. This development would be replacing existing land used for agriculture when we should be preserving green spaces and enhancing our 'natural capital' assets. The Saltway is a natural cut off from development and land to the south of the Saltway to Wykham Lane should be excluded from further developments
LPR-B-289	Elsbeth and David Mackenzie	LPR-A-116	Strongly object. Development would impact upon the local wildlife and ruin what has always been a rural area. There has been significant development to the north of the Saltway and in Bodicote recently which sees loss in countryside . More housing in the areas proposed will only make things worse and we will see wildlife struggling to survive in an ever dwindling habitat. This development would be replacing existing land used for agriculture when we should be preserving green spaces and enhancing our 'natural capital' assets. The Saltway is a natural cut off from development and land to the south of the Saltway to Wykham Lane should be excluded from further developments
LPR-B-290	Savills for Oxford Technology Park	Call for Sites Promotion - The Piggeries and associated land, Langford Lane, Kidlington	The Piggeries and associated land, Langford Lane, Kidlington is promoted for community / leisure use. Update to HELAA448. Concept plans and images have been supplied.
LPR-B-290	Savills for Oxford Technology Park	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the south of Langford Lane, Kidlington	Land to the south of Langford Lane, Kidlington is promoted for employment. Update to HELAA336. Concept plans and images have been supplied.
LPR-B-291	Chris Stylianou	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC have installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. New development will add additional traffic on these already dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish. The proposed development sites are entirely unsustainable and every household would need to drive to access essential facilities. Several of the proposed sites would destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, greenfields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses. Additional development around Henge Close LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the greenspace and play area to the east. The proposed sites listed as LPR-A-086, to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Berry Hill Rd, would double the size of West Adderbury. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a small village and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale. Important and well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd would lose their existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests.

LPR-B-291	Chris Stylianou	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC have installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. New development will add additional traffic on these already dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish. The proposed development sites are entirely unsustainable and every household would need to drive to access essential facilities. Several of the proposed sites would destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, greenfields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village., Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the greenspace and play area to the east. The proposed sites listed as LPR-A-086, to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Berry Hill Rd, would double the size of West Adderbury. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a small village and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale. Important and well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd would lose their existing connection with local farmland. Development of LPRA-086 would lead to these houses being completely subsumed by new estates, changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests.</p>
LPR-B-291	Chris Stylianou	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC have installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. New development will add additional traffic on these already dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish. The proposed development sites are entirely unsustainable and every household would need to drive to access essential facilities. Several of the proposed sites would destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, greenfields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses. Additional development around Henge Close at LPRA-146 would directly affect the Conservation Area and be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the greenspace and play area to the east. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a small village and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale. Important and well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd would lose their existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests.</p>
LPR-B-291	Chris Stylianou	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC have installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. New development will add additional traffic on these already dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish. The proposed development sites are entirely unsustainable and every household would need to drive to access essential facilities. Several of the proposed sites would destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, greenfields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the greenspace and play area to the east. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a small village and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale. Important and well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd would lose their existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests.</p>

LPR-B-291	Chris Stylianou	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC have installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. New development will add additional traffic on these already dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish. The proposed development sites are entirely unsustainable and every household would need to drive to access essential facilities. Several of the proposed sites would destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, greenfields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-258 would change the approach to the village. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the greenspace and play area to the east. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a small village and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale. Important and well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd would lose their existing connection with local farmland. Development of LPRA-258 would lead to a substantial decrease in the greenspace between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity. Development of these sites will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests.
LPR-B-292	Penny Stylianou	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Would destroy the rural entrances to the village. Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road.
LPR-B-292	Penny Stylianou	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Would destroy the rural entrances to the village. Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road.
LPR-B-292	Penny Stylianou	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Would destroy the rural entrances to the village. Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-258 would change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing.
LPR-B-292	Penny Stylianou	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Would destroy the rural entrances to the village. Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road.
LPR-B-292	Penny Stylianou	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Would destroy the rural entrances to the village. Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing.
LPR-B-293	Ellen Gordon	Hanwell	Object. We were led to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. As more housing estates have been built around us we have seen an immense increase in traffic, litter, vast fly tipping and unknown vehicles stopped near the village at night. I don't feel safe in my village anymore. Our village is beautiful and a glimpse into history, but that will disappear through new development. I am surprised that developments like this that would destroy even more land are considered. Farm land around Hanwell is rich in hedgerows, with frequent tree copses and wide headlands that are allowed to grow tall supporting wild species to thrive: kites, buzzards, deer, bats, rabbits, voles, woodpeckers, wrens, owls, foxes, hedgehogs, pheasants, badgers, and a variety of insects.
LPR-B-294	Jonathan Meredith	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. The village is on the main A361, Daventry Road, the route for all HS2 traffic with lots of lorry movements through the village. How would the village cope with new houses. The village is continually becoming nosier and busier. Maintaining the character of any village is important and keeping the conservation area restrictions. Any development should not be out of character and be detrimental to the village. An expansion of that proposed would be out of all proportion to the size of village. There is a lack of infrastructure (water mains/sewerage) in the village and no additional housing of any sort should be contemplated without that being addressed with additional facilities. Without a complete improvement for road access, Wardington is already a nightmare and danger to which to drive or be a pedestrian on the existing roads.

LPR-B-295	Sarah Walker	Sibford Gower	Object. I'm not against small developments in villages in the Cherwell, particularly where sites contain affordable housing, it seems absurd to consider building vast swathes of housing that would radically change a sensitive rural environment at the edge of a site of outstanding natural beauty. Cherwell District Council has a duty to maintain the rich historical heritage of its region, which cannot be achieved by swamping small, rural villages with large-scale developments. A rural village does not have the infrastructure to support such a large influx of people and vehicles and this can only be achieved by radically changing the nature of the environment which destroys the rural setting. The village does not want street lights and the increase in commuter traffic is likely because there are very few employment opportunities in a small village and few bus services to nearby towns. Such developments should be directed towards brownfield sites in and around towns, where local amenities can support the increased population. The loss of rural agricultural land, with its hedgerows, trees and wildlife should not be supported when viable alternatives are available and at a time <u>when conservation and sustainability should be a priority.</u>
LPR-B-296	Donna Resek	Question - Green Belt	Object to building on green belt. Has no one thought about our precious wildlife in all of this? Wildlife is dwindling as it is. We will have to travel which increases pollution and traffic problems. There is already a traffic problem along the Woodstock Road, which increases pollution and cost just sitting in your car waiting for the traffic to move. Try walking along the Woodstock Road at rush hour in Yarnton, the exhaust fumes are horrible. Closing down Sandy Lane for the new houses will increase the traffic on the Woodstock Road. I do wonder if anyone has really thought about this. It would seem all the councillors voting for this plan do not live in the area so could care less, all they care about is money this will bring in. Why not think about all the empty buildings that have been vacated and turn them into housing.
LPR-B-297	Stuart Godman	Sibford Gower	Object. The local access infrastructure will not support any dwellings of this size, roads, cycleways and footpaths are inadequate. The proposed parcels of land are next to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Ironstone Downland). This land also sits at the highest point in the village, hence the concerns around the water table. The village already supports many environmental policies such as the 'dark sky' approach hence reducing the need for street lighting. We are also a low carbon village with literally zero public transport so any development will promote the use of more cars. I believe this also goes against the local Cherwell Plan i.e. key objectives 15 & 16. There will be a huge impact on agricultural land and damage to local countryside. If we want sustainable housing then we should be looking for development land nearer towns, such as Banbury, as they have the road infrastructure and local employment opportunities to support new housing. There is simply no economic and environmental benefit for developing small villages out of town. The plan is simply unsustainable.
LPR-B-298	Peter Gordon	Hanwell	Strongly object. Despite the council's commitments to build no further north than Dukes meadow road boundary, your new proposals disregard your promises. These proposals leave barely any space between North Banbury and Hanwell village. They would basically engulf Hanwell and the village would no longer exist. The conservation area status is being ignored. There are many consequential problems with these proposals, some of which are; countryside, village views and horizons destroyed; many and varied wildlife habitats ruined; increase in traffic through the village which is at breaking point; felling of trees and Co2 emissions contrary to the government's commitments; littering and fly tipping in the village; and, peace and solitude of rural village life gone. I understand there is a need for even more housing in Banbury. Please consider other sites, less damaging than these proposals. There seem to be many brownfield sites and inner town retail properties in Banbury that <u>have fallen into disuse and could be converted to housing.</u>
LPR-B-299	Mr and Mrs Cox	LPR-A-185	Object. Development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of a rural area and result in a visual intrusion into the countryside contrary to the Cherwell Plan and government guidance. Commercial development is not in keeping with the nature of the site and in an area of high landscape value. It does not protect the character of the landscape, respect the surroundings and is not in keeping with the location and the Green Buffer. The loss of the village to a commercial industrial park would be a significant loss to Cherwell from both a historical point of view and for the recreation and health of the residents of Banbury. Commercial development will have a detrimental impact on the natural environment and biodiversity and is likely to create noise, air and light pollution to nearby residential properties as well as creating a flood risk in a low lying area. <u>Despite the site's close proximity to the M40 junction the infrastructure is already insufficient and development will lead to further transport issues</u>
LPR-B-299	Mr and Mrs Cox	LPR-A-198	Object. Commercial development on this site would create a loss of a local amenity. The pub was always very popular and could be again having been recently developed. Development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the rural area and result in a visual intrusion into the countryside contrary to the Cherwell Local Plan and government guidance. Commercial development is not in keeping with the nature of the site and in an area of high landscape value. It does not protect the character of the landscape, respect the surroundings and is not in keeping with the location and the Green Buffer. Commercial development will have a detrimental impact on the natural environment and biodiversity and is likely to create noise, air and light pollution to nearby residential properties as well as creating a flood risk in a low lying area with already high level of surface water flooding.
LPR-B-299	Mr and Mrs Cox	LPR-A-034	Object. Commercial development on this site would create a loss of a local amenity. The pub was always very popular and could be again having been recently developed. Development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the rural area and result in a visual intrusion into the countryside contrary to the Cherwell Local Plan and government guidance. Commercial development is not in keeping with the nature of the site and in an area of high landscape value. It does not protect the character of the landscape, respect the surroundings and is not in keeping with the location and the Green Buffer. Commercial development will have a detrimental impact on the natural environment and biodiversity and is likely to create noise, air and light pollution to nearby residential properties as well as creating a flood risk in a low lying area with already high level of surface water flooding. <u>Despite the site's close proximity to the M40 junction the infrastructure is insufficient and development will lead to further transport issues.</u>

LPR-B-299	Mr and Mrs Cox	LPR-A-168	Object. Commercial development on this site would create a loss of a local amenity. The pub was always very popular and could be again having been recently developed. Development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the rural area and result in a visual intrusion into the countryside contrary to the Cherwell Local Plan and government guidance. Commercial development is not in keeping with the nature of the site and in an area of high landscape value. It does not protect the character of the landscape, respect the surroundings and is not in keeping with the location and the Green Buffer. Commercial development will have a detrimental impact on the natural environment and biodiversity and is likely to create noise, air and light pollution to nearby residential properties as well as creating a flood risk in a low lying area with already high level of surface water flooding. Despite the site's close proximity to the M40 junction the infrastructure is insufficient and development will lead to further transport issues.
LPR-B-300	Nicola Hale	LPR-A-077	Strongly object. Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District's housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. The existing 2015 Local Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031. Twelve potential sites measuring a total of 109.28 hectares could provide a minimum of 3,250 new houses have been proposed around Adderbury including a large 60 hectare site between Twyford and the M40. These proposals contradict Cherwell District Council's Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury. Sufficient land has been allocated in the district to meet predicted demand for the next 13 years. Development on these sites expressly contradicts Policy ESD1. Adderbury is not a sustainable location. The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development would be contrary to NPPG - Rural housing para 78. The current supply of housing more than adequately provides for the housing demand, therefore there is no further need for housing in this location. Continued development of land, particularly located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development on these sites would be contrary to Policy ESD10. Substantial new buildings on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell Conservation Target Area and, according with Policy ESD11 development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury. Cherwell has over 13 years of underutilised supply to meet future demand. Residential development on this land will harm both the function and open character of the village in the Conservation Area. Proposals to increase residential development in Adderbury will place unnecessary and restrictive burdens upon the health, mental wellbeing and accessibility of the village and place developer profit ahead of recreational, social and community needs and vastly increase social exclusion. This is of particular relevance given the lack of affordability of new developments in Adderbury. Cherwell is a high growth area and demand for housing is high. It can be an expensive place to live especially in areas of the district where average median house prices The fact that affordable housing is currently only sought on 'qualifying' sites demonstrates the applicant's non-compliance with this objective. Any residential development in Adderbury does not support Local Plan and does not meet the existing local plan objective that 'seeks to deliver growth as part of an 'urban focused strategy', in other words most of the housing and employment was allocated in the main towns.'
LPR-B-301	Oxford Green Belt Network (OGBN)	Option 2	Cherwell District Council should not leave the determination of any future housing need and the setting of housing targets to the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050, but should use the Standard Method to determine this based strictly upon local need and revised demographic forecasts. The Oxfordshire Plan 2050 will be designed to incorporate all the local housing needs in each District, so each District must first define these local housing needs for these to be included within OP 2050. The definition of the local housing need using the Standard Method in Cherwell District is a major omission in the Local Plan 2040 and in this public consultation
LPR-B-301	Oxford Green Belt Network (OGBN)	Question - Green Belt	Object. There is no justifiable need for any small scale review of the Green Belt land in the District for additional future employment use. The area of land already allocated in Langford Lane and in the Begbroke Science Park will be sufficient for all future needs within the lifetime of CDCLP
LPR-B-301	Oxford Green Belt Network (OGBN)	Question - Local Green Spaces	A connected network of Local Green Spaces should be designated around the built-up area of Kidlington, as proposed by Kidlington Parish council, and should include all of the existing Green Belt land. This would be in accordance with policy guidance expressed in NPPF paragraph 142. The designation of these Local Green Spaces would also be supported in NPPF paragraph 145.
LPR-B-301	Oxford Green Belt Network (OGBN)	Question - Green Belt	Suggests that there should be a greater emphasis on planting trees, in line with NPPF paragraph 131 and 146 and that in Cherwell there will multiple opportunities to plant more tree within and around settlements, and especially in the Oxford Green Belt. Suggests there is a need in the CDC Local Plan 2040 to provide some specific policy incentives so that this can be achieved, in accordance with national policy to increase carbon capture by trees and to increase the interception of airborne pollution by trees. Highlights that there is also a local need in nearby Oxford City to draw clean cool air from the surrounding Green Belt to mitigate the negative impact of the summer heatwaves forecast to affect this city during the coming decades.
LPR-B-302	Caroline More	Sibford Gower	Object. Suggests that Sibford Gower is very rural and does not have the facilities to support large development proposals. Greenfield sites should not proceed when there are so many disused buildings and brown filed sites available. Concerns that the public transport in the village is not amenable to current residents and that increasing the need for people to travel further to work will be bad for the climate. Development in small villages like Sibford Gower should be for small started homes, as the current housing stock is too expensive for young families.

LPR-B-302	Caroline More	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Housing development in rural areas should be accompanied by a major increase in the availability of public transport.
LPR-B-303	Colin & Judy Reeves	Hanwell	Strong object. Concerned about encroachment on the village from Banbury to the south. Hanwell village is currently used by many as a short cut from Warwick Road to Southham Road, on a route where in some places it is not wide enough for two cars to pass. More development will make this issue worse. Development should not be approved as Hanwell lies within a conservaton area, and there are few facilities in the village.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	Chesterton	Object. If the site submissions outlined in LPR-A-173, LPR-A-046 and LPR-A-106 came into fruition they would swamp the hamlet of Little Chesterton. Other associated developments (LPR-A-225 and LPR-A-118 would also have indirect effects). Permission must not be given to LPR-A-118 proposal on material considerations, including transport links, and the Parish Council would wish to expand the playing field provision on a section of this land. LPR- A-113 should also not go forward as it adjoins the Community Woodland and Countryside Properties had agreed there would be no further housing on land to the south of Vendee Drive. The services and facilities outlined in the village should read: Chesterton Community Centre, 2 Geminus Road, leisure and community activities Chesterton Village Hall - used by Chesterton Play Group Employment sites (not 0) - commerical sites on Bignell Park Barns & employment at Chesterton Hotel, Bicester Hotel, Golf & Spa and the Holiday Inn Bus services - A bus service quoted in profile goes one way to Bicester at 7.25am whcih usally very little passengers Library - free librarty on the Top Green in a bus shelter Profile should also include Chesterton Hotel (including a restaurant), Taxi Service (Banks Furlong), Allotments, Bicester Hotel, Golf & Spa, WYG Engineering industrial unit, Bruern Abbey School The parish extends to the Wendlebury Road to the south and includes the Holiday Inn on the A34, Bicester Avenue & Garden Centre and Bicester Wetland Reserve. Concerns over the inaccuracies in the Chesterton Profile which suggest that the authors do not have a close knowledge of the Parish boundaries. The Parish should have been consulted to check the data before its inclusion in the Review document. Population figures for Chesterton need to be updated as they are inaccurate. P.77. Concerns over building delays on planned school buildings at Kinsmere and Graven Hill. Coordinated planning is needed to ensure that children can use a local schoolland not one in East Bicester. CDC should address such issues with OCC, who give impression that they do not plan in coordinated way with CDC. SOME MORE AT END OF COMMENT. Para 6.3.23. The Burnehyll Community Woodland in Chesterton Parish is accessible to Kingsmere residents, but it is not easily accessible for Chesterton residents. CDC should contribute to resolving this issue. Para 6.3.28. In relation to the potential impacts on the setting of nearby vilages such as Launton and Chesterton by unconstrained development, please refer to comments made by Chesterton PC on the future swamping of little Chesterton if submitted plans are approved. Para 6.3.30. Supports improved access to Bicester's hinterland with the recognition that many villages, like Chesterton, cannot be readily accessed by public transport.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	LPR-A-173	Object. If the site submissions outlined in LPR-A-173, LPR-A-046 and LPR-A-106 came into fruition they would swamp the hamlet of Little Chesterton. Other associated developments (LPR-A-225 and LPR-A-118 would also have indirect effects). Permission must not be given to LPR-A-118 proposal on material considerations, including transport links, and the Parish Council would wish to expand the playing field provision on a section of this land. LPR- A-113 should also not go forward as it adjoins the Community Woodland and Countryside Properties had agreed there would be no further housing on land to the south of Vendee Drive.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	LPR-A-046	Object. If the site submissions outlined in LPR-A-173, LPR-A-046 and LPR-A-106 came into fruition they would swamp the hamlet of Little Chesterton. Other associated developments (LPR-A-225 and LPR-A-118 would also have indirect effects). Permission must not be given to LPR-A-118 proposal on material considerations, including transport links, and the Parish Council would wish to expand the playing field provision on a section of this land. LPR- A-113 should also not go forward as it adjoins the Community Woodland and Countryside Properties had agreed there would be no further housing on land to the south of Vendee Drive.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	LPR-A-106	Object. If the site submissions outlined in LPR-A-173, LPR-A-046 and LPR-A-106 came into fruition they would swamp the hamlet of Little Chesterton. Other associated developments (LPR-A-225 and LPR-A-118 would also have indirect effects). Permission must not be given to LPR-A-118 proposal on material considerations, including transport links, and the Parish Council would wish to expand the playing field provision on a section of this land. LPR- A-113 should also not go forward as it adjoins the Community Woodland and Countryside Properties had agreed there would be no further housing on land to the south of Vendee Drive.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	LPR-A-225	Object. If the site submissions outlined in LPR-A-173, LPR-A-046 and LPR-A-106 came into fruition they would swamp the hamlet of Little Chesterton. Other associated developments (LPR-A-225 and LPR-A-118 would also have indirect effects). Permission must not be given to LPR-A-118 proposal on material considerations, including transport links, and the Parish Council would wish to expand the playing field provision on a section of this land. LPR- A-113 should also not go forward as it adjoins the Community Woodland and Countryside Properties had agreed there would be no further housing on land to the south of Vendee Drive.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	LPR-A-118	Object. If the site submissions outlined in LPR-A-173, LPR-A-046 and LPR-A-106 came into fruition they would swamp the hamlet of Little Chesterton. Other associated developments (LPR-A-225 and LPR-A-118 would also have indirect effects). Permission must not be given to LPR-A-118 proposal on material considerations, including transport links, and the Parish Council would wish to expand the playing field provision on a section of this land. LPR- A-113 should also not go forward as it adjoins the Community Woodland and Countryside Properties had agreed there would be no further housing on land to the south of Vendee Drive.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	Bicester	The map on p. 78 fails to show Vendee Drive which is an important routeway from A4045 to the A412/A34.



LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Para 6.3.1. Concerns that out commuting as not been adequately addressed in terms of the necessary infrastructure, especially in roads. The A4095/The Hale/Akeman Street is used by commuting traffic to access B430 and A34 but the roads are not adequate to support this traffic and the neither the Hale or Akeman Street have footpaths. Further development on NW Bicester will exacerbate these problems.
LPR-B-304	Chesterton Parish Council	Option 24	In agreement that the Town Centre has lost its distinctiveness and this needs addressing. Concerns that out-of-town shopping centres only serve to diminish the Town Centre. Requests the release date for the Retail and Town Centre Study. CDC should consider an article 4 direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential.
LPR-B-305	Graham Chamberlain	LPR-A-086	Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.
LPR-B-305	Graham Chamberlain	LPR-A-258	Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.
LPR-B-306	Kirsten Tisdale	LPR-A-175	Object. It is a greenfield site on agricultural land that needs to be retained as such. Many of the current community has either been born or brought up in Wardington or has actively chosen to move to a village - doubling the size of the village will completely change the environment. In particular, much of Wardington is a conservation area.
LPR-B-306	Kirsten Tisdale	LPR-A-034	Object. This is a greenfield site on agricultural land and it should be retained as such. Additional traffic will be a major obstruction and off little in the way of benefit to local people. Unless there are restrictions on accessing the A361 to Daventry, there may well be additional accidents on what is already a route with high casualties.

LPR-B-307	Woodstock Town Council	LPR-A-063	<p>Objection to major development at the site and consideration of submitting a pre-emptive submission to the Consultation noting the Inspector's actions to replace the site despite being promoted in the previous Draft Plan by Cherwell District Council. The Town Council can consider that many of the concerns reinforcing reasons for objecting now carry even further weight for the future, bearing in mind the same landowner's 'Land at Begbroke' submission referred to in their same submission document (Appendix 3 to this report) suggests a further nearby allocation of a 25 hectare site for up to 750 dwellings a short way along the A44 (near the traffic light junction of the A44 and Campsfield Road by the Airport). The Town Council is also concerned that allocation would strain Woodstock severely, without any degree of benefits in terms of Council Tax precept revenue, local eligibility for affordable housing etc.. Should circumstances regarding constituency opinion change materially, the Town Council would withdraw its objections. The Town Council is in agreement with inspector's comments that the site lies well beyond Begbroke and Yaunton, but they also consider that the site would not be seen as part of Woodstock either as it lies outside of the Woodstock boundary and outside West Oxfordshire. Object. It is unsurprising that Blenheim do not feel setting of the WHS will be significantly harmed by development as they are both landowner and development. Majority of visitors to the WHS come from south of Woodstock, entering the WHS at Hensington Gate and the development will disrupt the existing rural estate. It will take years for any green landscaping to achieve any disguise for the proposed development. The outline proposal of the site gives little attention to the site of the Roman Villa, Developments in the area have been justified on the basis that they are essential in order to maintain the structures of the WHS, but how many more tranquil, peaceful green fields in Oxfordshire must be destroyed before the need to support the WHS is satisfied. There needs to be substantial infrastructure improvements in Woodstock before further development and not later when problems are recognised and change may not be possible. Tivitating sections of road to widen or change traffic flow as part of development does not resolve the problem of more traffic on main roads around this development. There are immovable bottlenecks close to the A4095 and A44 in the centre of Bladon and across the Glyme in Woodstock. The suggested road running through the development linking the A44 at Park View to the A405 could become a rat run. This is an ongoing problem with parking in Woodstock and no opportunities for increasing parking space in either Bladon or Woodstock. The Park &amp; Ride at the south of Woodstock will not solve the parking problem for those in the new developments proposed for the east and north of the town. Without the development, there are issues over Primary School places. Further development will mean the Marlborough School will have to include many more pupils from Woodstock. The current Doctor's surgery is unfit for purpose in terms of size and layout and plans for a new surgery will not be complete in time for new development. As already suggested the boundary of Woodstock will have to be extended to incorporate this development if the development is to be considered 'Woodstock'. The proposed site extends to the Bladon roundabout. This brings the development area right up to the Green Belt of Bladon and, more significantly, it means that Bladon and Woodstock will no longer be spatially separate. The two communities will, in effect, become one - something made even more obvious if the caravan site at Bladon Chains becomes a series of holiday chalets. We need to avoid merging of distinct communities if we are to prevent a Greater Oxford stretching not only to Begbroke and Yarnton but out to Woodstock and Bladon as well.</p>
LPR-B-288	Natalie Chamberlain	LPR-A-086	<p>Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.</p>

LPR-B-308	Natalie Chamberlain	LPR-A-258	Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.
LPR-B-309	David Harris	LPR-A-175	Object. The proposed development is out of proportion to any conceivable need as there are already many industrial estates and warehouses to the west of the A361/M40 roundabout, with several more being built to the south. These have existing services and facilities. The current permitted development being constructed to the east of the M40 is both depressingly ugly in an area of beautiful countryside, but has already caused significant disruption to A361 traffic and to all users of the junction roundabout. Even to conceive of a large commercial development to the east side of the A361 seems extraordinary: without direct access to the M40 the traffic congestion would become intolerable. In light of COP26 and with AONBs nearby, the Council should not be permitting large developments like this.
LPR-B-310	David Harris	LPR-A-175	Object. Concerned of suggestion that 15ha of land are being considered for change of use to permit housing developments in Wardington at a rate of 2030 houses per hectare. There is no shop or school, only one pub, which is struggling to reopen and the local GP surgery in Cropedy has had to twice close its list due to excess demand. The A361 in the village would not be able to cope with an increase in traffic. There are considerably more suitable areas for expansion nearby such as Upper Heyford.
LPR-B-311	Martin Scott	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-311	Lucy Foley	LPR-A-091	Object. Site has no natural access point and creating one would result in significant disruption to local residents. Other areas closer to main roads could be developed without disruption to people living in the area
LPR-B-311	Lucy Foley	LPR-A-091	Object. The site would create significant traffic and disruption to local residents who have lived in the area for many years.
LPR-B-312	Colin and Anne Ewles	LPR-A-258	Strong object. All of the sites fall outside Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1.
LPR-B-312	Colin and Anne Ewles	LPR-A-041	Strong object. All of the sites fall outside Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1.
LPR-B-312	Colin and Anne Ewles	LPR-A-086	Strong object. All of the sites fall outside Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Will create additional traffic which, together with increased traffic as we come out of Covid, will make accidents more likely
LPR-B-312	Colin and Anne Ewles	LPR-A-146	Strong object. All of the sites fall outside Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1.
LPR-B-312	Colin and Anne Ewles	LPR-A-218	Strong object. All of the sites fall outside Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Will create additional traffic which, together with increased traffic as we come out of Covid, will make accidents more likely

LPR-B-313	Stephen Skinner	LPR-A-175	Object. Services at Wardington are barely adequate for its current size, be they sewerage, water supply, power, roads or school. Low water pressure and power cuts are a regular annoyance in Wardington and the A361 that cuts through the village is unsuitable for increasing demand. Proceeding with development will result in fiscal implications for the Council. The environment is also likely to suffer from increased people using their cars as there is <b>limited public transport.</b>
LPR-B-313	Stephen Skinner	LPR-A-175	The proposed scale of development (15.4ha, maximum housing density of 30 houses/ha, equating to 462 houses, equates to 1,104 inhabitants) is too much for a village that currently has some 453 inhabitants and only 189 houses. This represents tripling the village size in a Conservation Area. The Council are of course fully aware that The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its Conservation Areas. The proposal within the Cherwell Local Plan Review, specifically LPR-A-175, most certainly does not meet the requirement of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 1	generally supportive of the draft vision and agree with its ambition at points 1) and 2) to meet climate action targets and ensure energy production is sustainable whilst delivering new, high energy efficient developments. The client team considers these aims can be achieved through the delivery of future development within rural areas. Also support point 3) growth of rural areas is needed for point 3) of the vision to succeed across the district, so long as that growth is planned sustainably and is reflective of existing built form insofar that it is proportionate to the settlement size and comprises a high quality design reflective of the character of the area. Point 14)- encouraging to see this forms part of the Council's draft vision, which in turn could help rural communities reach their full potential in order to be sustainable neighbourhoods. paramount that the final vision supports a level of sustainable rural growth, which would lead to these areas having greater access to key services and facilities and be better to connected to towns, and <b>major employment and service centres.</b>
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 2	supports KO1 and believes there is sufficient land in rural areas to help meet it. . Support KO4- would help support the growth of development within rural areas by becoming digitally connected with the wider area, creating a sense of community, and reducing their reliability on services that would otherwise be found outside the bounds of rural settlements. Supports KO5- delivery of sustainable rural developments can help achieve this and this objective acknowledges the support for local food production. Supports KO10 and welcomes the opportunity for new developments in rural areas to meet sustainable construction standards to support carbon neutrality. KO11-the delivery of rural development would support KO11 by allowing settlements to become more self-sufficient, therefore reducing the rate of commuting and the output of carbon emissions. KO16- the delivery of rural growth would help meet this objective Allowing sustainable growth proportionate to the size of settlements in these areas will help facilitate and secure their sustainability in the future, reducing the need to travel to other more urban areas for travel. KO20agrees with KO20 insofar that there needs to be particular focus towards providing homes, particularly of an affordable tenure, within rural areas. allowing growth to the rural areas will help meet rural housing needs, whilst securing their future vitality and sustainability. KO21-positive to see affordable housing is identified as a key objective.it should be recognised that there is a specific affordable housing need within rural areas that needs to be addressed. the delivery of housing, and in particular affordable housing, as part of the emerging spatial strategy within Cherwell is key to preserve and enhance the sustainability of rural areas. This particular need has been conveyed within KO21 which is welcoming. KO23-believe that sustainable levels of development are required within rural areas to ensure they can become sustainable in their own right. Proportionate, well planned and well-designed growth should be accommodated to ensure that all rural settlements can grow sustainably. sites that are situated within or adjacent to smaller villages, and which may currently have access to fewer services and facilities or less frequent public transport services, should still be considered suitable locations for development proportionate to the settlement size and its function, allowing for incremental growth which will help sustain and enhance rural villages. KO24 supportive of KO24.The growth of rural areas would provide opportunities for those areas to be better designed to enable walking and cycling along with public/shared transport options. development in rural areas could create multi modal active travel corridors, linking rural settlements with one another in order to become collectively more sustainable. KO27agrees with KO27; any new development within rural areas can enhance the local distinctness of its villages and become well connected to existing communities. opportunity within Deddington to allow for growth in rural areas which does not adversely impact upon its character. KO31 - strongly supports KO31; consider sustainable levels of rural development are required in order for rural communities to have access to a range of services, facilities and affordable housing to meet local needs, allowing those communities to become more socially inclusive. Whilst welcoming the Council's previous intention to help to deliver some rural growth, clearly, given the results of the HIA accompanying this consultation it is concluded that the emerging spatial strategy should provide greater flexibility to ensure rural areas do not become unsustainable. greater emphasis should be placed on the growth of rural communities when compared to the adopted local plan, helping to secure their future vitality.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 30	neither option is preferred and rather it is proposed a combination of both is considered as part of the Council's emerging spatial strategy. Progressing point 1) would ensure that local rural housing needs are met, addressing the affordability issues currently received. However, actioning point 2) would not restrict rural development to where there is an identified local housing need. This provides greater flexibility for proposals to come forward that could help raise the economic prospects and vitality of existing service and facilities within a settlement, which in turn will help increase the sustainability of those settlements, allowing them to become selfsufficient whilst helping to tackle climate change. Point 2) also ties in with the transformational change in which the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 proposes to help meet a higher housing need over the emerging plan period. We assert that rural areas would be able to accommodate a certain amount of growth to help achieve this higher housing need number, helping remove barriers of affordability and sustainability. allocating smallscale growth that is proportionate to the settlement size results in those settlements (and others in close proximity) becoming more self-sufficient. increasing development in the Cat B villages of Clifton and Hempton would help support Deddington's role as a service village.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 31	Point 3) is preferred.

LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 32	Other - an amalgamation of points 1) and 2) should be considered as the rural settlement hierarchy is developed. This provides rural settlements that contain several key services the opportunity to grow sustainably, enhancing the vitality of those services and facilities and the self-sufficiency of those settlements. Key services and facilities include educational facilities, a local shop/supermarket, health facilities such as a doctor's surgery/pharmacy, a place of worship, public open spaces and public transport facilities (i.e. bus stops). giving weight to rural settlements that are within close proximity to the district's urban centres or are linked sustainably by means of public transport, cycling and walking should also be considered sustainable locations for growth. Those settlements should be given weight to the within the hierarchy. other factors that should be considered as part of the rural settlement hierarchy, as above, the growth of settlements that would help support the vitality of other nearby settlements and the services and facilities within them should also be given weight within the hierarchy. Moreover, the Council should have regard to settlements which are digitally more connected given the increase of home working since the pandemic and the digital future in which we live in. This in turn will help the Council tackle its climate change agenda. Paragraph 6.6.9 of the consultation document provides justification for continuing the rural settlement hierarchy approach, having regard to Paragraph 79 of the NPPF. highly support the principles of this, but it is noted the Council have failed to recognise the final part of Paragraph 79. it is requested that the review of the rural settlement hierarchy considers growth within settlements that may in themselves not contain many services and facilities but, are located to other rural settlements that do contain a sufficient level. Moreover, consideration again should be given to Paragraph 104 of the NPPF whereby opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas and this should be taken into account in planmaking and decision-making.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 19	the Council's emerging spatial strategy is similar to that contained in their adopted local plan, focusing growth at Banbury and Bicester primarily. This is reflected within options 19 and 22 of the consultation document. It is not disputed that further growth should not be accommodated within these areas given the sustainability attached to them. Rather it is welcoming that point 3) attached to options 19 and 22 considers focusing development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury/Bicester. This provides greater flexibility in allowing other settlements "well connected" to these towns to grow.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 22	the Council's emerging spatial strategy is similar to that contained in their adopted local plan, focusing growth at Banbury and Bicester primarily. This is reflected within options 19 and 22 of the consultation document. It is not disputed that further growth should not be accommodated within these areas given the sustainability attached to them. Rather it is welcoming that point 3) attached to options 19 and 22 considers focusing development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury/Bicester. This provides greater flexibility in allowing other settlements "well connected" to these towns to grow.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Deddington	Deddington is approximately 6 miles away from Banbury town centre and is already well connected to Banbury as the village contains several bus stops providing regular services to it. However, it should also be recognised that settlements not "well connected" to Banbury or Bicester can in their own right be sustainable. Notwithstanding Deddington's connections to Banbury, the parish profile accompanying this consultation outlines that the area contains a number of key services such as a village shop, pharmacy and a primary school. It is our primary contention that Deddington is a well functioned settlement that could fully support rural development. Consequently, in line with Paragraph 79 of the NPPF, the growth of that settlement would help support the vitality of other settlements such as Hempton and Clifton, and vice versa. We reiterate that this should be reflected in the emerging spatial strategy.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Option 16	Option 1) would be transformational and innovative, helping best deliver the aims of this option by requiring all developments to at least consider connecting digitally to the wider area. This would particularly be advantageous for rural areas insofar that it would allow persons to work from home easily, an increasingly popular trend since COVID19, and could increase small enterprises and businesses to grow within such areas, in turn improving its sustainability. Moreover, becoming digitally connected enhances social cohesion and is environmentally beneficial, reducing the reliance on the private vehicle to access the 'everyday' needs.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Home Farm, Clifton, Deddington	Land at Home Farm, Clifton, Deddington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA114. Representation supported by copy of submission to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 18 Part 2 consultation, site submission in response to Cherwell Local Plan Review Issues consultation and copy of submission to emerging Deddington Neighbourhood plan.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Wimborn Close, Deddington	Land at Wimborn Close, Deddington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA116. Representation supported by copy of submission to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 18 Part 2 consultation, site submission in response to Cherwell Local Plan Review Issues consultation and copy of submission to emerging Deddington Neighbourhood plan.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Duns Tew Road, Hempton,	Land off Duns Tew Road, Hempton, Deddington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA137. Representation supported by copy of submission to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 18 Part 2 consultation, site submission in response to Cherwell Local Plan Review Issues consultation and copy of submission to emerging Deddington Neighbourhood plan.

LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the rear of The Grove, Deddington	Land to the rear of The Grove, Deddington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA455. Representation supported by copy of submission to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 18 Part 2 consultation, site submission in response to Cherwell Local Plan Review Issues consultation and copy of submission to emerging Deddington Neighbourhood plan.
LPR-B-314	Ridge and Partners for M&G Real Estate	Call for Sites Promotion - Land south of The Lane, Hempton,	Land south of The Lane, Hempton, Deddington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA456. Representation supported by copy of submission to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 18 Part 2 consultation, site submission in response to Cherwell Local Plan Review Issues consultation and copy of submission to emerging Deddington Neighbourhood plan.
LPR-B-315	Ian Tisdale	LPR-A-175	Strong objection. Allocation of the proposed development threatens to ruin the rural character and the environment enjoyed by residents of the village. Previous proposals for 'affordable' housing have found no support in our village, some of which is a conservation area. Postbrexit economic challenges make it all the more vital to ramp up agricultural productivity, and rolling out this unwelcome project over land that's been farmed for centuries is destructive.
LPR-B-315	Ian Tisdale	LPR-A-034	Strong objection. Development of industrial units will destroy the rural character of the area we've chosen to live in and will remove acres of prime agricultural land. The postBrexit challenges make it even more vital to ramp up domestic food production, and the seizure of greenfield sites like this is absolutely counter to the efforts we should be making. Additionally, access to and across the M40 junction is already problematic towards Banbury and will likely become intolerable with the proposed development.
LPR-B-316	Jan Warner	Sibford Gower	Strong objection to development on land at top of Pound Lane. This is a dark sky village and it should stay that way. Any new development will likely include street lighting and utilities. There has been raw sewage running down road for weeks in summer so more development in Pound Lane would put added pressure on already overloaded system.
LPR-B-317	Simon Bion	LPR-A-104	Object. Proposals to virtually double the size of the Clifton hamlet through the development of a 5 acre site at south end of Chapel Close are unnecessary and will ruin any existing community culture. The site is currently occupied by unspoilt green space that is enjoyed by residents with little light or sound pollution. There are no amenities for public transport links in the hamlet. The proposed development would lead to disastrous increases in traffic. Inclusion of the site would likely not be influenced by local planning in terms of design and density. Access to the site is not feasible as there are pinch points in road widths. A PRoW lies adjacent to the site, which is in constant use, loss of this is not acceptable. Plot 104 is subject to flooding from ground water and the Thames Water Sewerage Plant. Heavy rainfall consistently floods in Chapel Close. There are already a number of linear sites along Clifton Road that have been identified which are more accessible and less intrusive.
LPR-B-318	Celia Chasey	Hanwell	Strong object. Concerned over encroachment on the village from Banbury to the south. Residents were led to believe there would be no development north of Duke Meadows Drive, but it appears now there will be. With the threat of climate change, we should not be eroding the countryside and cutting down mature trees. The roads in Banbury are heavily congested and journeys to work from Hanwell to Banbury can take over an hour. The road infrastructure in the area can't cope with further development and there will be decreased air quality for future children. The doctor's surgeries are at capacity and cannot cope with further development. The village is 800 years old with a 12th century church and conservation area and further development will erode the character of the village.
LPR-B-319	Nicola Still	LPR-A-175	Object. The proposal would double the size of the village, which is appalling. Wardington is a conservation village with a large number of listed buildings. There are few facilities within the village and they would be swamped by further development. The A361 already has more traffic than it can cope with and the village needs a by-pass, not 400 more houses.
LPR-B-320	Ann Gibbons	Hanwell	Object. Concerned over plans to build right up to Hanwell from Banbury. The development plans will disrupt resident's peaceful lifestyles and local wildlife. It would also encroach on farmland that we need more than ever to become self sufficient. Banbury has already seen huge development in all directions, please allow some space between the town and country villages.
LPR-B-321	Susan and Ian Jelfs	LPR-A-258	Object. Falls outside residential settlement boundary as per the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, which contravenes Policy AD1. Adderbury has seen six housing estates in recent years and 40 more houses approved on appeal. Adderbury is changing in character as a result and developments so far have not enhanced the village. Traffic in the village is a problem and further development will make the problem worse. Any development close to the conservation area would overwhelm the area. Sites to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Beny Hill Road are very large and more suited to an urban setting. Further development in village would increase risk of floods to properties near Sor Brook. It is not clear why the Category A villages in Cherwell have been treated far more favourably in terms of the number of and area of proposed sites.
LPR-B-321	Susan and Ian Jelfs	LPR-A-041	Object. Falls outside residential settlement boundary as per the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, which contravenes Policy AD1. Adderbury has seen six housing estates in recent years and 40 more houses approved on appeal. Adderbury is changing in character as a result and developments so far have not enhanced the village. Traffic in the village is a problem and further development will make the problem worse. Any development close to the conservation area would overwhelm the area. Sites to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Beny Hill Road are very large and more suited to an urban setting. Further development in village would increase risk of floods to properties near Sor Brook. It is not clear why the Category A villages in Cherwell have been treated far more favourably in terms of the number of and area of proposed sites.

LPR-B-321	Susan and Ian Jelfs	LPR-A-086	Object. Falls outside residential settlement boundary as per the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, which contravenes Policy AD1. Adderbury has seen six housing estates in recent years and 40 more houses approved on appeal. Adderbury is changing in character as a result and developments so far have not enhanced the village. Traffic in the village is a problem and further development will make the problem worse. Any development close to the conservation area would overwhelm the area. Sites to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Beny Hill Road are very large and more suited to an urban setting. Further development in village would increase risk of floods to properties near Sor Brook. It is not clear why the Category A villages in Cherwell have been treated far more favourably in terms of the number and area of proposed sites.
LPR-B-321	Susan and Ian Jelfs	LPR-A-218	Object. Falls outside residential settlement boundary as per the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, which contravenes Policy AD1. Adderbury has seen six housing estates in recent years and 40 more houses approved on appeal. Adderbury is changing in character as a result and developments so far have not enhanced the village. Traffic in the village is a problem and further development will make the problem worse. Any development close to the conservation area would overwhelm the area. Sites to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Beny Hill Road are very large and more suited to an urban setting. Further development in village would increase risk of floods to properties near Sor Brook. It is not clear why the Category A villages in Cherwell have been treated far more favourably in terms of the number and area of proposed sites.
LPR-B-322	Jessica and Kate Sadler	Hanwell	Object. Please don't build houses next to Hanwell, it is its own village and not connected to Banbury. New development at Hanwell will destroy habitats and wildlife. Please build somewhere else that is more appropriate. Hanwell should retain its village character
LPR-B-323	Edgars for Mr & Mrs Tomes	Call for Sites Promotion - 14-16 Woodstock Road, Yarnton	14-16 Woodstock Road, Yarnton is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA342. A site context plan has been submitted.
LPR-B-323	Edgars for Mr & Mrs Tomes	Option 27	Section 6.4 considers Kidlington and surrounding villages. This identifies that Kidlington together with Yarnton and Begbroke have an immediate and close relationship with Oxford and play an important role as shopping and employment centres being within Oxfordshire's knowledge spine. It is identified that this area will see significant change following the allocation of land for construction of 4,400 new homes and creation of new residential neighbourhoods. Text of paragraph 6.4.4 is incomplete. The following text identifies that the Kidlington area is being considered within the spatial options of the Oxfordshire Plan but this does not mean that further development will be located at Kidlington
LPR-B-324	Nigel Hall	Hanwell	Objection to plan to develop land north of Duke Meadow Drive. The proposals are counter to the council's duties to maintain a rural gap between Banbury and Hanwell so that they remain separate entities. The plan will destroy rural lifestyles in the area and the rural environment. Hanwell has seen its rural identity eroded in recent years as Banbury has edged closer and closer. It would be a shame for Hanwell to be built upon to the extent that Bodicote has been, which was once a gem of a small rural community.
LPR-B-326	James Dobbs	Wardington	Objection to change of use of land at Wardington, particularly the 4.6ha off the Greensward and the 10.8ha adjacent to the A361. The scale of development proposed would overwhelm village infrastructure and resources, especially since the area is prone to both electrical service and sewage issues. Development would also interrupt the character of the village and impact the quality of life of existing residents. New development will put too much pressure on the A361 and would also cause safety issues for children in the area. The location of development would cause significant visual impacts to the Grade 1 listed church. Development will result in the loss of important agricultural land and key habitats for wildlife. Whilst in favour of development and growth at Wardington, it must be done in a more sympathetic manner.
LPR-B-327	Rachel Gascoigne	Hanwell	Objection to development proposals that will encroach on Hanwell from Banbury to the south. Local authority led residents to believe there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow, but this has been eroded. The village is experiencing severe light pollution as a result of development of Hanwell Fields and it is deeply concerning that development is contemplated that will result in further light pollution, an increase in traffic and the destruction of wildlife habitats.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 3	Beyond the green belt all of the above options should be considered. Within the green belt, including Kidlington, Yarnton, Begbroke and areas removed from the green belt by the Partial Local Plan Review, only previously developed land should be considered
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 5	The centre of Kidlington is relatively small, and the shopping area should be protected by restricting uses. In the larger centres of Banbury and Bicester, other community and leisure uses could also be considered.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 6	Requirement for 50% affordable housing was one of the few welcome elements in the Partial Local Plan Review. The percentage requirement of affordable housing should now be similarly increased throughout the rest of District.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 7	In areas such as Oxfordshire, where property values are high, social rented housing is often the only truly affordable housing available. Social rented housing should therefore be priorities above other 'affordable' housing tenures
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 8	All new dwellings should meet nationally described space standard; this should be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Question - Separation Distances	There should be a minimum separation distance. High ridge lines cast longer shadows than low ridge lines. To avoid overshadowing in midwinter, the minimum separation distance across street needs to be at least four times the ridge height
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 9	Demographic change means needs of older residents are likely to become increasingly relevant. Accessibility standards should be introduced.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 10	It is essential we minimise carbon cost of new development by setting design and construction standards above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Question - Green Belt	There should be no further release of green belt land beyond that already envisaged in the Partial Review.

LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 13	The environment has all too frequently been trashed by developments that take no account of environmental considerations. Proposals should be able to demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods are an interesting and innovative concept that needs to be explored further
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree. It is essential to avoid unnecessary journeys and to undertake those that are necessary in the most sustainable way possible in order to minimise carbon emissions.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 17	Climate change is now such a pressing problem that it is essential to take this into account in all proposals. The methodology should be updated.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 26	There should be no further erosion of the Green Belt (except perhaps for use of previously developed land at Shiptonon-Cherwell. Any further employment land should be accommodated beyond the Green Belt.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 27	These three options do not appear to be mutually exclusive and all should be adopted. It is important to recognise Exeter Close as part of the village centre.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	The proposed closure of Sandy Lane has the effect of lengthening car journeys, and so helps to undermine sustainable travel. Sandy Lane should therefore remain open, recognising that this may necessitate replacement of the level crossing with an overbridge, together with reconstruction of the canal bridge. This link will become particularly important in the event that a rail station is provided at the site of the level crossing.
LPR-B-328	Chris Robins	Option 28	Support proposals of Kidlington Parish Council
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 1	Point 14 does not mention housing growth in rural areas, yet this will be required and is essential
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 2	Too brief and should not solely relate to quantum of development to be allocated. That level of development is required to be provided in locations that assist the achievement of sustainable development, relative to the pressures and opportunities that exist in Cherwell- such as Oxford related growth, good communication links, the need for affordable housing, and so on
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 3	Should include employment development of a suitable scale, in villages
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 6	Plan needs to be flexible with regard to affordable housing tenure split, so it can respond to different policy approaches and varying demand without formal revision over plan period.
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 7	Plan needs to be flexible with regard to affordable housing tenure split, so it can respond to different policy approaches and varying demand without formal revision over plan period.
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 8	Plan should not be overly prescriptive regarding the application of standards principally dealt with under other legislation. The plan should not duplicate other legislation.
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 9	Plan should not be overly prescriptive regarding the application of standards principally dealt with under other legislation. The plan should not duplicate other legislation.
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Question - Green Belt	The Local Plan should undertake a comprehensive review of the green belt. To exclude green belt sites that could provide sustainable options for development is not good planning. Without comprehensive review, development needs of the Borough will be forced outside of green belt, perhaps to detriment of environment and local needs.
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 31	Development in rural areas and need for development should be a combination of proposed sites and Parish level figures. Without meaningful green belt review, this approach becomes partial and ineffective for some areas
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 32	A settlement hierarchy is important tool in setting of locational strategy that benefits from existing infrastructure and services and therefore should be created. Where settlements such as Bletchington score highly, with a good level of everyday services and facilities, in close proximity to nearby rail and road strategic infrastructure, and so on, it is clear that further development that meets locally arising development needs, will assist in the delivery of sustainable development
LPR-B-329	Satnam Group	Option 33	Option 33, The Rural Economy is an important facet of the nature of Cherwell, and it will be important to consider the needs of the Rural Areas as a whole, including the need for employment, tourism, workers accommodation and market housing
LPR-B-330	John Collier	Question - Green Belt	Extensive construction of houses on greenfield sites should be avoided wherever possible and brownfield sites should be used instead. Apartment buildings should be adopted where possible instead of discrete housing units. Hard to imagine how delivering an additional 100,000 homes across Oxfordshire by 2031 will mean that we will be "first generation to leave natural environment in better state than that in which we found it". Why does Cherwell have to 'grow' economically at the expense of the natural environment. Good, well paid jobs are needed but not at expense of natural environment. Managing biodiversity and green infrastructure is not compatible with building houses over thousands of acres of farmland. The number of new homes proposed is quite frankly astonishing. The predict and provide approach is dangerous and more caution should be used.
LPR-B-330	John Collier	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Public transport links should be strengthened to minimise the need for cars
LPR-B-330	John Collier	Option 3	Employment centres should be strengthened in existing centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington where there is much scope for redevelopment and improvement. Each of these destinations should be established as places to live and work, and not necessarily just destinations for commuters



LPR-B-330	John Collier	Option 4	It seems unlikely that shopping will be primary function of towns in future. This is recognised in the paper but much more should be made of it in evaluating choices for Cherwell. Villages should be left much as they are although provision of local shops could be encouraged
LPR-B-330	John Collier	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	The Thames Water regio has been designated by the Environment Agency as being seriously water stressed. There is surface water flooding and widely fluctuating river levels in North Oxfordshire. Building more houses with more concrete and roads will not help.
LPR-B-330	John Collier	Adderbury	If more than a fraction of the sites (lised in the Schedule of sites in Adderbury in Appendix 2) are developed the character of Adderbury will be be changed for good and another lovely village will be just another bit of commuter land
LPR-B-331	Oxford & Country Planning OBO Mewslade	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of Rau Court, Caversfield.	Land north of Rau Court, Caversfield is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-331	Oxford & Country Planning OBO Mewslade	Call for Sites Promotion - Land south of Springfield Road, Caversfield	Land south of Springfield Road, Caversfield is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-331	Oxford & Country Planning OBO Mewslade	Call for Sites Promotion - Garage court off Springfield Road, Caversfield	Garage court off Springfield Road, Caversfield is promoted for recreation.
LPR-B-331	Oxford & Country Planning OBO Mewslade	Call for Sites Promotion - Garage court off Woodcote Road, Caversfield	Garage court off Woodcote Road, Caversfield is promoted for recreation.
LPR-B-331	Oxford & Country Planning OBO Mewslade	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Woodcote Road, Caversfield	Land off Woodcote Road, Caversfield is promoted for open space or access.
LPR-B-332	Matthew Smith	LPR-A-086	Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.

LPR-B-332	Matthew Smith	LPR-A-041	<p>Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.</p>
LPR-B-332	Matthew Smith	LPR-A-146	<p>Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.</p>
LPR-B-332	Matthew Smith	LPR-A-218	<p>Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.</p>

LPR-B-332	Matthew Smith	LPR-A-258	Object. Adderbury has seen significant development since the 2011 census, when 1064 dwellings were registered, compared to 1250 now. Adding permitted developments to this also amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. Large scale, generic style of new development has been upsetting to residents and is compromising the rural character of the village. Residents at St Mary's Road have had to accept developments to west and north and if two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, as they intend to build outside of the accepted boundary of the village and narrow the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of density of 30 dph, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large compared to previous developments in the village. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity and congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. The sites proposed at the village would make it more of a rat run as queues on the A4260 often stretch back from Oxford Road traffic lights to Station Road industrial estate. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017 from 30 to 45 children per year. Anything more than 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. Extra traffic at existing pinch points, particularly at junction between Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area. Many parents already avoid walking children to school due to air pollution along the Oxford Road north of The Green. Development on greenfield sites around the village will have a destructive impact on regional ecology. Concerns about effects of water run-off from substantial development might have on existing floodplain. None of sites in Adderbury are within floodplain, but they are adjacent to it and therefore with climate change this could become an issue. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields are great educational opportunities. There is currently a lack of light pollution in the village, but substantial new development will diminish this.
LPR-B-333	Alastair Cooke	Shutford	Strong objection to Land at Lower End & Thistle Hill and Land to the North of Epwell Road. Shutford is a category C village and therefore least suitable for development in terms of services and facilities. Previous development applications for Epwell Road have been refused for impacts on views and previous development applications for Thistle Hill have also been refused. Roads around Shutford are narrow and in a poor state of repair and are unsuitable for further development. Parking is also a problem and there is no village bus service. On the approach roads to Shutford there are no footpaths and no lighting. There are drainage problems in the village with raw sewage overflowing into Sor Brook. Thistle Hill is unsuitable for development as the houses would either be very high up and obtrusive or if lower down they would overlook the houses already there and block out light to properties at the bottom. Thistle is a valuable natural resource and so the area should not be developed. Any development should respect the green belt and consider brown field sites before
LPR-B-334	Charles Wilford	Hanwell	Ongoing regeneration of Banbury town centre is to be welcomed but with the inevitable consequence that the retail heart of the town will be shifting further towards the new Castle Quay development. As the patterns of use and occupation of our town centres change we should be looking to encourage an increase in housing in towns to ensure they remain vibrant and reduce the reliance on transportation. To this end I am wholly in favour of bringing forward Bankside and Canalside scheme for residential use, utilising existing brownfield sites
LPR-B-334	Charles Wilford	LPR-A-212	Concerned about any further development to north of Banbury adjacent to Hanwell fields. The review document recognises the need to protect both rural environment and heritage. However, encroachment on the boundary of Hanwell Fields and Dukes Meadow Drive has gone far enough. Any further development will cause the village to lose its identity. The development of LPR-A-152 would leave just metres between edge of conservation area down Gullicote Lane. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence
LPR-B-334	Charles Wilford	LPR-A-152	Concerned about any further development to north of Banbury adjacent to Hanwell fields. The review document recognises the need to protect both rural environment and heritage. However, encroachment on the boundary of Hanwell Fields and Dukes Meadow Drive has gone far enough. Any further development will cause the village to lose its identity. The development of LPR-A-152 would leave just metres between edge of conservation area down Gullicote Lane. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence
LPR-B-334	Charles Wilford	Option 18	Development is most appropriate to the east or south of Banbury where there is lesser prospect of incursion on neighbouring villages.
LPR-B-334	Charles Wilford	Option 19	Limit development at Banbury and protect its landscaper setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-334	Charles Wilford	LPR-A-205	Support for sites such as this, which would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages.
LPR-B-335	Carla Colombani	LPR-A-175	Object. The services for Wardlington are only adequate for current size of village. Sewerage, water supply, power and road provision are poor. There will be impacts to the environment from more cars on the road as there is a limited availability of public transport to access essential services. The proposed scale of development (15.4ha, maximum housing density of 30 houses/ha, equating to 462 houses, equates to 1,104 inhabitants) is too much for a village that currently has some 453 inhabitants and only 189 houses. This represents tripling the village size in a Conservation Area. The Council are of course fully aware that The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its Conservation Areas. The proposal within the Cherwell Local Plan Review, specifically LPR-A-175, most certainly does not meet the requirement of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
LPR-B-336	John Spratt	Hanwell	Concerned by encroachment on Hanwell from Banbury, around Dukes Meadow Drive. Hanwell is an 800 year old village with a conservation area and it is supposed to be the planning authority's policy to keep it separate from Banbury. With the threat of climate change, there should not be further houses on greenfield land adjacent to the village. It should be retained as farmland or for planting trees. Instead of allowing builders to stretch out from Banbury, development should be built within Banbury itself.

LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Hanwell	strongly opposed to the encroachment of Banbury urban area on the landscape setting of the village with development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Developments north of this area increasingly threaten the rural setting and character of the village. Reasons to resist further housing sites to protect fragile and important strategic gap to prevent coalescence. Impacts on climate emergency, high landscape value and natural capital, traffic and further demand on existing infrastructure, conservation area, historic importance and sustainability. Site has not shown to be sustainable. Site is unacceptable on a number of key planning and conservation grounds.
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	LPR-A-047	Object to any development on this site. Breaches previous agreement from CDC regarding boundaries at Dukes Meadow Drive and the tree line forming the boundary of existing developments. Direct breach of Councils commitments to protect the rural setting of the CA. Development would adversely impact the CA of the village and destroy the semirural setting. CDC should not be considering sites north of Banbury. Site has not shown to be sustainable. Site is unacceptable on a number of key planning and conservation grounds. Development of the site will seriously erode and completely destroy the "strategic" physical gap in open countryside. Insufficient consideration has previously been given to the fundamental effects of the erosion on the overall rural setting and character of the small conservation village. Assessing the narrowing of the gap in purely visual impact terms misses the point; the greatest impact is on the rural character of the area. Impact on Hanwell CA- 2007 CA appraisal clearly sets out why development should be rejected. Development to the south of Hanwell will effectively join the CA with Banbury which is unsympathetic to the rural setting and destroys the semi-rural nature of the CA; Hanwell must be protected from this as stated in the 2007 CA Appraisal. Development which is visually intrusive of affects the CA setting must be avoided. The proposed site does not protect the setting of the CA. Developing Hanwell up to Babury is not retaining significant open spaces and field systems around the village/CA. Development of this scale will have a harmful impact on the overall quality of the landscape in the open countryside north of Dukes Meadow Drive; it does not protect or enhance it. It is vital to protect Hanwell village and its rural setting from urbanising development. Unclear how the various green buffers will be achieved and there appears to be no provision for wider landscape mitigation or protection. Further development will seriously impact light pollution and the publicly funded community observatory. Development has caused the loss of best quality farmland; Hanwell has been studied to review soil fertility and crop suitability which shows importance of the quality of farmland surrounding Hanwell. The site is relatively remote from key facilities and will encourage more car usage which will impact transport infrastructure. Against undesirable piecemeal development. additional housing will put additional strain on existing infrastructure, particularly through the village and the village already suffers from serious problems from heavy traffic usage.
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	LPR-A-154	Object to any development on this site. Breaches previous agreement from CDC regarding boundaries at Dukes Meadow Drive and the tree line forming the boundary of existing developments. Direct breach of Councils commitments to protect the rural setting of the CA. Development would adversely impact the CA of the village and destroy the semirural setting. CDC should not be considering sites north of Banbury. Site has not shown to be sustainable. Site is unacceptable on a number of key planning and conservation grounds. Development of the site will seriously erode and completely destroy the "strategic" physical gap in open countryside. Insufficient consideration has previously been given to the fundamental effects of the erosion on the overall rural setting and character of the small conservation village. Assessing the narrowing of the gap in purely visual impact terms misses the point; the greatest impact is on the rural character of the area. Impact on Hanwell CA- 2007 CA appraisal clearly sets out why development should be rejected. Development to the south of Hanwell will effectively join the CA with Banbury which is unsympathetic to the rural setting and destroys the semi-rural nature of the CA; Hanwell must be protected from this as stated in the 2007 CA Appraisal. Development which is visually intrusive of affects the CA setting must be avoided. The proposed site does not protect the setting of the CA. Developing Hanwell up to Babury is not retaining significant open spaces and field systems around the village/CA. Development of this scale will have a harmful impact on the overall quality of the landscape in the open countryside north of Dukes Meadow Drive; it does not protect or enhance it. It is vital to protect Hanwell village and its rural setting from urbanising development. Unclear how the various green buffers will be achieved and there appears to be no provision for wider landscape mitigation or protection. Further development will seriously impact light pollution and the publicly funded community observatory. Development has caused the loss of best quality farmland; Hanwell has been studied to review soil fertility and crop suitability which shows importance of the quality of farmland surrounding Hanwell. The site is relatively remote from key facilities and will encourage more car usage which will impact transport infrastructure. Against undesirable piecemeal development. additional housing will put additional strain on existing infrastructure, particularly through the village and the village already suffers from serious problems from heavy traffic usage.

LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	LPR-A-205	<p>Object to any development on this site. Breaches previous agreement from CDC regarding boundaries at Dukes Meadow Drive and the tree line forming the boundary of existing developments. Direct breach of Councils commitments to protect the rural setting of the CA. Development would adversely impact the CA of the village and destroy the semirural setting. CDC should not be considering sites north of Banbury. Site has not shown to be sustainable. Site is unacceptable on a number of key planning and conservation grounds. Development of the site will seriously erode and completely destroy the "strategic" physical gap in open countryside. Insufficient consideration has previously been given to the fundamental effects of the erosion on the overall rural setting and character of the small conservation village. Assessing the narrowing of the gap in purely visual impact terms misses the point; the greatest impact is on the rural character of the area. Impact on Hanwell CA - 2007 CA appraisal clearly sets out why development should be rejected. Development to the south of Hanwell will effectively join the CA with Banbury which is unsympathetic to the rural setting and destroys the semi-rural nature of the CA; Hanwell must be protected from this as stated in the 2007 CA Appraisal. Development which is visually intrusive of affects the CA setting must be avoided. The proposed site does not protect the setting of the CA. Developing Hanwell upto Babury is not retaining significant open spaces and field systems around the village/CA. Development of this scale will have a harmful impact on the overall quality of the landscape in the open countryside north of Dukes Meadow Drive; it does not protect or enhance it. It is vital to protect Hanwell village and its rural setting from urbanising development. Unclear how the various green buffers will be achieved and there appears to be no provision for wider landscape mitigation or protection. Further development will seriously impact light pollution and the publicly funded community observatory. Development has caused the loss of best quality farmland; Hanwell has been studied to review soil fertility and crop suitability which shows importance of the quality of farmland surrounding Hanwell. The site is relatively remote from key facilities and will encourage more car usage which will impact transport infrastructure. Against undesirable piecemeal development. additional housing will put additional strain on existing infrastructure, particularly through the village and the village already suffers from serious problems from heavy traffic usage.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	LPR-A-152	<p>Strongly Object to any development on this site. Breaches previous agreement from CDC regarding boundaries at Dukes Meadow Drive and the tree line forming the boundary of existing developments. Direct breach of Councils commitments to protect the rural setting of the CA. Development would adversely impact the CA of the village and destroy the semirural setting. CDC should not be considering sites north of Banbury. development must not be allowed on this site. Site has not shown to be sustainable. Site is unacceptable on a number of key planning and conservation grounds.</p> <p>Development of the site would leave just metres between the site and the edge of Hanwell CA which would not be shielded from the site by any natural border as exists with the trees which hide the Banbury 5 development. Development of the site breaches clear, defensible urban boundaries created by the Dukes Meadow Drive development. Effectiveness of a green buffer is yet to be explained need to know how the boundary alterations will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary and how it will protect Hanwell village. Development of the site will seriously erode and completely destroy the "strategic" physical gap in open countryside. Insufficient consideration has previously been given to the fundamental effects of the erosion on the overall rural setting and character of the small conservation village. Assessing the narrowing of the gap in purely visual impact terms misses the point; the greatest impact is on the rural character of the area. Impact on Hanwell CA - 2007 CA appraisal clearly sets out why development should be rejected. Development to the south of Hanwell will effectively join the CA with Banbury which is unsympathetic to the rural setting and destroys the semi-rural nature of the CA; Hanwell must be protected from this as stated in the 2007 CA Appraisal. Development which is visually intrusive of affects the CA setting must be avoided. The proposed site does not protect the setting of the CA. Developing Hanwell upto Babury is not retaining significant open spaces and field systems around the village/CA. Development of this scale will have a harmful impact on the overall quality of the landscape in the open countryside north of Dukes Meadow Drive; it does not protect or enhance it. It is vital to protect Hanwell village and its rural setting from urbanising development. Unclear how the various green buffers will be achieved and there appears to be no provision for wider landscape mitigation or protection. Further development will seriously impact light pollution and the publicly funded community observatory. Development has caused the loss of best quality farmland; Hanwell has been studied to review soil fertility and crop suitability which shows importance of the quality of farmland surrounding Hanwell. The site is relatively remote from key facilities and will encourage more car usage which will impact transport infrastructure. Against undesirable piecemeal development. additional housing will put additional strain on existing infrastructure, particularly through the village and the village already suffers from serious problems from heavy traffic usage.</p>

LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	LPR-A-214	<p>Strongly Object to any development on this site. Breaches previous agreement from CDC regarding boundaries at Dukes Meadow Drive and the tree line forming the boundary of existing developments. Direct breach of Councils commitments to protect the rural setting of the CA. Development would adversely impact the CA of the village and destroy the semirural setting. CDC should not be considering sites north of Banbury. development must not be allowed on this site. Site has not shown to be sustainable. Site is unacceptable on a number of key planning and conservation grounds.</p> <p>Development of the site would leave just metres between the site and the edge of Hanwell CA which would not be shielded from the site by any natural border as exists with the trees which hide the Banbury 5 development. Development of the site breaches clear, defensible urban boundaries created by the Dukes Meadow Drive development. Effectiveness of a green buffer is yet to be explained need to know how the boundary alterations will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary and how it will protect Hanwell village. Development of the site will seriously erode and completely destroy the "strategic" physical gap in open countryside. Insufficient consideration has previously been given to the fundamental effects of the erosion on the overall rural setting and character of the small conservation village. Assessing the narrowing of the gap in purely visual impact terms misses the point; the greatest impact is on the rural character of the area. Impact on Hanwell CA - 2007 CA appraisal clearly sets out why development should be rejected. Development to the south of Hanwell will effectively join the CA with Banbury which is unsympathetic to the rural setting and destroys the semi-rural nature of the CA; Hanwell must be protected from this as stated in the 2007 CA Appraisal. Development which is visually intrusive of affects the CA setting must be avoided. The proposed site does not protect the setting of the CA. Developing Hanwell upto Babury is not retaining significant open spaces and field systems around the village/CA. Development of this scale will have a harmful impact on the overall quality of the landscape in the open countryside north of Dukes Meadow Drive; it does not protect or enhance it. It is vital to protect Hanwell village and its rural setting from urbanising development. Unclear how the various green buffers will be achieved and there appears to be no provision for wider landscape mitigation or protection. Further development will seriously impact light pollution and the publicly funded community observatory. Development has caused the loss of best quality farmland; Hanwell has been studied to review soil fertility and crop suitability which shows importance of the quality of farmland surrounding Hanwell. The site is relatively remote from key facilities and will encourage more car usage which will impact transport infrastructure. Against undesirable piecemeal development. additional housing will put additional strain on existing infrastructure, particularly through the village and the village already suffers from serious problems from heavy traffic usage.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Hanwell	<p>Instead of building more housing north of the urban limits of Banbury, there should be extensive tree planting undertaken to help offset emissions from Banbury and the nearby heavy traffic at Hennef Way. Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal has been achieved at cost - many market towns and villages have been changed beyond recognition, threatening the rural character. Nearly 20,000 houses planned for the Oxford Green belt which removes countryside access, coalesces villages and puts the setting of the historic city at risk. Urbanisation has stressed natural drainage and added to flood risk in the area. UK already imports 45% of its food. Land is a scarce resource that we need for climate change mitigation for planting of trees and hedgerows.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 1	<p>The suggested vision is strong. Opening sentence lends support to protection of villages. Appropriate prominence should be given to the goal of ensuring the distinctive natural and built environment and rich historic heritage is cherished, protected and enhanced; this goal should be ranked higher in the vision to indicate its importance. The importance of protecting what is special about Cherwell must be taken in to account when considering proposals that expand larger towns in to the countryside and directly threaten historic rural villages and communities.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 2	<p>KO23 - If further housing sites are accepted north of Banbury this would merge Hanwell and Banbury which would be a direct conflict with KO23 as it would not conserve the setting and character of Hanwell.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	<p>The Village Playing Field, off Muddy Lane, Hanwell and Field between Park Farm and the Castle Grounds, Hanwell are proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 18	<p>The urban area of Banbury has seen considerable housing building over the last 30 years and provided a substantial proportion of CDCs overall housing provision. The topography and landscape means that development is not reaching the natural limits. Too much development to the north of the town already and that further development north would threaten the fragile open strategic gaps between Banbury and the conservation villages of Hanwell and Drayton; the individual rural setting and character of the village of Hanwell and its CA would be permanently destroyed by further housing.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 19	<p>Preference is Option 2. The urban area of Banbury has seen considerable housing building over the last 30 years and provided a substantial proportion of CDCs overall housing provision. The topography and landscape means that development is not reaching the natural limits. further emphasis for greenfield sites should be in the southern parts of Cherwell such as Bicester. However there should be renewed efforts to regenerate brownfield sites in Banbury and its centre.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 30	<p>Option 1.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 31	<p>Option 1. Hanwell itself is not a category of village that should allocate specific sites.</p>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 32	<p>Both matters should be taken in to account together with the need to preserve the identity of historic villages. Other factors to consider- for villages near towns, the availability of services associated with urban settings and the accessibility to the urban areas can increase following previous expansion of those towns. It would be wrong for this accessibility to move such villages up the rural settlement hierarchy since this would be detrimental to the preservation of their identity discrete from the neighbouring urban area</p>

LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 33	Option 3. The natural capital assets north of Banbury's edge should be used to further enhance the rural economy and to conserve and protect vital landscape and woodland that is regionally important not just to agriculture, tourism and leisure but for wellbeing and mental health
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Question - Settlement	Boundaries should be used for villages and towns. This can prevent towns expanding too close to existing villages and so preserve the countryside <b>buffer between settlements. Boundaries in villages should be applied to restrict their expansion as a measure to preserve natural capital and countryside</b>
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Option 34	Both options. Strongly promote the conservation and protection of the countryside where it will protect Hanwell's character and identity. Planting trees north of Banbury would help to combat climate change on a local scale and continue to provide access to the countryside for local residents.
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Provide finance to allow the preparation of a neighbourhood plan.
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Question - Development Management Policies	A formal clarification and policy on "green buffers" would explain the approach in respect of maintaining buffer zones between towns and villages; this should build upon the Sept 2013 report ENV04 Banbury Green Buffers as used in the 2011-2013 evidence base. Such a policy would greatly clarify the framework under which future decisions are made in respect of the expansion of towns into the countryside. Green buffers would prevent development extending beyond the settlements to such an extent that the identity of the individual settlement is lost, development coalesces and valuable countryside is lost. The policy would be essential to protect important gaps, preventing development which would harm character. Such a policy would be especially valuable where development is proposed on land that is currently described as "permanent green buffers"
LPR-B-337	Hanwell Parish Council	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. there is an equal duty to protect the conservation area for the historic heritage of neighbouring settlements. There should be a policy to protect views of other significant Places of Worship. An update of Policy C34 should apply to ancient Places of Worship such as St Peter's Church in Hanwell. This church can still be viewed from open countryside in the south, which is a vista that has been protected for many centuries. This is especially <b>important now as it is under threat from the latest proposals for more housing development north of Banbury</b>
LPR-B-338	Mary Whatman	Hanwell	Object. Residents were assured the Hanwell would not be engulfed into the Banbury conurbation. Hanwell is in a conservation area and has significant historical relevance that shouldn't be destroyed by greed of developers. The village does not have the infrastructure for a larger population. Through traffic between the Southham and Warwick roads already causes chaos. The village is also surrounded by productive farmland and valuable wildlife habitats.
LPR-B-339	Michael Whatman	Hanwell	Object. Residents were assured that there would be no further encroachment of Banbury towards Hanwell village. It is an old village with a 12th century church and the road through the village would not cope with extra traffic the proposal would produce. Hanwell has no infrastructure apart from a public house, there are no services for an increased population. The wood to the south side of Hanwell is the site of century old fishing ponds now dry and planted with mature trees. This is full of a wonderful variety of flora and fauna that would be decimated with a larger local population.
LPR-B-340	Trevor Trivett	Adderbury	Object. The proposals take no account of the Neighbourhood Plan developed for Adderbury. Adderbury has taken a huge rise in housing development over the last few years with little or no increase in employment prospects or village amenities. Traffic through the village has increased dramatically and further housing would exacerbate this. Additional housing would inevitably increase schooling requirements. There is already a problem with 16+ children being denied transport to the secondary school in Bloxham. Its time for the local authority to stand up to developers and honour the conditions of approved Neighbourhood Plans.
LPR-B-341	Mario Pascoe	LPR-A-175	Object. The proposed development will significantly impact on the traffic on A361, particularly through the narrow and dangerous stretches within Wardington. The proposed increased number of residents and therefore traffic around junction 11 of the M40 will require a bypass, which could use one of the parcels of land identified for houses or a further widening of the A361 which will impact existing roadside properties significantly. The blind and narrow turns and very poor quality roads will need considerable improvement to accommodate increased traffic using Wardington village and particularly Thorpe Road as a short-cut between the A361 and B4525. The inappropriate extension of the village boundary/infrastructure changes all aspects of current village life. Wardington has very limited amenities and public transport. The use of a car is essential for day to day life. Any increase in population will stress the current amenities and add to road traffic and congestion. Current infrastructure within the village is not equipped to deal with current village needs with sewer, water (current poor pressure), broadband, electrical outages and roads (pot holes and eroded verges) all requiring significant improvement. The latest Wardington Conservation Area Appraisal from Cherwell District Council highlights: 'the appraisal process enables the special character and appearance of Wardington can continue to be identified; thereby ensuring that any future development preserves or enhances that identified special character'. It is hard to see how the development will meet the Cherwell District Council management plan, how the proposal will not significantly change the village or village life beyond recognition or how without significant infrastructure projects will not cause significant detriment to Wardington village, its inhabitants old and new and those who have to travel through or around Wardington.

LPR-B-342	Sarah Triandafilidis	LPR-A-104	<p>Object. No existing access in for proposed site - new access will require substantial new road construction along with pedestrian walkways. No obvious place for new road layout, as at the end Chapel Close the road narrows to a bridleway which will restrict two-way traffic measures. Limited space for pavement on the bridleway which effects the safety of users. Chapel Close is already affected by storm flood water run off. The site is equally a sloping site with a lake/large pond which will require indepth assessment into the drainage/soakaway requirements. The site is subject to flooding from the nearby Thames sewage water plant. The plant is at full capacity and is unlikely to cope with additional housing sewerage. Impact to local Wildlife will be significantly affected by any development. Any development would result in a significant increase to light pollution affecting both the environment and wildlife. Environmental costs of construction associated to new infrastructure will be greater than other proposed sites which offer more immediate access and uses existing infrastructure Clifton is small hamlet that has no existing amenities apart from the local pub to support its current community. Clifton is a rural community with no or limited infrastructure to support the safe access to neighbouring villages such as Aynho or Deddington. Clifton offers no bus service to connect it's residents to other communities therefore any development will increase the number of vehicles on roads which are already heavily populated. The main road through Clifton linking Deddington and Aynho is difficult to navigate through and at times is reduced to a single lane carriageway, increased dwellings would exacerbate the situation. It is recognised that the proposal is at a preliminary stage, that said, I do not consider the site suitable for future development considering the high environmental and infrastructure impact it will have on the current residents of Clifton, when more suitable sites are readily available and pose less of an impact to the environment or the wildlife habitat.</p>
LPR-B-343	Steve Triandafilidis	LPR-A-104	<p>Object. No existing access in for proposed site - new access will require substantial new road construction along with pedestrian walkways. No obvious place for new road layout, as at the end Chapel Close the road narrows to a bridleway which will restrict two-way traffic measures. Limited space for pavement on the bridleway which effects the safety of users. Chapel Close is already affected by storm flood water run off. The site is equally a sloping site with a lake/large pond which will require indepth assessment into the drainage/soakaway requirements. The site is subject to flooding from the nearby Thames sewage water plant. The plant is at full capacity and is unlikely to cope with additional housing sewerage. Impact to local Wildlife will be significantly affected by any development. Any development would result in a significant increase to light pollution affecting both the environment and wildlife. Environmental costs of construction associated to new infrastructure will be greater than other proposed sites which offer more immediate access and uses existing infrastructure Clifton is small hamlet that has no existing amenities apart from the local pub to support its current community. Clifton is a rural community with no or limited infrastructure to support the safe access to neighbouring villages such as Aynho or Deddington. Clifton offers no bus service to connect it's residents to other communities therefore any development will increase the number of vehicles on roads which are already heavily populated. The main road through Clifton linking Deddington and Aynho is difficult to navigate through and at times is reduced to a single lane carriageway, increased dwellings would exacerbate the situation. It is recognised that the proposal is at a preliminary stage, that said, I do not consider the site suitable for future development considering the high environmental and infrastructure impact it will have on the current residents of Clifton, when more suitable sites are readily available and pose less of an impact to the environment or the wildlife habitat.</p>
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Call for Sites Promotion - Heyford Park	Heyford Park is promoted for housing. The representation includes a concept plan and a context plan for Heyford Park showing the proposed SRFI.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 1	<p>The suggested vision is broadly supported. The context for the vision is provided not only by the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, but by the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and in accordance with the NPPF. The vision is comprehensive and covers many issues. Heyford Park is mentioned in the vision (point 13) in the context that, along with other areas of planned growth, it will benefit from enhanced community facilities, sustainable transport links and other infrastructure investments required to support existing and new neighbourhoods. However, the role of Heyford Park in the settlement hierarchy should be acknowledged, it is a more sustainable location than given credit for. Heyford Park is providing a role equivalent of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, as it functions not only as a sustainable settlement, but also functioning as a service centre for the surrounding villages. Heyford Park provides a range of services in retail, healthcare, education and employment so that neighbouring village do not need to travel to Bicester. Heyford Park is the only settlement outside Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington that has a secondary school. There are opportunities for green energy at Heyford Park and the nearby waste to energy plant. The growth at Heyford Park was recognised by the Minister. Dorchester has a track record of not only building houses, but establishing vibrant, popular and dynamic new communities, with an emphasis on upfront social infrastructure and design solutions. Dorchester also has a track record of delivering infrastructure early in the scheme. Further development at Heyford Park will continue the strategy of co-location of employment and residential provision and will support the sustainability of the location.</p>
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 2	<p>The objectives should be capable of being monitored as mechanism to assess whether the plan is "on track" to meet the vision. Whilst not necessarily a comment on the objectives of the Plan, it is important that the Plan is clear on the relationship to the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and its policies. The Oxfordshire 2050 Plan is a joint statutory spatial plan. Once adopted, the Plan will form part of the Development Plan for all of the districts in Oxfordshire. The Local Plan can contain strategic and non-strategic policies and as set out in the NPPF, but as set out in paragraph 21, plans should make explicit which policies are strategic policies. Non-strategic policies should set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods and types of development, including allocating sites. Paragraph 6.7.1 of the Local Plan review confirms that the plan will contain a mix of strategic and non-strategic policies and that it will be important to distinguish these policies</p>



LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 3	Cherwell Local Plan review needs to reflect the strategy from Oxfordshire 2050 and Oxford-Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework, and develop a consistent approach to the delivery of employment land. The Local Plan strategy should reflect the “knowledge spine” and implement the Oxfordshire LIS. The OGNA states that central Oxfordshire, including the Knowledge Spine (including Oxford City and Fringe) is expected to remain a significant driver of economic activity. Heyford is in the area identified as the “Knowledge Spine North” Figure 7 of the Oxfordshire Local Industry Strategy (LIS) Proposed network of global hubs and international clusters includes Heyford Park. The emphasis is on sustainable development, the NPPF states that planning policies should set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to LIS and other local policies for economic development and regeneration (para 82) and reflect the locational requirements of different sectors and be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan. As part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan review it is noted that the Council have commissioned a Cherwell Employment Land and Needs Assessment (September) which has made a number of recommendations. Heyford Park in the adopted Local Plan was allocated for residential led mixed uses as enabling development to secure environmental improvements and conservation of the heritage interest of the site associated with its former use as a Cold War military base. There continues to be further scope at Heyford Park to accommodate future needs in the plan period to 2040 and in the period of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan on both brownfield and greenfield land. A combination of the options at the most sustainable locations should be the basis of the local plan strategy in accordance with the NPPF and the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 and the OxfordCambridge Arc Spatial Framework.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 4	When identifying sites for employment land, these should be provided consistent with the NPPF and the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 and the Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework. Heyford Park is identified in the options to accommodate growth in the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. It is already identified in the Oxfordshire LIS as part of the network of global hubs and international clusters in Oxfordshire. Land at Heyford Park continues to provide the opportunity for both residential and employment development in what is a highly sustainable location. The Local Plan review should provide the policy framework to ensure this employment location is supported and extended in order to continue to attract inward investment into the District and to provide new training and employment opportunities. Heyford Park provides a wide range of commercial property opportunities with over 1,300,000 sq ft of commercial accommodation. The accommodation is made up of warehousing, workshops, lab space and offices ranging from 700 sq ft to 30,000 sq ft. Heyford Park has established itself as one of Oxfordshire’s leading business parks, attracting a broad range of occupiers from both the private and public sectors. The park is home to over 100 established businesses that employ over 1,200 people. The proposed Creative City at Heyford Park, will provide for the film, media sector, it has the clear potential to attract extensive inward investment into the District. As this facility grows and develops, the cumulative benefits it provides will generate further spin-off benefits for other businesses more widely across the surrounding area. The intention is that Heyford Park can accommodate sectors important to the Oxfordshire economy as set out in the Oxfordshire LIS 2020, this should be reflected in the emerging Cherwell Local Plan. The Local Plan should also recognise that there are also opportunities for green technology and transport which can support existing businesses. Heyford Park has the potential for higher levels of containment given the provision of employment and residential development and opportunities to secure 20 minute neighbourhoods. The attached draft concept plan illustrates that approximately 5,000 dwellings and 5,500 jobs (approximately 110,000sqm) can be accommodated at Heyford Park to meet Oxfordshire 2050 needs.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Supporting Employment	Further residential and commercial development can be accommodated at Heyford Park. A policy should be included in the Local Plan to support the opportunity to strengthen existing clusters. A policy should also be included to support a containment strategy where housing and employment growth can be accommodated in close proximity, this strategy should be prioritised as is strongly supports sustainable development and reflects the climate change agenda.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 5	The role and function of Heyford Park as an emerging service centre should be reflected in policy in the Local Plan. The facilities and services at Heyford Park support not only the residents/employees of Heyford Park, but also those from the neighbouring villages. Further development at Heyford Park of retail and leisure uses will increase the inward trips and support the sustainable centre of Heyford.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	Services at Heyford Park have continued to grow in support of the residential and employment provision on site and also supporting the neighbouring villages. Providing facilities for Heyford Park and neighbouring villages is therefore supporting sustainable development, reducing the need to travel to the other towns for facilities and services.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	There is a need for flexibility in the provision of facilities and services. Dorchester Group would encourage the Council to undertake a regular review of business rates, to achieve a more equitable yield across Cherwell district. The changing role of the High Street should be recognised as it provides more than the sum of its parts in terms of a place shaping/experience etc, this could be reflected in business rates to support the valuable role the town contributes to the sense of place/place shaping. The approach at Heyford Park so far, has focused on bringing forward a mix of provision, retail, hotel, bowling alley, cycle shop and café to provide an attractive offer and so that Heyford Park becomes a “destination” in its own right.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 6	The % levels for affordable housing should be kept the same as in the Local Plan, but recognising that the same % should be applied to Heyford Park as it is to Banbury and Bicester, thereby recognising Heyford Park’s role in the settlement hierarchy and the extent of affordable housing that has been provided to date. Heyford Park has continued to deliver at 30% affordable housing, delivery has moved forward at a pace and has not deviated from the headline figure of 30%. Looking to the future there is scope to accommodate further residential and employment development at Heyford Park, and a delivery rate of 30% affordable housing is envisaged. The delivery of affordable housing and the mix of tenures for all stages of life and socio economic groups is an important part of the housing delivery model for Heyford Park. Heyford Park is providing to be a good centre for a mixed economy and aiming to provide housing so that people can life on site whatever their needs throughout their lives. The mix of housing is an important aspect of maintaining the community.

LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 7	The question does not reflect the adopted Local Plan Policy BSC3. Option 2 is preferred, but it should be recognised that tenure mix could affect the quantum delivered. The policy should be drafted so that there is some flexibility to address different circumstances.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 8	The Policy for space standards should be consistent with Government Guidance.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Separation Distances	The PPG provides guidance on how planning authorities can gather evidence to set optional requirements and the nationally described space standard. The Government set out its policy on the application of these standards in decision making and plan making in a written ministerial statement, which also withdrew the Code for Sustainable Homes. In other authorities these issues are addressed in for example residential design guides and such matters of detail may be covered in an SPD which expands upon policies in the plan showing how they will be implemented. The approach to separation standards should allow for some flexibility and support the objective of using land efficiently (paragraph 124 of the NPPF) especially in the context of climate change. Separation distances can be addressed by good design.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 9	A consistent approach relying on Building Regulations is preferred.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Housing Policies	The Local Plan should only include those policies which are appropriate and consistent with the NPPF. National Planning Policy Guidance exists on Self build and custom housebuilding. A review of storey heights, would ensuring efficiency of land uses, whilst also recognising the need for flexibility in some circumstances.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 10	Sustainable Construction is best addressed through building regulations so that a national approach is applied. The Government has confirmed that improvements to energy efficiency in new homes are most likely to come through building regulations, but at the same time the Government has indicated that Councils can continue to set local targets for reductions in emissions. The policies in the Cherwell Local Plan should be led not only by the national guidance, but by the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. In the recent consultation on the Reg 18 Oxfordshire 2050 Plan the preferred policy approach is to define an Oxfordshire-wide definition for net zero carbon design and construction for development in Oxfordshire which will assist in achieving the county's objectives. Such an approach would also ensure consistency between the various district local plans. The emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan also states that the preferred approach to sustainable design and construction is to include in the Oxfordshire Plan a policy setting out sustainable design and construction requirements to be applied to major residential and non residential developments within Oxfordshire; this policy would be subject to viability and deliverability testing. A countywide approach is preferred.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	The Local Plan policy should reflect the NPPF and PPG and in summary the approach to retrofitting of historic buildings should be to safeguard the fabric and enable the building to function with an appropriate use. At Heyford Park there has been an emphasis on re-use/re-purpose buildings on site where possible into employment use. This area will utilise the existing HAS structures on the former base by refurbishing the existing structures as well as providing new employment buildings, which will be separated from the HAS structures. There are further opportunities to reuse/repurpose buildings on site for commercial use
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 11	The emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan states that in order to achieve a net zero carbon energy balance within the county there is a need to significantly increase the proportion of renewable electricity generated within the county. The approach adopted in the Cherwell Local Plan needs to sit within the framework set out by the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and compliment the strategy. There are several renewable energy elements that could be delivered at Heyford Park including solar. For example, there are opportunities for possible solar use on the flying field, producing local sustainable green energy; it is possible that Heyford could become a net contributor powering not only its own development, but also exporting to the surrounding area. This opportunity cannot be produced on the edge of Bicester or Banbury.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	The Cherwell Local Plan review refers to the fact that there are a suite of strategic policies in the adopted Local Plan that are aimed at mitigating and adapting to climate change. These policies will have been formulated in the early part of the last decade and are consequently in need of review in line with the NPPF and PPG other relevant government guidance. As the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan is in preparation this should provide the overall strategic approach to many of these issues and the framework for any local policies that are considered necessary and can be justified. It is important that a consistent approach is applied and matters are not duplicated at a local level.

LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 12	The emerging Oxfordshire Plan proposes ambitious targets above the national requirements to support the importance of nature's recovery and to improve environmental quality throughout the county. The Plan proposes a 20% biodiversity net gain, providing a countywide framework for all the local authorities to work within. This approach is intended to support Oxfordshire's efforts to support nature's recovery and an attempt to redress some of the past losses to biodiversity. A consistent approach throughout the county is supported. Dorchester Living is proposing further development at Heyford Park in response to the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan, increasing the areas within the existing site and with additional development to the south, whilst retaining a buffer to Caulcott. In terms of the policy approach to be included in the local plan, where designations are proposed there needs to be a flexible approach to mitigation, this must involve discussions with landowners. One of the challenges of developing on brownfield sites is that often the baseline is higher than greenfield sites, there is a conflict with trying to maximise the efficient use of the site whilst also addressing biodiversity. It is challenging whilst ensuring the effective use of land in accordance with the NPPF paragraphs 119, 124 and 125 and addressing biodiversity net gain. Brownfield sites are often more diverse than farmland, in which case it may be more appropriate to seek contributions towards a county/district biodiversity scheme whereby many development proposals can contribute to securing a larger area of Biodiversity Net Gain which can be enjoyed by future generations.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 13	The emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan outlined the Preferred Option which seeks to use the draft Nature Recovery Network to shape the policies and define the spatial strategy and determine the spatial distribution of development in the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan, reflecting the commitment to strengthening ecological networks and delivering biodiversity net gains and building resilience to climate change, recognising the importance of the county's habitats, natural resources and landscapes in supporting biodiversity, connecting habitats and supporting nature's recovery. Paragraph 5.7.10 of the Cherwell Local Plan review refers to the mapping of Oxfordshire's natural capital undertaken by the University and supported by the Council. The consultation document then states that the Council will apply this approach to help develop policies in the local plan where for example, it will be used as a means of informing where development is located so that the Council protect the most valued areas, and locating uses where they would have the greatest benefit. Whilst in principle the approach proposed in the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan is supported, there are some difficult decisions to make when the three zones of the NRN are mapped. The three zones cover the entire county of Oxfordshire, so it is not clear how such an approach affects the development of brownfield sites and the emphasis on the more efficient use of land to minimise the use of greenfield sites. The Draft Nature Recovery Network for Oxfordshire does not mention brownfield sites. It is considered that a county wide approach to some form of offsetting should be applied to allow optimization of brownfield land that comes forward for development which is usually more biodiverse than farmland. Our concern is how the approach to Natural Capital is compatible with accommodating growth consistent with the wider agenda. Consideration should be given to the role of mitigation and where this can be applied rather than seeking to prevent/restrict development. The policy approach in the Cherwell Local Plan needs to be consistent with the Government agenda and policy framework in the NPPF and the PPG.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	The framework for the policies on biodiversity and the natural environment is provided by the NPPF and the PPG and by the approach taken in respect of the policies included in the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan, so long as they are consistent with national guidance. The preferred policy approach is for an Oxfordshire wide Policy e.g. flood risk, the preferred approach is to provide a planning framework for managing flood risk in Oxfordshire, local plans could then provide further detail as appropriate. A county wide or in this case district wide approach to some form of offsetting should be applied to allow optimization of brownfield land that comes forward for development which is usually more biodiverse than farmland and which could achieve so much more for the wider community.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 14	No. 1 is preferred, but with some flexibility so that consultation can take place with local communities to ascertain their thoughts about what is needed in terms of play facilities. There also needs to be some flexibility about the type of provision e.g. play with nature and factor in health and wellbeing. All these are important points to consider in the place shaping of the community.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 15	The policy approach in the Local Plan should be consistent with the NPPF and PPG and be supported by an evidence base/assessment of need/provision. Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites is the preferred approach to sports provision as part of the development of strategic sites. Similar to the provision of play areas there is a need for consultation and to ascertain what is locally important.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	The overall context is protecting the historic environment, this involves sensitive and appropriate development, no necessarily to prevent development. At Heyford Park the historic and cultural heritage of the site has been fully embraced within the ongoing development of the site, with the creation of a central heritage parkland, interpretation of Heyford Park's story and investment into key structures across the site. The same approach would be adopted when considering future development opportunities of the site, with appropriate and relevant protection and enhancement of features which contribute to the ongoing understanding of the historic and cultural heritage of the site in the local, national and international context. The heritage is an important component of the evolving development and the creation of a dynamic places, considering reuse, <del>re-purpose of the buildings and the site, introducing new element to be complementary</del>
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The experience at Heyford Park shows the balance that can be achieved between heritage and new design and reflects that a design code is not always necessary to shape a place, instead a flexible approach considering all the issues and engagement with the local community has created an attractive sustainable place. Dorchester has a track record of not only building houses, but establishing vibrant, popular and dynamic new communities, with an emphasis on upfront social infrastructure and design solutions.

LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods are supported, these have been seen to work well at Heyford Park because of the provision of employment and residential development, retail and leisure and education facilities and services creating and supporting place shaping community.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The approach proposed in the review is too narrow and does not recognise potential opportunities such as the SRFI and anticipated investment in road improvements. Dorchester are promoting passenger rail which should be taken into account. In future higher growth targets could be linked to rail provision. Heyford Park represents opportunities for increasing containment where residential development takes place alongside employment growth such as reducing the need to travel and the creation of 20 minute neighbourhoods. There is the potential for modal share to shift to towards greener, more sustainable active forms of transport and for more private vehicles to be removed from the roads Through internalisation of trips. These outcomes would be consistent with the Oxfordshire 2050 vision.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 16	Digital infrastructure should be provided as standard with developments.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Transport Policies	The transport policies in the Cherwell Local Plan should be consistent not only with the NPPF, but also with the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and the County's Local Plan Transport Plan "Connecting Oxfordshire"; but avoiding duplication/repetition of policies covered elsewhere.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 17	The preparation of a new IDP is supported to identify the infrastructure needed to support the Plan's proposals. There is no need to update the methodology given that this could be a source of delay in the provision of infrastructure. Once sites are appraised and allocated the expectation should be that the developer delivers on site infrastructure and public bodies deliver off site infrastructure. <b>The IDP should allow the Council to deliver the offsite infrastructure improvements on a district basis increasing delivery</b>
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Any policies on infrastructure should be consistent with the NPPF and the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 Plan.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 29	There is scope for significant further sustainable development to be accommodated at Heyford Park, by extending the current development boundary of the site and by developing suitable brownfield areas. This can be undertaken through a phased approach. The re-use of brownfield and underutilised land to achieve a more efficient use of land and to minimise the use of new greenfield land is supported. In order to maximise the amount of brownfield land, this requires continual reassessment of the constraints and opportunities that can arise from the brownfield sites. Heyford Park demonstrates such sustainable credentials with approximately 1,000 dwellings that are occupied and a wide range of employment uses in place, many looking to expand. There is scope to develop the land to the south of Heyford Park beyond the boundary of the site, whilst sensitively redeveloping some of the areas of brownfield land within the site. Land at Heyford Park can be considered to meet the future needs arising in Cherwell as a result of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and depending on the scale of growth to be accommodated in Oxfordshire 2050, the site could meet some of the needs from neighbouring authorities. The wider transport improvements would be complimentary to the Heyford Park. Further development in the short term at Heyford Park, should be considered as organic growth providing further support for public transport services, while in the long term possibly related to the SRFI at Ardley and a passenger halt, development could result in a change in terms of the level of development, this could be transformational for the area and consistent with paragraph 106 of the NPPF 2021. The location of Heyford Park has already demonstrated that it is a sustainable community. The new masterplan created a pioneering opportunity in Heyford's history to provide true accessibility to the heritage of the airfield for local residents. The additional homes allowed for greater improvements to Heyford's social infrastructure, ensuring a sub-hub status for the local community can be cemented by providing more amenities. Heyford has the opportunity to grow existing and emerging business clusters. There are opportunities for energy production. Further development at Heyford Park will continue the strategy of colocation of employment and residential provision and will support the sustainability of the location. Given the ratio of jobs to dwellings and the further development in the area there is the potential for modal share to shift to towards greener, more sustainable active forms of transport and for more private vehicles to be removed from the roads Through internalisation of trips. These outcomes would be consistent with the Oxfordshire 2050 vision. The application of urban design objectives will ensure a high quality layout is achieved whilst the identification of the constraints and opportunities will ensure that the proposals are sensitively assimilated on the site and into the surrounding landscape and urban fabric. The historic and cultural heritage of the site has been fully embraced within the ongoing development of the site, The same approach would be adopted when considering future development opportunities of the site, with appropriate and relevant protection and enhancement of features which contribute to the ongoing understanding of the historic and cultural heritage of the site. Development at Heyford Park has been promoted with the support of local residents, local politicians and officers at Cherwell. Heyford Park is adjacent to the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI). The development and movement network at Heyford Park is already designed around the use of active travel modes The transport links to surrounding areas will prioritise sustainable travel modes. Streets will be designed to encourage walking and cycling. There will be easy access from the new dwellings to bus services and key transport hubs. By encouraging active travel between areas of residential development and employment etc this has both health benefits and also reduces the carbon footprint. Further development at Heyford Park provides the opportunities to support the Plan's approach. There will be adequate charging facilities and other infrastructure provided with the Heyford Park, development for individual houses and for the public areas. An objection is made to the high level assessment in the Interim SA. It is not clear on what basis the assessment has been made. There is a clear lack of any evidence to justify the arbitrary scoring. It is considered that there are statements and assumptions about Heyford Park included in the SA that are wholly inaccurate and misconceived. It is assertions and not evidence based and the whole document is misleading.

LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 30	The approach towards housing in the rural areas should be based upon the NPPF. The Local Plan should limit the amount of development to meet local needs, and housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 31	In order to reflect the NPPF and the PPG, the Local Plan should include a combination of 1 and 2.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 32	The settlement hierarchy should be reviewed. Since the Local Plan was adopted Heyford Park has developed and now functions as a sub hub. It not only provides a range of facilities and services for those living and working in Heyford Park, but also for neighbouring villages. Its form and function and role is distinctive and should be recognised alongside Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington in the Local Plan Review. The review provides the opportunity to recognise the role Heyford Park has in the wider locality and the opportunities to accommodate future growth.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Option 34	The approach to the historic and natural environment should be consistent with the NPPF in particular in respect of the historic environment paragraph 190.
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Heyford Park is the centre of one of the largest neighbourhood plans in England. Working in an active partnership on the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan assisted Heyford Park and the neighbouring villages, and enabled active issues to be discussed. The relationship with the neighbouring villages continues irrespective that the Neighbourhood Plan has been made
LPR-B-344	Pegasus OBO Dorchester & New College	Question - Development Management Policies	The policies need to be considered in light of the higher tier strategic plan. The policies included in the Local Plan should not duplicate policies in the Oxfordshire Plan, but add value. The Development Management policies need to be capable of effective implementation to assist in the development process. All policies should be clear on purpose and how they will be monitored
LPR-B-344	Jayne Gordon	Hanwell	Object. Cherwell District Council not only plagiarised the name of this 800year old village within many other developments, but also totally disregarded its promise and commitment to protect Hanwell from urban encroachment. When Hanwell Fields was developed, it was promised by the council that Dukes Meadow Drive is where it would all stop, which was effectively the top of the 'Banbury Bowl' to the north. Cherwell District Council broke its promise to Hanwell Village and allowed further development to the north of Banbury, beyond Dukes Meadow Drive. By way of some kind of poor 'compensation' the District Council yet again committed to protect Hanwell Village from becoming a part of Banbury by not allowing development to the north beyond the 'substantial' tree line that is merely two fields away from the conservation area of Hanwell. The district council is now considering further development to the north of Banbury, breaching the tree line that protects Hanwell Village from being merged with Banbury. This is neither acceptable nor democratic behaviour. The encroachment of Banbury on the village has brought about a huge increase in traffic in the village; an unacceptable level of light pollution for a rural community; evidence of drug use, litter and constant streams of people walking from the housing estates around the village day and night. Not to mention the significant increase in fly tipping along the lanes between the main roads and the villages. The fields around Hanwell are home to an extremely diverse population of wildlife and plant species. The old, carefully managed hedgerows, copses, spinneys and fields around the village teem with animals, insects and plants. In light of climate change, how can it be considered moral to continue to put our district, and our planet, at risk. There is an abundance of brownfield sites that can be developed. I have been led to believe that the question of further development to the north of Banbury has only reared its head due to an error on the part of the council in submitting its response to its higher bodies. I sincerely hope that this is not the case.
LPR-B-346	Mark Gerold	Adderbury	Object. I appreciate that you put notice of this consultation onto your website and informed the Parish Council, there appears to have been no other publicity about such an important process underway. It is clear many were unaware of this consultation. I appreciate that CDC has a housing supply target to fulfil but I hope that you will not deliver this at the expense of the villages which are a key part of Oxfordshire. I realise that not all these proposals will be adopted. However, even a limited amount would significantly change the character of the village which I thought would be protected. Most of the land parcels seeking allocation within Adderbury do not align with the objectives in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031. Even the smallest parcels (LPR-A-077) seem incredibly opportunistic and potentially very damaging. A total of 109.28 acres of proposed residential development land in the Adderbury Parish Profile. Looking at the similar plans, the proposals for Banbury total 264.06 acres and Deddington a mere 38.03 acres. When you look at the size of Banbury (50,000 population) compared to Adderbury (3000), the total land proposals for our village at 41% of those sought for Banbury, highlights the massive imbalance and implications of these proposals. I would expect landscape protection, particularly views of St Marys Church, the conservation area status of much of the village, the limited amount of local supporting infrastructure and unsuitability of access roads will be considered when assessing. I would hope that CDC will take seriously into account the significant impact upon the village should a large amount of land be allocated. The aims of CDC are clearly set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. It would be a dreadful legacy for CDC to allow such a huge increase in population that would take place. I really would struggle to see how any would meet the above stated objectives. I would be grateful to receive your guidance as to whether there will be further consultation and if so how you suggest the residents of Adderbury should best present their views.

LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	General	The main consultation paper, flyer and poster, provide a clear and succinct summary of what the plan will include, how this stage fits into the process and how feedback, emerging evidence and government/national planning policy and more local policy will help to inform the local plan. I congratulate you on the use of plain English, particularly in the poster and flyer. 'Image of the future' (Vision); 'the ideas to shape new planning policies' (objectives) and 'choices available for shaping and directing development' (options). The use of a QR code is also a step in the right direction in achieving a user- friendly, digital planning system. The consultation document, it provides a good balance between more traditional themes and issues of local plans, e.g. heritage asset protection and meeting housing needs, and highlighting more recent issues, concepts, concerns and emerging policy/context, such as climate action, Biodiversity Net Gain, natural capital and design codes. We welcome cooperative working, not least because for many issues a District boundary is arbitrary, but because proposals or a particular policy approach in one local plan can have implications for adjoining areas. For example, proposals have been put forward for sites near to West Oxfordshire, e.g. Blenheim/Pye Homes proposals for 4501000 home development immediately to the east of Woodstock. I request that we could be involved in discussions on such issues and sites. Page 39 definition of Gypsies and Travellers. Typo in c) 'resuming', rather than 'residing'. Page 40. Question on housing policies. By way of example, support for alternative methods of construction is identified. These are important to consider but should be for all types of development, not just homes. It is good to see that a Health Impact Assessment is being undertaken.
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 1	All three of your overarching themes are justified and we support their identification.
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	General	Sections 2.1 and 2.2 Provide a useful summary of the national context to the plan, particularly the uncertainty as a result of both emerging national policy and the long terms results of COVID19. It might have been useful here to have identified the national/international context of climate change. Section 3 provides a useful context, with a particular emphasis on economic growth, so it is not surprising that the first theme of the three overarching themes identified for the Local Plan is 'Maintaining and developing a sustainable local economy'
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 1	Overall this is a vision that appears to relate well to the national and local context and the feedback received so far. Given subsequent references in the paper to reduce inequality, specific reference could be added to the second paragraph of the vision to read: '... delivers a healthier, fairer, more prosperous...'. Point 4 could be broadened – it is not just homes that need to be energy efficient and well designed. Points 10 and 11 of the vision should perhaps give recognition to landscape and biodiversity being part of a wider network
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 2	KO 1 sets out that sufficient land will be allocated for Cherwell's housing and employment needs but It may be appropriate here to provide flexibility to accommodate any potential unmet housing needs arising elsewhere. KO 5 relates to the rural economy. A useful addition could be '... ensuring effective and sensitive management of the natural environment.' KO 1019 - welcome and support these objectives, including those related to net zero carbon, natural capital and active travel. KO 13 includes reference to pollution. In the same way that KO 17 says '(particularly water efficiency)', it would be useful to add to KO 13 '(including air and water quality)'. KO 20- welcome the recognition of the need to address all sector's housing needs, including those of the travelling communities. (Typo – ageing)
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 3	Reference is made to an Employment Land and Needs Assessment and a town centre and retail study. It will be interesting to see the findings of these studies. We would welcome the opportunity to be involved, particularly to get a better understanding of the possible impacts of the pandemic and the changes to the Use Classes Order and to Permitted Development Rights. Given specific reference to the green economy in the vision, I would have expected coverage of this in the employment section.
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 5	Reference is made to an Employment Land and Needs Assessment and a town centre and retail study. It will be interesting to see the findings of these studies. We would welcome the opportunity to be involved, particularly to get a better understanding of the possible impacts of the pandemic and the changes to the Use Classes Order and to Permitted Development Rights.
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 6	As with West Oxfordshire, I am not surprised there is a focus on affordable housing, both in terms of rates and tenure, in the housing section of the document. This is welcomed.
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 10	A question is posed on the introduction of specific housing standards. The government has had concerns in the past about the use of local standards which means it is especially important to have evidence to support the approach
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 13	Given the recognised ecological emergency and the emerging 25 Year Environment Plan, I would encourage you to have strong and robust policies to help address the issues, including on the Nature Recovery Network, biodiversity net gain (BNG), biodiversity off-setting, natural capital approach and ecosystems services. Requiring a natural capital assessment and achieving a high level of BNG is supported. As you may know, we are proposing a 25% BNG through the Salt Cross Garden Village AAP.
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 14	While formal facilities can provide an important community resource, the benefits of considering play and sport in its widest sense (and not just for children), including as part of a multifunctional green infrastructure network, is being increasingly emphasised, e.g. by Sports England.

LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 15	While formal facilities can provide an important community resource, the benefits of considering play and sport in its widest sense (and not just for children), including as part of a multifunctional green infrastructure network, is being increasingly emphasised, e.g. by Sports England. We welcome the emphasis given to placemaking and good quality design and the introduction of the concepts of beauty and 20-minute neighbourhoods. We welcome and support the use of the transport hierarchy. (NB Oxfordshire County Council have approved a new Street Design Guide). As with West Oxfordshire, the need for the timely provision of supporting infrastructure is a particular concern locally. Given the pressing need, it is important that the wider context of social and environmental benefits of infrastructure and the contribution of infrastructure schemes to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping and a sustainable economy are considered.
LPR-B-347	West Oxfordshire Council	Option 27	There is a substantial area of West Oxfordshire that abuts and is influenced by Cherwell District, the area of potential greatest change is likely to be that close to Kidlington. It is important that consideration is given to the relationship of Kidlington proposals and policies to, in particular, Woodstock and Bladon, and vice versa- for example, the transport connectivity along the A44, the proposed Park and Ride and the use of the emerging Hanborough Hub at Long Hanborough railway station. We support the identified strategic green corridor running on the western side of the A44 from the A40 through to Bladon and Blenheim Place.
LPR-B-348	Judy Hine	Sibford Gower	This is a greenfield site, good agricultural land on the edge of a village with poor public transport, and with no existing drainage infrastructure on the site. The roads in and around both Sibfords are already unfit for the increased amount of traffic that would result from a housing development. The Council should be aiming to reduce dependency on the car as a mode of travel to reduce carbon emissions and they should be limiting the growth of small villages. The proposed development site would, if given permission to build, double the size of Sibford Gower, putting pressure on the Primary School and causing an increased volume of traffic, as residents would need to drive to both places of employment and to shops- the Sibfords have low local employment opportunities and the Gower has no shop. housing developments should be limited to existing brownfield sites
LPR-B-349	Lucy Wells	LPR-A-077	The proposals, contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Indeed, sufficient land has already been allocated in the district to meet predicted demand for the next 13 years. development on these sites expressly contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. These locations contradict both the current Local Plan Policy and contradict the Key Objectives of the CDC Local Plan Review and therefore the proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development should be dismissed. The proposal does not support KO8; The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. This risk is not only to children, the elderly, pedestrians and cyclists from a sheer volume perspective but clear links with increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development of this land would also be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. Proposals do not align with SO12 or KO 9: Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development on these sites would be contrary to Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA and as such, according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. The proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development would result in the loss of the remaining open space to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and therefore should be dismissed. . The proposals do not support KO 23: The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury.

LPR-B-350	Peter Wells	LPR-A-077	<p>The proposals, contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Indeed, sufficient land has already been allocated in the district to meet predicted demand for the next 13 years. development on these sites expressly contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. These locations contradict both the current Local Plan Policy and contradict the Key Objectives of the CDC Local Plan Review and therefore the proposal to allocate land at LPRA-077 for residential development should be dismissed. The proposal does not support KO8; The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents.</p> <p>This risk is not only to children, the elderly, pedestrians and cyclists from a sheer volume perspective but clear links with increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development of this land would also be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. Proposals do not align with SO12 or KO 9: Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development on these sites would be contrary to Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. This area should remain free of substantial new build structures. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA (Conservation Target Area – Other Sites) and as such, according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. The proposal to allocate land at LPRA-077 for residential development would result in the loss of the remaining open space to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and therefore should be dismissed. Proposals do not support KO 13 or KO 16: Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Further residential development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. The proposals do not support KO 23. The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury.</p>
LPR-B-351	Jane Hudson	LPR-A-175	<p>Strongly objects. Proposal is inappropriate. Proposal would be out of scale with the existing village and detrimental to its character. Important services such as Horton General Hospital maternity unit and primary schools are less accessible from this northern end of Oxfordshire. The site would conflict with the potential route for a future bypass. The A361 is constricted and already causes traffic problems; further development either side of the A361 near J11 of the M40 would increase heavy traffic. The road through the village already has traffic difficulties which would be made worse by the proposed development; the road cannot be easily widened without damage to the conservation area. The village could accommodate minor/infill development but the proposed development of some 300-400 homes would swap the village and damage the conservation area.</p>
LPR-B-352	Jacynth Back	Milcombe	<p>Objects to proposals in the village. Land proposed in the centre of the village is a much valued greenfield site providing a RoW, grazing for horses and occasional sheep, wildflower meadow, popular and safe dog walking space. Field adjacent to Paradise Lane contains horses, a RoW, is used for village fetes, and provides access to walking routes. The site can flood in winter months. Site is located next to an Listed Building; development of the site would result in loss of these attributes. All other proposed sites in the village are on greenfield agricultural land surrounding the village; if approved the village would be overwhelmed and would result in further drainage problems and increased traffic</p>
LPR-B-353	Peter and Jane Cooper	Option 30	<p>Presenting these two options as the only alternatives is unsatisfactory. It is impossible to understand the implications of option 1. It is unclear what the definition of local needs will be and on what basis they will be assessed. Option 2 is prescriptive and appears to take no account of existing residents' views and wellbeing. Therefore an additional option is required. In this option development of rural areas would give great weight to the existing character and size of the village and the wellbeing and life style of the thousands of existing residents.</p> <p>The rural communities of Bloxham, Adderbury, Bodicote and Hanwell have already provided large areas of what was once rural land for development and become a suburban sprawl. This greenfield development has been partially at the expense of not developing brownfield sites. Brownfield sites at high density can be affordable, increase the vibrancy of urban centres and reduce the need for car transport, so contributing to a more sustainable life. If the villages are to retain their rural character it is important that housing development is proportionate to the size of the village and should not alter its nature. Appropriately located infill allows for the sensitive growth of communities</p>



LPR-B-353	Peter and Jane Cooper	North Newington	Comments provided in relation to developments in the village. LPR-A-135; could be considered infill development. It does not significantly alter the footprint of the village. In contrast LPR-A-004 is a 'backland' location and would extend the village well beyond its existing boundaries and significantly change the skyline of the village and its setting within the rural environment. The need for a significant road development and the construction of potentially 20-30 houses will have a major impact on the village. Over 20 houses back directly onto this site and a similar number look out over it. These residents would see their property devalued and their privacy and well-being adversely affected. If all the proposed sites in the parish are developed then the parish housing stock would rise by over 100%. Even when the Broughton Road site is excluded the increase in housing stock within the village will be at least 30%. If only Plot LPR-A-135 is developed the increase would be a very proportionate 10-12% of housing stock within the existing footprint of North Newington village. The village has a narrow through road with many parked cars and is already heavily used by traffic from other villages. The narrow pavement is not continuous throughout the village and makes safe walking difficult in many places. Water pressure within the village is often low and the current electricity supply has been insecure at times. Storm drains are not coping with the heavy rain. the bus service has been withdrawn, walking or cycling to Banbury are not sensible options as there is no safe route. North Newington has no regular, established public transport routes and safe cycling and walking routes to work, school, shopping and leisure activities, residents have to rely exclusively on cars. This makes significant development within the village unsustainable in a green environment. Access to the M40 and Banbury train station is becoming more and more difficult because of the increased traffic resulting from the westward expansion of Banbury.
LPR-B-353	Peter and Jane Cooper	Option 31	Option 3 seems most appropriate whereby the Local Planning Authority and Parish council work together to make informed decisions. However for this to work effectively there would be need to be formally agreed procedures that allowed for proper and genuine consultation of residents and Parish councils. CDC's approach to consultation over its Local Plan Review has been extremely poor; Parish Council was not informed until 27 October with accessing and reading the complex documents needed and responses required by 10 November. This is a wholly unsatisfactory time period and calls into question the genuineness of the consultation. Whilst I understand the desire for a paperless process, so far attempts to get paper copies have not been successful which has led to many (particularly older) residents feeling their views are not really being sort.
LPR-B-353	Peter and Jane Cooper	Option 32	Support Option 2 which suggests that rural development should mainly take place where there are regular, established public transport routes and safe cycling and walking routes to work, school, shopping and leisure activities. Before considering what weight to give to certain services and facilities it is important to ensure that the existing infrastructure of each village is resilient enough to cope with any new development (roads, pavements, power, water, sewage, drainage, electricity and broadband). This resilience should be tested. An additional criterion for a rural settlement hierarchy is that the nature and character of the village should not be significantly affected by the development. Put simply the village should mainly look and feel the same before and after the development. This is particularly important where a development abuts a Conservation Area
LPR-B-353	Peter and Jane Cooper	LPR-A-004	North of Broughton Road - This development comes within the Parish boundary so should be considered as part of the housing increase for North Newington although it does not directly impact on the character of the village. It will increase the traffic on the Broughton Road and storm water will run off the development and worsen the flooding that often occurs on the Broughton Road. South of Shutford Road and Main Street - strongly of the view that this backland development is not supported by the policy in the current local plan and will have a negative impact on the village. It entails a significant development outside the existing footprint of the village and is on rising ground so visually it will overpower many of the cottages on Main Street within the conservation area.
LPR-B-353	Peter and Jane Cooper	LPR-A-135	Providing the scale and type of development proposed is suitable we would see this area as appropriate infill as it sits within the village footprint. Before any site is agreed for development a proper testing of the resilience of the infrastructure should take place
LPR-B-354	Susan and David Davies	LPR-A-064	3000 houses will swap the village and result in urban sprawl of Kildington. Will result in increased traffic and add to pollution. A proposed bypass to the west would have to cross land that regularly floods for long periods of time and would also have to cross the railway line. It will have to be built high enough to clear these areas and be a blot on the beautiful landscape. A bye pass to the east would be a more considered option from the A34 across to Wheatley Road. A bye pass would increase traffic and not necessarily stop traffic going through the village. All of the plans involve building on the GreenBelt. Any building works in the dead end Mill Street would be problematic; resulting in road blockages with deliveries. There is a brownfield site (the oil dump) in the village which would be more suitable. New traffic management with lights is being trialled in Islip and hopefully may have an effect on those using the village as a rat run. The plan would destroy Islip as a village and decrease the quality of life here.
LPR-B-354	Susan and David Davies	LPR-A-124	3000 houses will swap the village and result in urban sprawl of Kildington. Will result in increased traffic and add to pollution. A proposed bypass to the west would have to cross land that regularly floods for long periods of time and would also have to cross the railway line. It will have to be built high enough to clear these areas and be a blot on the beautiful landscape. A bye pass to the east would be a more considered option from the A34 across to Wheatley Road. A bye pass would increase traffic and not necessarily stop traffic going through the village. All of the plans involve building on the GreenBelt. Any building works in the dead end Mill Street would be problematic; resulting in road blockages with deliveries. There is a brownfield site (the oil dump) in the village which would be more suitable. New traffic management with lights is being trialled in Islip and hopefully may have an effect on those using the village as a rat run. The plan would destroy Islip as a village and decrease the quality of life here.

LPR-B-354	Susan and David Davies	LPR-A-221	3000 houses will swap the village and result in urban sprawl of Kildington. Will result in increased traffic and add to pollution. A proposed bypass to the west would have to cross land that regularly floods for long periods of time and would also have to cross the railway line.It will have to be built high enough to clear these areas and be a blot on the beautiful landscape. A bye pass to the east would be a more considered option from the A34 across to Wheatley Road. A bye pass would increase traffic and not necessarily stop traffic going through the village. All of the plans involve building on the GreenBelt. Any building works in the dead end Mill Street would be problematic; resulting in road blockages with deliveries. There is a brownfield site(the oil dump) in the village which would be more suitable. New traffic management with lights is being trialled in Islip and hopefully may have an effect on those using the village as a rat run. The plan would destroy Islip as a village and decrease the quality of life here.
LPR-B-354	Susan and David Davies	LPR-A-223	3000 houses will swap the village and result in urban sprawl of Kildington. Will result in increased traffic and add to pollution. A proposed bypass to the west would have to cross land that regularly floods for long periods of time and would also have to cross the railway line.It will have to be built high enough to clear these areas and be a blot on the beautiful landscape. A bye pass to the east would be a more considered option from the A34 across to Wheatley Road. A bye pass would increase traffic and not necessarily stop traffic going through the village. All of the plans involve building on the GreenBelt. Any building works in the dead end Mill Street would be problematic; resulting in road blockages with deliveries. There is a brownfield site(the oil dump) in the village which would be more suitable. New traffic management with lights is being trialled in Islip and hopefully may have an effect on those using the village as a rat run. The plan would destroy Islip as a village and decrease the quality of life here.
LPR-B-354	Susan and David Davies	LPR-A-227	3000 houses will swap the village and result in urban sprawl of Kildington. Will result in increased traffic and add to pollution. A proposed bypass to the west would have to cross land that regularly floods for long periods of time and would also have to cross the railway line.It will have to be built high enough to clear these areas and be a blot on the beautiful landscape. A bye pass to the east would be a more considered option from the A34 across to Wheatley Road. A bye pass would increase traffic and not necessarily stop traffic going through the village. All of the plans involve building on the GreenBelt. Any building works in the dead end Mill Street would be problematic; resulting in road blockages with deliveries. There is a brownfield site(the oil dump) in the village which would be more suitable. New traffic management with lights is being trialled in Islip and hopefully may have an effect on those using the village as a rat run. The plan would destroy Islip as a village and decrease the quality of life here.
LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	LPR-A-002	Express strong opposition.Development of the areas outlined would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of the present infrastructure especially the roads and major junctions which are already bottlenecks at rush hour. particularly concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems.There is reason to manage the rate at which small villages such as Adderbury become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community.
LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	LPR-A-077	Express strong opposition.Development of the areas outlined would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of the present infrastructure especially the roads and major junctions which are already bottlenecks at rush hour. particularly concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems.There is reason to manage the rate at which small villages such as Adderbury become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community.
LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	LPR-A-081	Express strong opposition.Development of the areas outlined would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of the present infrastructure especially the roads and major junctions which are already bottlenecks at rush hour. particularly concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems.There is reason to manage the rate at which small villages such as Adderbury become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community.
LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	LPR-A-086	Express strong opposition.Development of the areas outlined would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of the present infrastructure especially the roads and major junctions which are already bottlenecks at rush hour. particularly concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems.There is reason to manage the rate at which small villages such as Adderbury become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community.
LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	LPR-A-146	Express strong opposition.Development of the areas outlined would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of the present infrastructure especially the roads and major junctions which are already bottlenecks at rush hour. particularly concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems.There is reason to manage the rate at which small villages such as Adderbury become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community.
LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	LPR-A-156	Express strong opposition.Development of the areas outlined would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of the present infrastructure especially the roads and major junctions which are already bottlenecks at rush hour. particularly concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems.There is reason to manage the rate at which small villages such as Adderbury become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community.

LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	LPR-A-218	Express strong opposition. Development of the areas outlined would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of the present infrastructure especially the roads and major junctions which are already bottlenecks at rush hour. particularly concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. There is reason to manage the rate at which small villages such as Adderbury become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community.
LPR-B-355	Mr and Mrs AP Hartwell	Adderbury	Residents in rural areas are seeing a continued loss of green spaces and the elimination of wildlife corridors. Some of the areas designated for housing could be used more sustainably for local renewable energy system development – making the villages themselves more sustainable and helping to achieve Net Zero. Prior to the pandemic many of the new residents on developments in Adderbury were commuters. There has been no evidence of increases in local employment. There is no evidence that SME housebuilders have benefited from recent developments in Adderbury – quite the contrary. Transport is a major issue for rural communities – efficient public transport systems in towns can minimise the need for vehicle ownership but this is not possible in rural areas. Victorian sewage system is already struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have, over many years, managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and hence the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems during the more frequent periods of heavy rainfall. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas.
LPR-B-356	Paul Westgate	Bodicote	Objects to development south of Bodicote. seems counterproductive to destroy an area of countryside and the wildlife and amenity that it provides when the canalside development has not even been started. This should be completed before other more damaging construction is considered. The canalside development has numerous advantages: 1. It is already built on; 2. It is in need of regeneration; 3. It would not destroy wildlife or countryside; 4. It would reduce the use of motor vehicles due to its proximity to the town centre; 5. It is within walking distance of the bus and train stations; and 6. It would benefit town centre businesses
LPR-B-357	Ivan Tyrrell	Sibford Gower	Strongly oppose any large scale development. Sibford Gower is a quiet, pleasant village surrounded by beautiful countryside. Already an enormous growth of housing imposed on surrounding villages and towns; no need for any more. The location suggested, which is on valuable agricultural land, would massively increase the amount of traffic in the area. Furthermore the village does not have the infrastructure to service a large increase in population
LPR-B-358	Julian Murphy	LPR-A-104	Site is inappropriate for development. There is little infrastructure to support an increase in the population of Clifton. There is a pub but no other amenities; no buses so transport would entail increased car usage. Access down Chapel Close is narrow and restrictive for current residents due to parked cars and delivery vehicles. An increase in car use would add to the parking problems. The site access would need to be positioned so as not to badly affect the peace of the existing houses at the end of Chapel Close. No room for a pavement for more pedestrian use. More houses would have added strain on service vehicles such as bin lorries. More vehicles would add to the noise in Clifton and Chapel Close. Clifton would lose its identity as a quiet rural village. Additional housing in Clifton would put added strain on Deddington Health Centre and the local school. Flooding is already an issue from storm water, which damages the road surface. Sewerage floods from adjacent sewerage works have affected the Manor Barn area.
LPR-B-359	Sharon Tomkinson	Bloxham	Strongly object to proposed new sites in the village. Development would further extend the village to link up to Banbury and its surrounding villages resulting in damage to the countryside and quality of life for residents and wildlife. If Bloxham gets bigger it will lose its very essence that makes it a village. Village would be unable to cope in terms of infrastructure and traffic levels with more dangerous roads and higher pollution levels. Key reasons to object to further development in Bloxham include- schools at maximum capacity, sewerage cannot cope with existing requirements, narrow central roads already constrained resulting in hazardous conditions for pedestrians, doctors and dental services are at capacity, wildlife should be protected and heavy traffic will result in noise pollution.
LPR-B-359	Sharon Tomkinson	LPR-A-100	Very against the proposed development. directly negatively impact the character of the village, its wildlife, Church views and the graveyard, and disrupt ancient pathways across fields which have for generations linked the villages. Existing new developments are already very dense in the village by rural standards and it is imperative we preserve what remaining rural wildlife and countryside we have around them. An obvious increase in usage of rural paths and fields during pandemic lockdowns as an example has brought the need to contain these areas for positive mental health of residents and preserve countryside/wildlife/outside space that is accessible to villagers - not to mention a small effort around climate change.
LPR-B-359	Sharon Tomkinson	Bloxham	object to the Cherwell Council Local Plan - and the potential land developments over and above those over the last decade that are already having a negative impact on the village. This would include immediate surrounding developments - Milcombe, Milton etc as these residents will depend on Bloxham providing services and travel routes - which it can no longer sustain. These have been put forward as issues year after year for the last decade the Council needs to push back and no longer accept so many planning applications and restore some semblance of rural and quality of life for those paying their taxes.
LPR-B-360	Oliver Foley	LPR-A-091	object to proposals. Bodicote area has undergone significant development in recent years and the village cannot accommodate more houses without significant change to the existing roads and infrastructure.

LPR-B-361	Sarah Smith	LPR-A-041	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. The proposals work in total oppositon with the aims of the local plan, Oxfordshire plans and Governement plans in relation to retaining green space, fighting climate change, supporting natural wildlife and eco systems and supporting mental health and well being which has been significantly impacted by the pandemic. children are unable to walk to school because of the speed of traffic along the Milton Road. The safety and quality of life of residents in Adderbury is already at serious risk and further development in the village would be wholly detrimental to the residents.</p>
LPR-B-361	Sarah Smith	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPRA-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. The proposals work in total oppositon with the aims of the local plan, Oxfordshire plans and Governement plans in relation to retaining green space, fighting climate change, supporting natural wildlife and eco systems and supporting mental health and well being which has been significantly impacted by the pandemic. children are unable to walk to school because of the speed of traffic along the Milton Road. The safety and quality of life of residents in Adderbury is already at serious risk and further development in the village would be wholly detrimental to the residents. site would also be completely inappropriate for affordable (social) housing as is too remote and isolating for anyone living there. There are poor transport links - with long distances needed to be travelled to do anything. There are no real local employment opportunities. As a result it would only increase car usage and dependency and increase traffic and pollution.</p>
LPR-B-361	Sarah Smith	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. The proposals work in total oppositon with the aims of the local plan, Oxfordshire plans and Governement plans in relation to retaining green space, fighting climate change, supporting natural wildlife and eco systems and supporting mental health and well being which has been significantly impacted by the pandemic. children are unable to walk to school because of the speed of traffic along the Milton Road. The safety and quality of life of residents in Adderbury is already at serious risk and further development in the village would be wholly detrimental to the residents.</p>

LPR-B-361	Sarah Smith	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. The proposals work in total opposition with the aims of the local plan, Oxfordshire plans and Government plans in relation to retaining green space, fighting climate change, supporting natural wildlife and eco systems and supporting mental health and well being which has been significantly impacted by the pandemic. children are unable to walk to school because of the speed of traffic along the Milton Road. The safety and quality of life of residents in Adderbury is already at serious risk and further development in the village would be wholly detrimental to the residents.
LPR-B-361	Sarah Smith	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. The proposals work in total opposition with the aims of the local plan, Oxfordshire plans and Government plans in relation to retaining green space, fighting climate change, supporting natural wildlife and eco systems and supporting mental health and well being which has been significantly impacted by the pandemic. children are unable to walk to school because of the speed of traffic along the Milton Road. The safety and quality of life of residents in Adderbury is already at serious risk and further development in the village would be wholly detrimental to the residents.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 2	Climate change is a priority
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 3	Options 1, 2 and 3 but primarily option 2.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 4	Option 3 a mixture but limiting the retail to urban locations / town centres
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Supporting	Improving internet connections so that people can work more flexibly from home.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 5	Option 2 - Other community and leisure uses should be considered before turning into residential development.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	A policy of at least 1 hour of free parking for all CDC car parks.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 6	Surely Banbury and Bicester need more social housing rather than less?
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 7	Choice 1
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 8	Choice 1
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	Yes - there should be minimum separation distances between properties

LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 9	1, but it should be for all new homes, not just a proportion
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Travelling Communities	No specific locations are available with Caversfield.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 10	Choice 3
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	The whole issue needs a review. We must move on into the 21st century and historic buildings must be part of this. An example of this was in the Garden Quarter in Caversfield where it was insisted that the original 1940s aluminium windows had to be maintained and not replaced with new double glazed units, but unsightly, internal secondary glazing could be installed. Surely new 21st century units which were fit for purpose would have been a much better solution to modern living.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 11	2: you need a criteria-based policy in order that you can identify and allocate the sites.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	The whole of the Green Belt should be reviewed as it is not now fit for purpose. While the Green Belt might protect Oxford and the villages surrounding it. Any villages surrounding the larger towns in Cherwell are totally unprotected from coalescence
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 12	Choice 1
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 13	Choice 2
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 14	Choice 3
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 15	A mixture of choices 1 and 2
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	Sites off Springfield Road and Rau Court have been previously designated for recreational use. When the MoD owned them, both sites used to have children's play areas, however these were removed by the new land owners. These areas should be reinstated and are of significant importance as green lungs for the village. Two site location plans have been supplied. A small area designated as a Village Green in Old School Close is extremely important.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes. But, not sure how the principles would work in villages with very few facilities.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes, agree with approach. Yes, the approach should be different for rural areas with much more support to help reduce individual car travel. Until the technology catches up with personal requirements, it is very difficult to consider other measures. Electric cars are a great idea, but are still prohibitively expensive; the infrastructure also needs greater consideration in rural areas.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 16	While it is imperative that digital infrastructure is future-proofed, the Parish Council does not have the knowledge or experience to answer this
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Reinstatement of the Bicester Magistrates' Court and Job Centre would reduce car travel from Bicester.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 22	Choice 2. Coalescence must be reduced between the town and the surrounding villages.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 23	None of the above on green field sites. Only brown field sites should be selected.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 24	Neither suggestion. Some minor conversion would be acceptable, but not to the detriment of the business of the high street shops. A mix of shops, leisure and community use with meeting spaces would be ideal
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 25	Surely you need to have a criteria-based policy to be able to identify the specific sites?
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	They should not be built on at any cost, but should have regular funding assistance.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car dependency in Bicester	Proper cycle lanes and a decent bus service. Medical services should be centrally provided and easily accessible.

LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 30	Choice 1
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 31	Choice 1. However, the Parish Council does not believe there are any sites within Caversfield for allocation.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 32	The current policy is working well for Caversfield and would wish to remain a Category C village.
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 33	Choice 3
LPR-B-362	Caversfield Parish Council	Option 34	a combination of both.
LPR-B-363	Andy Sorrell	LPR-A-086	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. The site is completely landlocked and would require significant roadworks to support a site of this scale this would have devastating and irreversible impacts on residents and wildlife. The site would also be completely inappropriate for affordable (social) housing as is too remote and isolating for anyone living there. There are poor transport links - with long distances needed to be travelled to do anything. There are no real local employment opportunities. As a result it would only increase car usage and dependency and increase traffic and pollution. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-363	Andy Sorrell	LPR-A-041	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-363	Andy Sorrell	LPR-A-146	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-363	Andy Sorrell	LPR-A-218	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-363	Andy Sorrell	LPR-A-258	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply

LPR-B-363	Andy Sorrell	Adderbury	Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011; a 21% increase in housing when the recent appeal at Berry Hill Road is factored in. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Several of the sites put forward would result in the narrowing of the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Several of the proposed sites, if developed in their entirety, would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site); two sites have capacity for over 400 homes and one could accommodate 1800 homes; more than doubling the number of homes in the village itself. Adderbury's infrastructure in terms of roads and services are at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village, making it more of a rat run. The Christopher Rawins primary school would not be able to accommodate the proposed level of housing. Additional traffic would add to the existing air pollution in the area; particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, which is also in close proximity to the local primary school. Development on the greenfield sites would have a destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats. Concerned about the effects that water run-off from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths. These routes are all popular with walkers and local families, and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates is going to render them substantially less safe and pleasant to use. Substantial additional development will further diminish the dark skies. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade mirrors or exceeds the rate and scale of development of the past ten years, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, completely undesirable and unsustainable way.
LPR-B-364	Bluestone for Mr & Mrs Hockaday	LPR-A-185	Respondent lives in a Grade II listed farmhouse on the boundary of site LPR-A-185. Land circa 150m to the north of the respondents property has outline permission for up to 1000 dwellings and other development. Should the LPA-A-185 site, be brought forward the respondents dwelling will become encompassed by residential development, engulfing their home into Banbury Town and removing the rural character which their listed dwelling has sat within since its erection. The potential connection of the site to the north with outline permission with the submitted site would affect Wykham Farmhouse's setting, views and historic character. This is especially due to the lack of screening along the western boundary of Wykham Farm, which if lined with planting, would obscure the outlook to which the listed building has always enjoyed. Wykham Lane is not suited to accommodate the level of additional vehicles proposed and is not wide enough or capable of being widened without removal of biodiverse hedges.
LPR-B-364	Bluestone for Mr & Mrs Hockaday	LPR-A-116	Respondent lives in a Grade II listed farmhouse on the boundary of site LPR-A-185. Land circa 150m to the north of the respondents property has outline permission for up to 1000 dwellings and other development. Should the LPA-A-185 site, be brought forward the respondents dwelling will become encompassed by residential development, engulfing their home into Banbury Town and removing the rural character which their listed dwelling has sat within since its erection. The potential connection of the site to the north with outline permission with the submitted site would affect Wykham Farmhouse's setting, views and historic character. This is especially due to the lack of screening along the western boundary of Wykham Farm, which if lined with planting, would obscure the outlook to which the listed building has always enjoyed. Wykham Lane is not suited to accommodate the level of additional vehicles proposed and is not wide enough or capable of being widened without removal of biodiverse hedges.
LPR-B-364	Bluestone for Mr & Mrs Hockaday	Option 18	development to the south of the town as denoted by point 2, is resisted to ensure that the rural landscape which bounds both sides of Wykham Lane is maintained.
LPR-B-364	Bluestone for Mr & Mrs Hockaday	Option 19	point 2 and 3 are more preferable, to ensure that no further urban extensions into the open countryside surrounding Banbury are undertaken, especially to the south.
LPR-B-364	Bluestone for Mr & Mrs Hockaday	Option 2	Key Objective 5 is strongly supported. Key Objectives 14 and 15 are supported in full. Key Objective 23 gains strong support.
LPR-B-365	Ria James	Hempton	Objects. The new proposed plans will obstruct countryside views. The village already has many traffic accidents, and congestion on the roads. The speeds driven on the roads has resulted in many pet casualties. Infrastructure in the village cannot cope currently, no amenities in the village which will result in more congestion in local village shops. Protected species are located in the village and their environment should be given consideration. There are no affordable houses available.
LPR-B-366	Anna Sorrell	LPR-A-086	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. The site is completely landlocked and would require significant roadworks to support a site of this scale this would have devastating and irreversible impacts on residents and wildlife. The site would also be completely inappropriate for affordable (social) housing as is too remote and isolating for anyone living there. There are poor transport links - with long distances needed to be travelled to do anything. There are no real local employment opportunities. As a result it would only increase car usage and dependency and increase traffic and pollution. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply



LPR-B-366	Anna Sorrell	LPR-A-041	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-366	Anna Sorrell	LPR-A-146	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-366	Anna Sorrell	LPR-A-218	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-366	Anna Sorrell	LPR-A-258	site falls outside of the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. ironic contradictions of the objectives of the increased housing - e.g. retaining green spaces, fighting climate change and supporting natural wildlife and eco systems, residents' mental health and wellbeing, destruction of existing public footpaths used by local residents for walking and cycling. proposed plans clearly do not enhance the vitality of the village of Adderbury- they will only contravene the very economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the plans. increasing the housing population at this proposed rate is unrealistic, unhealthy for residents and unsustainable for the existing and potential infrastructure in the area. Not to mention it will utterly destroy the natural beauty the village currently has. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply
LPR-B-366	Anna Sorrell	Adderbury	Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011; a 21% increase in housing when the recent appeal at Berry Hill Road is factored in. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. several of the sites put forward would result in the narrowing of the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. several of the proposed sites, if developed in their entirety, would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site); two sites have capacity for over 400 homes and one could accommodate 1800 homes; more than doubling the number of homes in the village itself. Adderbury's infrastructure in terms of roads and services are at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village, making it more of a rat run. The Christopher Rawins primary school would not be able to accommodate the proposed level of housing. Additional traffic would add to the existing air pollution in the area; particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, which is also in close proximity to the local primary school. Development on the greenfield sites would have a destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats. concerned about the effects that water run-off from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths. These routes are all popular with walkers and local families, and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates is going to render them substantially less safe and pleasant to use. substantial additional development will further diminish the dark skies. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade mirrors or exceeds the rate and scale of development of the past ten years, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, completely undesirable and unsustainable way.

LPR-B-367	Savills for Tilstone Ltd	Option 21	Respondent owns a significant area of land within the Banbury 1 allocation. The respondent notes the production of an SPD by the Council for the Canalside site has stalled and that latest LDS estimates suggest at least 2023 until an SPD is progressed. the text of Option 21 clearly looks to re-cast the net in terms of what the main focus for Canalside should be – i.e. either residential led, or a more flexible approach of commercial and residential mixed use area. Although it is not explicit, the third part of Option 21 seems to suggest some sort of approach that might involve setting up an Enterprise Zone using a Local Development Order, akin to that which has operated very successfully at Milton Park at Didcot since 2012, giving permitted development rights to the landowners and operators in order to fast-track development. The latter provides an especially interesting opportunity that the respondent would like to discuss further with the Council in advancing the policy approach for the new Local Plan. Based on Tilstone’s experience and portfolio of property, the commercial uses within our area of Canalside are stable and successful. Contrary to the narrative in the consultation document at paragraph 6.2.20, in respect of Tilstone’s land at least, there is not a high rate of turnover. The respondent welcomes the opportunity to review the balance of commercial space, and the focus for regeneration, based on viability and employment needs, and to consider the potential benefits of an Enterprise Zone in line with the second and third points set out in Option 21. The landowners are keen to work in partnership with the Council and agree that a more flexible approach to the area could deliver a range of high quality commercial space and homes, create jobs and improve local environmental and traffic conditions.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 1	supports the suggested Vision; appears to be well aligned with that of the overarching Oxfordshire 2050 Plan, including proposed action on achieving climate action targets. keen to explore what is meant at point 12) of the draft Vision in regard to how the main settlements in the District are proposed to be ‘reshaped and adapted’ to maintain their roles as attractive, vibrant, retail, cultural and social centres for communities and visitors, and how this interrelates to other larger service level settlements, and those that are well connected to the main towns. interested to understand the scope of the studies noted at para 1.3.4, and how the work has been framed, as soon as details are available
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 2	The Key Objectives all appear supportable, as principles, but they could benefit from rationalisation and reduction in number. The most important objectives, in our view, relate to; focusing the development, of required housing, jobs and training facilities, in sustainable locations, that are well connected to services and facilities, and thereby supporting existing and future communities; providing high quality and well-designed environments; and promoting net zero carbon and highly sustainable construction standards.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 3	The consultation document comments on the need for CDC to review the adopted 2015 Local Plan strategy, which has been ‘urban-focused’, and that the new approach will be partly informed by the 2050 Plan. Brownfield sites will continue to be an important contributor to employment land, but the degree to which that land can absorb the expected levels of growth is key, and previous studies of Cherwell’s available brownfield land have presented significant limitations. A review of the settlement hierarchy also seems sensible to recalibrate and understand the carrying capacity of settlements, their relationship within the wider spatial options that will fall from the 2050 Plan, and the important link between the location of jobs and houses in order to support sustainable pattern of living. Although a main focus for employment land is likely to be best aimed at the main urban centres, some rural and village locations, especially those adjoining existing employment sites, will continue to provide important opportunities for jobs in the more rural areas. We note that CDC has commissioned an Employment Land and Needs Assessment, to complement the OGNA, and we would need to see the details of that assessment in order to comment further.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 4	suggest that the approach to identifying employment land should recognise the need for a mixture of business spaces , as per 3) above, as well as the importance of improved physical, training and digital infrastructure that is needed to support this.Part of the offer will need to include flexible business space, including that associated with local community hubs, and where people can be part of local employment networks without having to travel away from their local area.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 5	Increased flexibility is implicit in the Government’s recent changes to the Use Classes Order and Permitted Development Rights, and the need to manage the effects of changing retail patterns. We do recognise the continued importance that retail, leisure and tourism play in town centre economies, including historic towns, and that these will need protection.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 6	As per 2) Trinity College considers that the percentage splits should be kept the same, but be subject to future review of viability, as the introduction of changes to Part L of the Building Regulations and the Future Homes initiative will have an adverse impact. Ultimately we need more information around the viability evidence and an understanding of how this can relate to policy aspirations for affordable housing provision.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 7	it is difficult to comment without the evidence base, but Trinity College considers that it is reasonable to retain the same tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Plan. Nb. There is an error in the question as the 30% figure relates to intermediate housing
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 8	do not support the imposition of a policy to require nationally described space standards, for any dwellings.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - Separation Distances	No. The imposition of minimum separation distances would be arbitrary, and not take account of local conditions and design ingenuity. We suggest that there are better ways of ensuring good design that is neighbourly and protects amenity, through compliance with the principles of the National Model Design Code and any local design code or SPD that is in place.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 9	Advocate 2) – continuing to rely on the Building Regulations.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - Housing Policies	consider that there is no need for a policy relating to Modern Methods of Construction – and that it would be more appropriate to let the market resolve this, in the context of meeting other sustainability requirements and legislation

LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 10	Section 5.5.7 of the consultation document highlights that the Government will shortly amend the Building Regulations to improve the energy efficiency of new homes. This new Future Homes Standard should ensure that all new homes-built from 2025 will produce 75-80% less carbon emissions than homes delivered under current regulations. The Government is also proposing to consult on a Future Building Standard which will look at, amongst others, measures to improve the energy efficiency of nondomestic buildings. Therefore advocate 2) – letting the Building Regulations set the standards.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 11	welcome support for renewable energy generation – but do not have specific recommendations for policy.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	consider that these matters are best dealt with through the Building Regulations
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 12	Trinity College considers that the opportunity to make the best contribution to BNG would be across the District, as identified in 3) – but that it also needs to be capable of being consolidated in order to make the best contribution to habitat and biodiversity. The College would therefore also support targeting areas where there is a real chance of achieving something beneficial, where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts, and that 2) is therefore also appropriate. The College has also proposed land in the Call for Sites, at Canal Lane, Banbury (LPRA-152), adjacent to the Longford Park Phase 2 scheme, which could be made available for Biodiversity off-setting.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 13	Without a standardised methodology for Environmental Net Gain, it will be extremely difficult to measure and prove at this point. Moreover, until the Environment Bill becomes statute, and the measures in that legislation are translated into the NPPF and guidance for plan-making and decision-taking, it is difficult to make an objective comment on this question. The industry needs to get to grips with BNG before moving onto the next step. For this reason we suggest that, presently, the answer should be 3) – not to require natural capital assessment.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	considers that the target for Biodiversity Net Gain should be 10%, in line with the Government target.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 14	would support a more flexible approach, as per 3). We have encountered difficulties in previous schemes, where the rigid application of the existing CDC policy and standards has limited the ability to deliver a more logical, efficient and effective provision of play space
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	This can be best supported by avoiding ambiguity between National Model Design Code and local codes/guidance, thus providing developers with certainty.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principles, and in proposals for existing allocations and developments at Drayton Lodge has supported masterplans which provide walkable neighbourhoods with key community facilities and services within easy reach
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - Transport & Connectivity	agrees with the proposed transport and connectivity approach. We support the aims of moving towards a net zero transport network and agree that spatial planning has a clear role in supporting a decarbonised transport system. Sites such as those being promoted by Trinity College at Wroxton and on land north of Drayton Lodge Farm, which lie on main public transport routes and near to Banbury, have the opportunity to make a significant contribution to this agenda, compared to more isolated sites where the opportunities for travel by sustainable travel modes, or linked trips, are lower
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 16	support Option 1) as a reasonable aim – but consider that it may be difficult to make policy requirements mandatory, depending on location and infrastructure networks, and the difficulty with being able to predict emerging technology.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Question - Transport Policies	support the range of policies and documents identified, but note the additional work that CDC has commissioned on transport network capacity. We would therefore reserve the right to comment further once more information is available
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 17	In the same way that CDC is proposing an audit of natural capital, we would advocate an overhaul of the methodology that is used to assess social and environmental benefits, in line with 1) – and then use this to inform the approach to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 18	supports the opportunity to focus development at existing settlements that are well connected to Banbury – as per 3). We note that CDC led studies to support the emerging Plan will include an updated assessment of landscape sensitivity. This will likely include consideration of the issues of coalescence and setting, and that this will need to be balanced with the wider requirements for growth in sustainable locations.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 19	supports sites that lie to the north and west of Banbury – and is directly promoting land for approximately 330 units in that area, at Drayton Lodge and Wroxton. [Additional land owned by Trinity College at Withycombe Farm, Bretch Hill, is also being promoted by Bloor Homes, for an additional 225 homes.

LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 30	If growth is to be directed, proportionately, to the rural areas over the plan period, to meet wider district needs, it should be directed to settlements that are located close to, and are well connected to, the main urban centres, and where those settlements are supported by sufficient services and facilities.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 32	would advocate an approach aligned with 2), where the accessibility of the settlement to the urban centres, and the connectivity available to them, is given additional weight.
LPR-B-368	Savills for Trinity College Oxford	Option 34	support a review of landscape sensitivity, which para 1.3.4 of the consultation document says is already underway. The consideration of landscape capacity and sensitivity needs to be reasonably detailed however, or otherwise a lack of granularity could risk opportunities for development being ruled out. The same applies to the assessment of natural capital mentioned in Option 13 – otherwise there is a risk that the outputs are too much of a blunt tool to develop additional policy.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Call for Sites Promotion - Land east of Adderbury	Land east of Adderbury is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA403. A vision statement and illustrative masterplan have been supplied.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 1	notes that the suggested Vision set out in the consultation document appears to be aligned with the overarching vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan, including the goals for achieving climate action targets, but should remain flexible to respond where the Oxfordshire 2050 Strategic Vision may change. The ambitions to develop energy efficient, well-designed homes, in the right place and in the right quantity, to meet Oxfordshire's housing needs and to support its economic growth, are welcome. In taking the Vision forward to a draft plan, HLM is keen to explore what is meant at point 12) of the draft Vision in regard to how Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington are 're-shaped and adapted' to maintain their roles as attractive, vibrant, retail, cultural and social centres for communities and visitors. The section of this representation on the directions of development considers this further. Para 1.3.4 of the consultation document states that "We have begun studies on the capacity of the transport network and the sensitivity of the landscape. We have also commissioned a town centre and retail study, and another looking at employment issues." We would be interested to understand the scope of these studies, and how the work has been framed, as soon as details are available. HLM has responded positively to the recent Oxfordshire Plan 2050 consultation, and we understand that the joint spatial strategy will be influential in setting target numbers for housing and employment space, and identifying the general spatial options, and consequently that the 2040 Cherwell Plan can only go so far until the strategic direction is clearer.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 2	We consider that the Key Objectives are all supportable as principles, but that there could be some consolidation and reduction in their number. The most important objectives, in our view, relate to; KO1 – as CDC has failed to allocate a sufficient amount of land in the past that has been able to deliver the required housing numbers, and therefore doesn't now have a 5 Year Housing Land Supply; focusing on developing in sustainable locations, that are well connected to services and facilities, and thereby supporting existing and future communities; and to providing high quality and well designed environments
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 3	The consultation document comments on the need for CDC to review the adopted 2015 Local Plan strategy, which has been 'urban-focused', and that the new approach will be partly informed by the 2050 Plan. Brownfield sites will continue to be an important contributor to employment land, but the degree to which that land can absorb the expected levels of growth is key, and previous studies of Cherwell's available brownfield land have presented significant limitations. Some brownfield sites may not be in sustainable locations, and the long-term sustainability and reduced need to travel, need to be borne in mind. A review of the settlement hierarchy also seems sensible to recalibrate and understand the carrying capacity of settlements, their relationship within the wider spatial options that will fall from the 2050 Plan, and the important link between the location of jobs and houses in order to support sustainable patterns of living. Overall, therefore, HLM supports a main focus for employment land at the main urban centres and those locations in close proximity with main urban centres which have good transport links. We also recognise that some locations, such as those required for storage and distribution, and certain manufacturing processes, may be better situated away from housing and/or near to the transport interchanges that can better accommodate these. We note that CDC has commissioned an Employment Land and Needs Assessment, to complement the OGNA, and we would need to see the details of that assessment in order to comment further.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 4	Suggests that the approach to identifying employment land should recognise the need for a mixture of business spaces, as per 3) above, as well as the importance of improved physical, training and digital infrastructure that is needed to support this. Part of the offer will need to include flexible business space, including that associated with local community hubs, and where people can be part of local employment networks without having to travel away from their local area.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 5	Increased flexibility is implicit in the Government's recent changes to the Use Classes Order and Permitted Development Rights, and the need to manage the effects of changing retail patterns. We do recognise the continued importance that retail, leisure and tourism play in town centre economies, including historic towns, and that these will need protection.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 6	As per 2) above, HLM considers that the percentage splits should be kept the same, but be subject to future review of viability, as the introduction of changes to Part L of the Building Regulations and the Future Homes initiative will have an adverse impact. Ultimately, we need more information around the viability evidence and an understanding of how this can relate to policy aspirations for affordable housing provision.

LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 7	As above, it is difficult to comment without the evidence base, but HLM considers that it is reasonable to retain the same tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Plan. [Nb. there is also an error in the question – as the 30% figure in the policy relates to intermediate housing.]
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 8	HLM does not support the imposition of a policy to require nationally described space standards, for any dwellings.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Separation Distances	No. The imposition of minimum separation distances would be arbitrary, and not take account of local conditions and design ingenuity. We suggest that there are better ways of ensuring good design that is neighbourly and protects amenity, through compliance with the principles of the National Model Design Code and any local design code or SPD that is in place.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 9	option 2 continuing to rely on the Building Regulations.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Housing Policies	We consider that there is no need for a policy relating to Modern Methods of Construction – and that it would be more appropriate to let the market resolve this, in the context of meeting other sustainability requirements and legislation.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 10	advocates 2) above – and letting the Building Regulations set the standards. Section 5.5.7 of the consultation document highlights that the Government will shortly amend the Building Regulations to improve the energy efficiency of new homes. This new Future Homes Standard should ensure that all new homes built from 2025 will produce 75-80% less carbon emissions than homes delivered under current regulations. The Government is also proposing to consult on a Future Building Standard which will look at, amongst others, measures to improve the energy efficiency of non-domestic buildings.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	we consider that these matters are best dealt with through the Building Regulations
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 12	considers that the opportunity to make the best contribution to BNG would be across the District, as identified in 3) above.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 13	Without a standardised methodology for Environmental Net Gain, it will be extremely difficult to measure and prove at this point. Moreover, until the Environment Bill becomes statute, and the measures in that legislation are translated into the NPPF and guidance for plan-making and decision-taking, it is difficult to make an objective comment on this question. The industry needs to get to grips with BNG before moving onto the next step. For this reason we suggest that, presently, the answer to the above should be 3) – not to require natural capital assessment.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	considers that the target for Biodiversity Net Gain would be 10% only – in line with the Government target.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 14	support a more flexible approach, as per 3)
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	This can be best supported by avoiding ambiguity between National Model Design Code and local codes/guidance, thus providing developers with certainty.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principles, and as part of our work to support proposals at Kemps Farm, Twyford, has proposed a masterplan that will support the existing community and create a new walkable neighbourhood
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Transport & Connectivity	agrees with the proposed transport and connectivity approach. We support the aims of moving towards a net zero transport network and agree that spatial planning has a clear role in supporting a decarbonised transport system. Sites such as those being promoted by HLM to the east of Twyford, on a main public transport route and near to Banbury, have the opportunity to make a significant contribution to this agenda, compared to more rural or isolated sites where the opportunities for travel by sustainable travel modes, or linked trips, are lower

LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 16	support Option 1) as a reasonable aim – but consider that it may be difficult to make policy requirements mandatory, depending on location and infrastructure networks, and the ability to predict emerging technology.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Transport Policies	We note the range of policies and documents identified, but also note the additional work that CDC has commissioned on transport network capacity. We would therefore reserve the right to comment further once more information is available.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 17	In the same way that CDC is proposing an audit of natural capital, we would advocate an overhaul of the methodology that is used to assess social and environmental benefits, in line with 1) – and then use this to inform the approach to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 18	HLM supports the opportunity to focus development at existing settlements that are well connected to Banbury – as per 3) above. We note that CDC led studies to support the emerging Plan will include an updated assessment of landscape sensitivity. This will likely include consideration of the issues of coalescence and setting, and that this will need to be balanced with the wider requirements for growth in sustainable locations.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 19	HLM supports sites to the south of Banbury, as per 2) above – and is promoting land for approximately 900 units at Kemps Farm, Twyford.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	would like to see more work to promote ‘walkable / 20 minute neighbourhoods’ that support active travel, and the greater integration of pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to support ease of travel to schools and rail stations, including King’s Sutton, as part of overall measures to reduce reliance on private cars.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 30	support directing proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period, to meet wider district needs. This development should be directed to settlements that are located close to, and are well connected to, the main urban centres, and where those settlements are supported by sufficient services and facilities.
LPR-B-369	Savills for Hallam Land Management	Option 32	HLM would advocate an approach aligned with 2) above, where the accessibility of the settlement to the urban centres, and the connectivity available to them, is given additional weight.
LPR-B-370	Phil Sansom	LPR-A-027	strongly object. The Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan was to limit the number of houses built in future years and this application exceeds that number. Bloxham does not need any additional houses. potential merging of Banbury and Bloxham. The capacity of existing electrical infrastructure; current experience power cuts, more housing will increase frequency. The local drainage system, ditches and pipework etc plus the pumping station on Crab Tree Close are frequently blocked as they are at capacity, more houses will increase this. Local broadband is poor due to current number of users. The local schools in Bloxham are already at capacity; more houses will increase this problem. The junction of Ells Lane, Crab Tree Close and Bloxham Road is very congested at Peak Times due to use by school buses and parents dropping off and collecting children from the Warriner School. This will increase with more houses and cars. Ells lane is narrow and in poor condition and does need any additional traffic along it. The A361 is a very busy road with a large number of vehicles using it every day at Peak Times. More traffic will only increase this problem. The additional houses would have an adverse affect on the local property values and also spoil the current pleasant views over the Countryside. Houses built to the rear of Crab Tree Close would result in an invasion of privacy. Why has the large field to the rear of the houses been included in this application, as given the height of the land, houses here would be able to see directly into the bedrooms of Crab Tree Close. The plan shows the road going to the rear of the proposed houses. This means future developments could use this to expand into a second development in the large field. This is wrong. Roads in the Banbury area are also getting busier and additional houses will add to this. The proposal shows a foot path from the houses through Crab Tree Close. This is not to be permitted as it is a Private Road managed by the residents. will have a major negative impact on the village and surrounding areas. It does not bring any benefits to the local community, will increase existing problems in the village, ruin views decrease property prices and blight the lives of people living on Crab Tree Close. It is about lining the pockets of Property Developers and not about improving an area. There is a huge potential at Upper Heyford with existing infrastructure and a motorway connection, this is where Cala Homes should be concentrating their efforts
LPR-B-371	Pat and David Keable	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-371	Pat and David Keable	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-371	Pat and David Keable	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-371	Pat and David Keable	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-371	Pat and David Keable	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-372	K Meadows	LPR-A-178	proposal is completely disproportionate and should not be approved. Any development as proposed would lead to the destruction of Adderbury as a viable village. rapidly expanding villages, as well as our towns and cities add up to an overwhelming urbanisation of the countryside. Further pollution will be generated through increased pressure on already over stretched waste and sewerage infrastructure leaving no room for wildlife; Adderbury Lakes is already suffering from increased pollution with raw sewerage discharges. Pollinators and insects are declining at a frightening rate and this development will add to their further destruction. The scale of this development is completely unsustainable and wholly disproportionate given the size of Adderbury village. development would completely destroy the identity and viability of Adderbury as a village, subjecting Adderbury to increasing "coalescence". Adderbury school, retail and infrastructure generally is already at capacity, the proposal does not address these issues sufficiently. proposal completely overestimates the scale and capacity of Adderbury's existing facilities and infrastructure to cope with a development on this scale. The traffic system is now over capacity and the local road system will not cope. village is already deemed to be at capacity with recent housing developments and this development sits outside the local plan. gap between Adderbury and Banbury and surrounding areas will be narrowed to an unacceptable level. This development impacts negatively on Adderbury's current "spatial feel". The development is on a "greenfield" site and no account has been taken of the impact on the environment as a whole or the considerable impact on local wildlife. The effect on existing residents "mental health" by the removal of open green spaces will be significant resulting in further pressure on already at capacity health facilities. The present government has deemed this to be vital to the health of our nation especially during the recent pandemic and recognised outdoor spaces and wildlife to be one of our saviours during this hard time. Building housing developments and taking away greenspaces surely goes against all that we have learnt over the past year or so. This effect will be magnified by the considerable disturbance over a significant period through the building activity. The development seeks development in key "valued landscapes" which should be protected for future generations.
LPR-B-373	Chloe-May Marshall	LPR-A-175	Objects to the change of use. Wardington would not cope with the added traffic that development would bring to the village. Numerous accidents occur on the A361 due to the large amounts of traffic and lorries which travel along it already, the increase in traffic would not benefit this already growing issue. Changing the land use from farming and agriculture would also have a large disturbance on the local wildlife; by changing the use of the land many of these animals will lose habitats and will be greatly disturbed. I do not believe that a change in use of the land proposed would benefit the village but instead create many issues and disturbances
LPR-B-374	Ian Marshall	LPR-A-175	Objects to proposals. Development will bring additional pollution and remove wildlife from the area. Development will cause overcrowding to the area, bring more traffic within the village onto roads which are already in a poor state and will not take the extra volume and cause further heavy traffic going onto the already dangerous A361 road. The environment to local wildlife will be destroyed, the land is home to a variety of wildlife. The proposed development is too large for the size of the village, a fundamental change to the character of a conservation village with both light and air pollution being increased.
LPR-B-375	Samantha Marshall	LPR-A-175	Objects to the proposals. the development will cause overcrowding and fundamentally change the character of the village. The proposed development is too large for the village which has no facilities to accommodate and will also decline the local wildlife. The development will also cause further heavy traffic onto a already dangerous and hazardous road A361 and within the village of Wardington
LPR-B-376	Cameron Marshall	LPR-A-175	Objects to proposals. Change of use proposed is not sustainable for the size of a conservation village like Wardington. There are no facilities and the development would increase pollution to the village and would decline all wildlife within these areas in which there are many. The development will not be in keeping with the village of Wardington and cause overcrowding as well as causing a fundamental change to the character of Wardington. Traffic volume will also be increased within the village and onto the A361
LPR-B-377	Mark and Julie Hewish	LPR-A-104	Comments relate to a 5 acre plot in Clifton. The more open linear sites along Clifton Road would be more suitable with less impact on current homes. The village has tight lanes and parking is often an issue. The width of the road would not permit development further out of the apron/border of Clifton. Water and or Sewerage can flood some of the area; the sewerage works can get overwhelmed. Clifton produces a lot of water in heavy rain. No amenities except a pub, no bus service. The field and hedgerows are home to a variety of wildlife



LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 6	<p>Local Viability Guide submitted. In order to assist local planning authorities in preparing their viability assessments the HBF have prepared a briefing note setting out our members key concerns with regard to viability testing and the approach taken by Councils. We would like to highlight four particular issues with whole plan viability assessments. The first issue is with regard to the approach taken to abnormal infrastructure costs. These are the costs above base construction and external costs that are required to ensure the site is deliverable. Prior to the 2019 NPPF viability assessments have taken the approach that these cannot be quantified and were addressed through the site-bysite negotiation. However, this option is now significantly restricted by paragraph 58 of the NPPF. Whilst the HBF recognise that abnormal costs are expected to come off the land value, we are concerned that if abnormal costs are high then it will result in sites not being developed as the land value will be insufficient to incentivise the landowner to sell. As such these abnormal costs must be considered in the whole plan viability assessment. We recognise that the very nature of an abnormal costs is difficult to quantify, but it is a fact that they are often substantial and can have a significant impact on viability. Where and how these costs arise is variable. They can occur in site preparation but can also arise with regard to the increasing costs of delivering infrastructure, such as upgrades to increase the capacity of utilities. It is also the case that abnormal costs are higher on brownfield sites where there can be a higher degree of uncertainty as to the nature of the site and the work required to make it developable. Important to ensure there is significant buffer between the Residual Land Value and the Benchmark Land Value on those sites assessed to ensure any abnormal costs do not make a site undeliverable and for the Council are to state with certainty that those sites allocated in the plan will come forward without negotiation. We would encourage the Council to use the upper end of any of the ranges suggested with regards to fees and profit margins. Again, these will vary from developer to developer but given that the Government want to minimise negotiation on planning obligations it would make sense to use the highest point of any range. The changing landscape with regard to viability assessment could lead to development slowing significantly if the correct variables are not taken into account.</p> <p>Council must ensure that all the policy costs associated with the local plan are included within the viability assessment. Whilst affordable housing and infrastructure contributions from the majority of the additional costs that are placed on developers by the Council it is important that the cumulative impact of all policies are tested. With regard to the local plan review the Council will need to consider the impact of not only their own policies but also proposed changes to building regulations including the delivery of the Future Homes Standard from 2025 as well as the mandatory 10% net biodiversity gain that is set to become a legal requirement on the Royal Assent of the Environment Bill. As such the viability assessment will need ensure that there is sufficient headroom to ensure the policies in the local plan can be delivered alongside the requirements established in national policy and legislation. The approach to land values needs to be a balanced approach and one that recognises that there will be a point at which land will just not come forward if values are too low to take account of policy and infrastructure costs. There are a variety of reasons why a landowner is looking to sell their land and it cannot be assumed that they will absorb significant reductions in land values to meet policy costs. Land is a longterm investment and the returns being offered must take account of this.</p>
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 7	<p>Tenure split that is taken forward will clearly depend on the viability of development to accommodate what that Council proposes. The Council will need to ensure that it meets the national policy requirements for 10% of all homes on major development to be available for affordable home ownership and that 25% of all affordable homes provided are First Homes. It will be important for the viability assessment to treat First Homes in the same manner as market housing. Whilst these homes fall under the definition of affordable housing in terms of viability, they cannot be treated the same as an affordable home ownership product as they are developed and sold by the developer. This is fundamentally different to a shared ownership unit or affordable home for rent where the home is bought up front by a housing association with the developer in affect acting as a contractor. The risk is lower as there is no need to put the affordable home on the open market, as such the developer accepts a lower level of profit. However, a First Home would be sold by the developer and as such they retain the risk and the other costs, such as marketing, in the same ways as they would for any home sold on the open market. The proportion of new homes delivered as First Homes should be treated in the same way as other market homes for sale within the whole plan viability assessment.</p>
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 8	<p>Whilst the HBF shares the Council's desire to see good quality homes delivered across Cherwell we consider that space standards can, in some instances, have a negative impact upon affordability issues and reduce customer choice. In terms of choice some developers will provide entry level two, three and fourbedroom properties which may not meet the optional nationally described space standards, but which would allow on lower incomes can afford a property which has their required number of bedrooms. Given the poor affordability of property in the area and the tight constraints on development it is therefore important that the Council can provide robust evidence that there is a need to introduce the optional space standards.</p>
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 9	<p>If the Council are going to introduce the optional technical standards for accessibility, they will need to ensure that there is appropriate evidence to support the approach taken. This evidence will need to consider not only the need for such homes, as set out in paragraph 147 of the NPPF but also the accessibility of the existing stock, impact on viability and how needs vary across the different housing tenures as set out in paragraph 56-007 of Planning Practice Guidance.</p>

LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 10	The housebuilding industry recognises that there is a need to improve the environmental performance of new residential development. We established with a wide range of partners the Future Homes Task Force. This task force examined how the house building industry can work toward delivering net zero carbon homes in order to support the Government's target of the country delivering net zero carbon emissions by 2050. The delivery plan published by the task force in July 2021 outlines the need to operate on a collective basis recognising the need for housebuilders, their supply network and the trades people building homes to successfully transition to the delivery of low carbon homes. In addition, it recognises the need for both national and local government alongside housebuilders to ensure those people buying new homes are confident in the technologies and systems being used. The Future Homes Standard that will be introduced from 2025 will see new homes emit 75% fewer emissions than current standards. However, to deliver further reductions and achieve the national commitment of net zero emissions by 2050 will require the decarbonisation of energy supply at a national level rather than from the Council setting additional requirements for new homes above those set by Government. HBF do not consider it necessary for additional local standards to be set with regard to energy efficiency and CO2 emissions. Only through a nationally consistent and phased approach to the introduction of the new standards and technologies will the house building industry be able to maintain housing supply, ensure consumer confidence and deliver the required improvements in emissions. A national and standardised approach to improving the energy efficiency of buildings is the most effective approach to ensuring improvements in energy efficiency whilst ensuring the continued delivery of housing and infrastructure. HBF considers a universal standard is necessary to allow the development of supply chains that focus upon responding to agreed national targets, and for training providers to plan their programmes to equip the labour force to meet these new requirements. Importantly, a phased approach to delivering these improvements ensures those people buying new homes are fully aware of the new technologies being used in their homes. It is vital that consumers are confident with the technology being used in their new homes and increase the wider appetite for similar standards to be adopted in the existing stock. HBF considers it important that Councils recognise that it will take time to ensure that the technology and supply chains required to achieve the significant reductions in emission from new homes required by the Future Homes Standard. There is considerable work to do to ensure that supply chains are in place to meet demand from the housebuilding industry as well as having a workforce with the technical skills in place to deliver and maintain systems such as ground and air source heat pumps on a much larger scale. These systems when they are used work to ensure that the public are satisfied with the product and can rely on it to meet their needs. Should the Council seek to go beyond what is required by building regulations then they will need to clearly set out in their viability study the additional costs this will place on development. These costs can be significant and can lead to development becoming unviable.
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 12	The location of offsite compensation with regard to biodiversity net gain will need to take account of the Environment Bill, which as the Council will be aware is set to become an Act shortly. The Bill makes provision for the Secretary of State to make arrangements for a developer to purchase Biodiversity credits from the Government for the purposes of meeting the 10% net gain requirement set out in the Bill. As such placing specific requirements with regard to the delivery of offsite compensation may not be consistent with the Government's approach to biodiversity credits.
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 13	If the local plan as a whole is being prepared whilst having regard to the natural capital and ecosystem services, there should be no reason to require major development delivered through the local plan to provide a natural capital assessment. Such an assessment is unnecessary as development that comes forward that is consistent with the local plan should by default be making a positive contribution to the natural capital of the area. Support not require major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Option 15	The Council will need to ensure that any requirement to provide or fund outdoor sport provision as clearly evidenced and consistent with paragraph 57 of the NPPF and regulation 122 of the CIL regulations. Where contributions are justified the approach taken to the delivery of outdoor sports provision will depend on the amount of development to be delivered, where it is located and how development it is provided.
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The principle behind the 20-minute neighbourhood is one that is a reasonable aspiration to take forward within the local plan, but the Council must remember that this should be seen as an aspiration within appropriate locations rather than a blunt tool for development management or site allocations across the Borough. For example, the Council note the application of this principal in more rural areas is inevitably more difficult as populations are generally too low to meet all the features of a 20minute neighbourhood. This should not prevent development from happening in such locations where appropriate. There may be clusters of villages or suburban communities that provide a range of services for that area within reasonable travelling of each other. These areas might be able to sustainably support a substantial level of development but may not meet the principles of the 20minute neighbourhood and as such development in such areas is not supported in the local plan. Council will need to recognise that settlements or areas that currently do not have the services that are consistent with the 20minute neighbourhood could expand to include those services if new development is allocated in those areas. The 20-minute neighbourhood should not be used as a basis for only locating development close to existing services rather identifying where services could be improved through new development. There is a real danger that the principle could be used negatively and become a way of preventing development in certain communities rather than promoting improved neighbourhoods. Council must also recognise that if it seeks to apply this principle there is a need for the Council to provide a strong leadership function for local public services to ensure that these are in place and are retained. The Council must ensure that they and their partners are able and willing to support this concept at larger strategic developments or where the Council is seeking to deliver higher density development. Without this strong co-ordinating role, the Council are unlikely to achieve their aspirations in relation to the 20-minute neighbourhood.
LPR-B-378	Home Builders Federation	General	Representation includes the submission of a HBF Local Plan Viability Guide (Sept 2019)

LPR-B-379	Gail Collingwood-Turner	Hanwell	Objects to development in and around Hanwell. would no doubt add to considerably more traffic passing through the village of Hanwell's old narrow, Main Street- which already struggles at peak times with congestion and damage to vehicles parked outside homes. Not to mention public safety, due to little and narrow pavements, and pollution. Not forgetting the reduced air quality (pm1/2), noise, dust, and damage to roads and natural habitats if any further building sites were permitted. This country has already lost much of the natural hedgerows and wildlife habitats due to developments. The wildlife in Hanwell has already been squeezed into a smaller area; To even consider reducing this further and the erosion of hedgeways and the like, is completely baffling. Just because a government now allows building on green-belt etc, does not mean it is right to do so... even if there are added incentives. we must do all we can to protect our green and pleasant land, the wildlife, and the necessary insects.
LPR-B-380	Susanne McIvor	Question - Local Green Spaces	comment about the provision (or lack of provision) of allotments. Respondent is on the committee of an allotment association (in Oxford City) where there is an increasing waiting list. One of the reasons for this is the development of the Papermill site in Wolvercote which has meant that there are a lot of new residents in the area. These newcomers, some of whom live in flats with no garden, are very reasonably seeking outdoor space to grow food. Close by there are very substantial housing developments planned. Some are in Oxford City (eg Oxford North) and some are in Cherwell (eg North Oxford Golf Club and the area between Oxford Parkway and Cutteslowe Park, and sites in Kidlington). Unaware of any additional provision being made for allotment sites, which I understand that the council has a statutory duty to provide where there is demand for them. It is reasonable to expect demand to increase as a result of the additional homes being built in and around Kidlington and Cherwell District Council should be assessing the demand for allotments and taking steps to fulfill their statutory duty to provide for them. Only mention of allotments (apart from a proposed site!) is a comment in 5.8.1. There is support for allotment provision and a growing population which can reasonably be expected to increase demand considerably. However there is no mention of how this demand for allotments will be met. This would appear to be a significant omission. Cherwell District Council should consider its statutory duty to provide allotment sites and take steps to ensure that it does so.
LPR-B-381	Brenda Vandamme	Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris	extremely concerned that Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower be correctly categorised to protect these villages and the land which are only 1 mile from the border of the AONB and are considered the North Cotswolds. CDC has made numerous studies in the past of the beauty, heritage, and strategic farming importance of these two villages. need to make these villages B villages to protect each one of them from unfair development. Sibford Ferris has not been successfully protected due to shortfalls and failures in the Local Cherwell Plan to protect its landscape, its character, its biodiversity, and its sustainability. An appeal was won by the developers for 25 new homes in Sibford Ferris as not enough protection was offered to the village by the Cherwell Local Plan; this should not happen again. If Cherwell does not limit the growth to the rural areas, Cherwell District is going against the wish of their constituents and against the new National Policies which protect against Climate Change. Cherwell must get ahead of the curve and try to be the example of the District Council that will move Climate Change measures forward and protect the existing communities. CDC should no longer accept planning applications from developers for our area until the Local Plan has been determined, especially since it was a great mistake to have amalgamated the two Sibfords as they should never have been placed together. It doubled their size in so far as target for new housing was concerned whilst they did not have anything near the required facilities and services required.
LPR-B-382	Shaun Costello	LPR-A-107	Strongly objects. Fields proposed are not suitable for housing; greenfield agricultural fields. Development proposed would be completely out of character with the village as it would double in size. Access road is too small, single tracked and damaged in places. Question over water supply. Street lighting not wanted as it is a dark sky village.
LPR-B-383	Hannah Jones	Islip	Objects to proposed development for 3000 homes. Proposals are on green belt which would destroy the ecosystems around the village. Secondly I would like to know how it will impact on flood levels as the ground proposed to be built on is necessary to absorb the increasing rain water to prevent overflow into the river that leads to flooding in the lower village. Thirdly the proposal of another road around the village is concerning as this will create two busy roads running through Islip rather than reducing traffic in the village.
LPR-B-384	Jill Bailey	Hanwell	Strong object to development north of Hanwell Fields. The gap between Hanwell and Banbury would be reduced to 100m and would effectively be the end of Hanwell as a village. The development would contradict the core strategy to preserve the rural landscape. The rural nature of the village would be lost forever. The setting of the Grade 1 Church and Grade 2* Castle would be compromised by development north of Banbury.
LPR-B-385	Johnnie Hand	LPR-A-214	Objects to site development. Village is already impacted by the encroachment of Hanwell Fields and also the vast number of houses that are about to be built on the Drayton site which will, in essence, join this proposed site to create an enormous housing estate on the edge of the town/county. To say that this will not devastate the tiny village of Hanwell and the surrounding countryside is simply ridiculous. Other objection points include the resulting Traffic chaos, the destruction of wild life habits, the detriment of the 12th century church and it's churchyard, light pollution and the fact that it is a conservation area. Alternative sites for housing should be sought.
LPR-B-386	Gill Heaton	Islip	The proposal should be significantly reduced in scope. Appreciates the need for more housing, particularly affordable. It is not appropriate to turn a historic village of approximately 700 residents into a town of at least 7,000 residents (assuming the extra 3,000 homes all have at least 2 residents). The character and community of the village would be completely lost in the development of this new town. Despite proposed improvements in rail, bus and cycle routes, it can be assumed that every house will have one or two cars, leading to a minimum of 3,000 cars moving into the village/town. Add these to the 41,000 car movements already through the village each week and the level of noise and pollution would undermine any goals for a greener environment. Some traffic would be taken around Islip on the new link road, but this does not change the quantity of traffic travelling through the village centre from Bicester and surrounding villages. Also, a faster link road would encourage more through traffic. The new link road would have to be built at a significant height to ensure it is not blocked by the regular flooding in Islip, which can be expected to get worse with climate change. So the new road would be very noticeable, both visually and for noise. I cannot see how the proposal meets the quoted climate change challenge in relation to traffic increase and flooding. Such a huge increase in housing would not create a healthy place to live, undermining our community, and would be detrimental to social health and wellbeing.
LPR-B-386	Gill Heaton	General	Local Plan Review documents and consultation requirements are simply too complex to understand how to have opinion heard.

LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	General	surprised that the implications of the National Decarbonisation Strategy for Transport for spatial planning (July 2021) has not been picked up in section 2 of this Consultation. Government recognises that current levels of car-dependency cannot be maintained if the national legally-binding trajectory to net zero-carbon in 2050 is to be attained. This makes it plain that Government recognises the need to much more tightly align spatial and land-use planning with transport strategy, and in particular, ensure that patterns of development strongly facilitate a mode shift away from personal car use to meet daily mobility needs. To meet national and local carbon reduction goals, this Local Plan's need to place the highest importance accelerating a transition to first a radically lower-carbon District, then a carbon-neutral one. The scope of the Plan's development strategy to influence the way in which patterns of growth facilitate more compact patterns of interaction on the one hand, and facilitate much higher levels of uptake of active travel and public transport on the other, must not be underestimated. Transport issues should be a principal focus of the plan, to a degree that it has never been previously. Rep includes commentary re the Oxford- Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework and The Oxfordshire Plan 2050.
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 1	A "business as usual" approach to the Local Plan Review, in which "sustainable transport measures" are retrofitted to development following an approach to site selection and urban design that is generally oblivious to public transport in particular, can only achieve the same car-dependent results as its application has previously. Government has indicated that this will no longer be admissible. Local plan-making will need to fundamentally reorient and realign to ensure that among other things, public transport presents a natural first choice. This will need local plan strategies to have regard to wider transport policies and initiatives. These must themselves transform the relative attractiveness of the public transport offer, as they are already seeking to do for walking and cycling. Consultation on a new Local Transport and Connectivity Plan for Oxfordshire (LTCP5) is imminent. This, when adopted, will perform a very important role in the transport evidence base for the plan. However, this is far from enough. Many of the major strategic issues for this plan really hinge on transport evidence that the Council does not yet have, including the outputs of the Countywide Strategic Transport Model, updates to the micro-simulations around the Oxford Fringe and in Banbury, and the initial outputs from the 2021 Census. Some of this essential data is already emerging, as County performs evaluations of key possible transport interventions, especially in Banbury and on the A41 corridor in and around Bicester. We would expect these to be ready well before the Plan is presented for Regulation 19 pre-submission consultation. It is also equally likely that this plan will be examined under a National Planning Policy Framework that is quite materially different from today's, in terms of its approach to transport and mobility. It is very disappointing and quite troubling that there is virtually no reference in the proposed Vision for Cherwell that demonstrates that the Council considers that a radical change is needed in how people in the District will move around. The closest it gets is to have a vision for "Excellent Connectivity". This of course "moves the dial" towards sustainable mobility not at all: the District already has exceptional levels of connectivity. This is largely afforded by the strategic road network including the (very congested) A34, A43 and the M40 all of which were built or extensively modernised and upgraded between 1989 and 2010; and a wider road network that well facilitates the observed exceptionally high levels of car ownership and use across the vast majority of the District. As currently drafted, the Vision is entirely agnostic about transport issues. If this persists, the result is certain to be a highly car-dependent pattern of development, as this will no doubt be easier and less politically challenging to accommodate.
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 2	KO16, 28 and 29 are those most closely related to transport, mobility and transport connectivity issues. There is little if any evidence that the previous and current planning strategies for the District have made much progress in achieving these outcomes. The KOs are inspecific and weakly worded. This avoids policy having to make potentially difficult locational choices and set much tougher targets for development to achieve, alongside a mechanism to monitor, review and manage the transport impacts of current and future new development in a manner that demonstrates that the plan is being effective and aligns with the delivery of wider local and national policy. With no clear idea of what achieving the outcomes is likely to involve there is no credible way that policy can be formulated to achieve it. As things stand, the KOs perform little more than aesthetic role. This is obviously very concerning in and of itself, but, from a practical point of view, they risk setting the Plan and its policies up to fail, seriously, at Examination in Public in due course.
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 3	Option 5. Inasmuch as a single approach will not provide for enough suitable employment land in places that meet the reasonable operational needs of business and employment more generally, which are exceptionally diverse. We would say that Option 3) is unlikely ever to be appropriate. Larger distribution parks are one of the few forms of development to which we are able to retrofit bus services, based on the pattern of occupier demand and shift changes, because they involve large numbers of people seeking to arrive in one place at one time, from a given labour source with a corresponding outward movement. The key is to ensure such bespoke services can be accommodated on-site when necessary and appropriate. Even better is a situation where existing passing services can provide a credible choice throughout the day, to pick up smaller shifts, part time working and office workers. It is very helpful to site these near the biggest settlements that represent large labour pools, not least to assist cycling. There is no question office and other kinds of development such as laboratories, research and development activities, and anything requiring various kinds of clustering and collaboration however intense or not, really should be steered toward passenger transport hubs. These could be the scale of Banbury Station, but we would urge in the strongest terms that a much more nuanced approach is taken. In key rural settlements, existing, expanded or entirely new, employment hubs can and should complement local intermodal interchanges.
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 4	Stagecoach is not in a position to comment at depth in this area. Nevertheless the NPPF requires the council to "positively plan" to meet the economic needs of the District, and to do this we would expect that a suitable and proportionate evidence base on what currently foreseeable employment land demands are likely to require. We do not take such evidence for granted. We are well aware that this is an area where other plan-making bodies have to date placed insufficient emphasis and we urge Cherwell District to leverage all resources it can find including the responses of local chambers of commerce and trade, to establish the appropriate policy suite. However, we dispute that the use of employment sites for "E" class uses would be appropriate in the vast majority of cases. By definition these are those for which town centre locations remain sequentially much more appropriate, mainly because this allows for the easiest access by active travel and public transport rather than the car.

LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 5	<p>very concerned that town centres, as the most sustainable venues for E-class uses, especially where active travel and public transport are concerned, should be strengthened through formulation and application of effective policy, rather than undermined. cannot lead to a “laissez-faire” attitude to locating town centre uses in the locations that allow cars to continue to offer by far the easiest means of access, if any shift away from already excessive car-dependency is to be achieved. The market for E-class uses will always tend to favour a “car-first” approach to location. It reflects the current trading environment where the vast majority of the audience sought by these occupiers are car owners and users. How the Plan can establish a basis to transition away from this is going to need a great deal of thought and care, and ultimate requires a number of things to change – not least a broader shift in public attitudes and with it, consumer behaviour. This is obviously well beyond the Plan to greatly influence. While the principle of a more nuanced and flexible approach to town centre uses is one we would broadly support it is worth mentioning that a transition to town centre residential uses poses some serious issues for wider policy and the nature of the town centre as a venue, which cause us some concern. We would therefore urge that the Council pursues an option that ensures that town centres remain the preferred location for a broad range of activities that require physical presence, including leisure, eating and drinking, public assembly (including activities such as adult and community education), higher- tier primary care and out-patient health facilities, to mention a few. Development of these uses, especially E-class, outside the town centre, should continue to be generally resisted. Policy should maintain an open and flexible stance to non-retail employment-generating uses in town centres, especially where this can be accommodated on upper floors. Residential development and re-use of wholly or partly redundant buildings must clearly continue to be supported either within DM polices, or SPD - needs to be put in place. This will clearly need to have regard to remaining permitted development rights in the Appendices to the GPDO and changes to national binding Building Regulations that can be expected to be promulgated by Government. This should seek to establish an appropriate standard of quality and a wider range of accommodation, such as 2bed apartments.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	<p>Policy to consider how to deal with out of town proposals to ensure that such sites are accessible by all mode is essential. The language with which such a policy needs to be framed will require a great deal of thought especially as CIHT and DfT thresholds for cycling in particular are so generous as to make any development site however far flung, “accessible” by cycle. The kinds of sophistry used with regards to public transport to support developments far distant from a realistic public transport service, much less an attractive one, are regularly even more extreme. where out of town retail is sited directly on high quality public transport corridors, the sites can often be accessed quite well without a car; A spectacular local example of this lies in the Vale of White Horse: the Mollies Diner and Motel lies outside Buckland on the A420 but served by the S6 service. Within or adjoining urban areas, pedestrian and cycle permeability and connectivity into adjoining development must be given hugely greater emphasis than it is today. If the developer cannot deliver it, then the development should be refused. This will incentivise developers securing the control they need to secure sustainable accessibility, prior to an application being lodged. This is also likely to afford better links to higher quality bus services, not all of which may pass directly past the site – though the presumption should be that bus services running at least every 20 minutes serving a variety of origins, should be in place or credibly sustainable at all significant OOT developments. It is likely that only a criterion-based policy is going to be effective in steering outcomes and offering sufficient clarity for development management decisions.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Supporting Our Town Centres	<p>Policy to consider how to deal with out of town proposals to ensure that such sites are accessible by all mode is essential. The language with which such a policy needs to be framed will require a great deal of thought especially as CIHT and DfT thresholds for cycling in particular are so generous as to make any development site however far flung, “accessible” by cycle. The kinds of sophistry used with regards to public transport to support developments far distant from a realistic public transport service, much less an attractive one, are regularly even more extreme. where out of town retail is sited directly on high quality public transport corridors, the sites can often be accessed quite well without a car; A spectacular local example of this lies in the Vale of White Horse: the Mollies Diner and Motel lies outside Buckland on the A420 but served by the S6 service. Within or adjoining urban areas, pedestrian and cycle permeability and connectivity into adjoining development must be given hugely greater emphasis than it is today. If the developer cannot deliver it, then the development should be refused. This will incentivise developers securing the control they need to secure sustainable accessibility, prior to an application being lodged. This is also likely to afford better links to higher quality bus services, not all of which may pass directly past the site – though the presumption should be that bus services running at least every 20 minutes serving a variety of origins, should be in place or credibly sustainable at all significant OOT developments. It is likely that only a criterion-based policy is going to be effective in steering outcomes and offering sufficient clarity for development management decisions.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Housing Policies	<p>Housing need - There clearly are a number very difficult trade-offs to be assessed. Among which will be the evaluation of what higher levels of growth might imply for the spatial pattern of development, given known environmental constraints, and how that in turn might lead to a more extensive pattern of development that it might be possible to deliver. This in turn could have potentially significant impacts on overall levels of carbonintensity, especially with regard to patterns of movement and connectivity. Housing Delivery - A very large proportion has been built in the villages, rather than the largest settlements (and virtually none in Kidlington). Banbury has brought a great deal more forward than Bicester where apart from South West Bicester (Kingsmere), which was mainly allocated under the prior planmaking round, relatively little of the planned growth allocated has translated into actual dwelling occupations. The range and geographic diversity of this distribution of outlets has greatly assisted the District in “substantially boosting the supply of housing” thus far. It has also allowed policy-compliant levels of affordable housing to be delivered, reflected in a good performance in this regard by the Council, though one that evidently still is falling short of meeting affordable housing need. This is because these smaller developments have generally not needed to make very substantial contributions to major infrastructure.</p>

LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	<p>the vast majority of residents of Cherwell District already live within a 20 minute walk of all day-to-day facilities that they need, and certainly within 20 minutes cycle. However, despite this, they evidently do not walk or cycle sufficiently to avoid the levels of car use and dependency that is observed.</p> <p>The concept, if applicable at all, represents the kind of service distribution we see today, at least as far as the top tier of the urban hierarchy is concerned. There is a strong argument that strategic allocations should be of a scale that either:</p> <p>a) consolidates development in such a way that either existing local facilities can be made more effective and/or securely sustainable. This includes education (especially primary) convenience retail, and potentially primary care and other E-class or similar leisure uses such as gyms.</p> <p>b) Creates a sufficiently large new neighbourhood to provide a suitable depth and breadth of local facilities on-site leading to a credibly high level of local self-containment.</p> <p>As part of this, either upgrade or extension of bus services to provide a credibly attractive alternative to car use needs to be justifiable, and the economic sustainability examined and unequivocally endorsed by experienced reputable bus operators, including ourselves where appropriate. In rural areas, the concept when looked at more carefully, moves us no further forward than a settlement function and service study. This would highlight those settlements that currently accommodate a better range of local services and facilities, and can also highlight those that could attain it, especially on the back of significant population expansion.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Transport & Connectivity	<p>welcomes the recognition that the role of the local plan in facilitating low-carbon and more sustainable travel choices. Where the three largest urban areas are concerned, and the largest villages, the approach set out above that seeks to maximise the relevance of active travel is clearly important. However, as planmaking has demonstrated both locally and much more widely for 20 years, merely focusing on active travel and a level of self-containment for local service needs does not, on its own, meaningfully reduce car dependency at all. The strategy needs to look at the provision of credible options for regular trips over about 2km, and for most people this is likely to need a much higher emphasis on how well development location and design can facilitate efficient, frequent and reliable bus services. A spatial strategy driven by the presence and potential creation of high-quality bus corridors seems to be us to be the only one that is likely to allow this to take place. Urgent action is needed to prevent rising levels of congestion in Banbury in particular, leading to the effectiveness and sustainability of the town's bus network being seriously threatened. There is no realistically identifiable strategy that simply ignores this matter in a vain attempt to provide as much highways capacity for unconstrained car use as possible, further assisted by cheap or free parking. Public transport can and does provide a potentially highly relevant and attractive choice outside urban areas. It simply requires the same principles to be followed and achieved as in urban areas: bus services need to be sufficiently frequent, direct and reliable, connecting people to a range of significant destinations – and not just a single local town centre. Experience elsewhere in Oxfordshire – such as the A420 corridor within the Vale of White Horse – shows that direct premium inter-urban bus routes can generate mode shares that are as high as the City of Oxford itself, in specific circumstances. This clearly is only applicable to these kinds of high-quality interurban bus corridors. This nevertheless ought to provide the Council with a significant range of options to meet housing need broadly throughout the District. It could even reduce existing high levels of car dependence since a sufficiently dramatic uplift in bus service quality can be expected to have a greater impact in car use from existing residents, in terms of numbers of journeys, than from even relatively high PT mode shares from new development. Leveraging significant rural service centres as local inter-modal interchanges should be pursued with some vigour. This should align with emerging intermodality strategies that we expect to be advanced through LTCP5. We wish to signal our increasing disquiet with the increase in the number of significant development applications in villages with little or no real availability of local services, far distant from key centres of economic activity and services, where no credible public transport offer is available today, nor is ever likely to be sustainable.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Transport Policies	<p>It is essential that the Local Plan Review has full regard to the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) for the County, the delivery of which will be underpinned by a Statutory Enhanced Partnership from April 2022. This will offer the basis of much greater certainty that bus service enhancements can and will be delivered in a given corridor. That should not be seen a rigid frozen programme however. The BSIP will be subject to rolling iterative review, and it will be possible for the BSIP and EP to respond to the requirements arising from the Plan strategy where it needs to do so. In the southern part of the District around Kidlington, the Plan must have full regard to the Oxford Transport Strategy, its Review under LTCP5, and any further initiatives that flow out from this especially as Connecting Oxford proposals are implemented within the City Council's area. The transport measures in this part of the District should be seen to act as a unity with these.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 17	<p>The approach set out under Option 1 is one that we have great sympathy with, mainly because the appraisal and prioritisation methodologies used to date for transport infrastructure heavily favour reductions in journey time for motor vehicles, with scant consideration of the negative externalities that arise from pursuing programmes established on this basis. Government continues to struggle to arrive at a much more rounded means of assessing the relative value of transport interventions that are most likely to secure a broad range of vital policy objectives, including carbon reduction and increasing levels of personal physical activity. We suspect that until a replacement for the current WebTAG methodology is in place a divergent approach on the part of the Local Plan might have the somewhat perverse outcome of prioritising sustainable transport interventions, which then carry relatively weak Business Cases. The Council, along with the County Council, will want to ensure that as part of any process of prioritisation, this outcome is avoided. It is especially important that transport programmes in support of the Plan's development strategy do not become undeliverable in due course as a result. Of course, development strategies that leverage existing public transport corridors are much less likely to need to seek funding for costly, high-risk capital schemes on the highway. No clear preference in relation to options 3 and 4. Any IDP structure should offer a logical and transparent approach to setting out the range of transport interventions needed to support the plan. Some will sit most comfortably under a place based heading, and others are likely to sit under a Districtwide, or corridor heading. Some key inter-urban corridors are clearly not going to sit comfortably under a single place-based heading.</p>

LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	We have a problem, both nationally and locally, in that entirely insufficient regard is paid to the timely delivery of infrastructure to facilitate safe and convenient access to bus service from new developments. This is equally true for off-site or closely related infrastructure such as bus stops outside the development, as streets and stops within them. It is not infrequently the case that developments are largely or entirely complete, before any bus service can be made reasonably accessible to residents. This is most likely to be true where developments rely on the completion of a spine road within the development. At no point should more than 50 dwellings on any development currently under construction be more than 500m from a stop served by a regular bus service, at any stage, unless due and thorough consideration of the particular circumstances indicates that this threshold cannot realistically be met. Developments should be phased with clear, enforceable triggers agreed to ensure that delivery of bus, walking and cycling infrastructure is in place at a suitably early stage, in line with this minimum standard.
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Banbury	<p>the relevance and effectiveness of bus services within the town is crippled by congestion, and contorted bus routing in and around the town centre. expect this to worsen as planned development comes forward on the remaining major sites almost all of which lie to the south of the town. District's adopted Banbury Master Plan, albeit nonstatutory, that picks up on the need for better bus connectivity across the town centre, and the County's Tramway Road scheme. We must reiterate that without urgent focused action, the medium to longterm viability of most of the town's bus service is quite doubtful. However, ironically, the kinds of interventions we think are needed are relatively small in scale and focused and there is good reason to suppose that on their implementation alongside a wider vision for bus in the town - a much more efficient, frequent, reliable and comprehensive bus offer is achievable. This has clear implications for potential directions of growth around the town. Comments re a transport strategy for Banbury: strongly endorse the high-level logic that lies behind the statement at 6.2.36. clear and increasingly strong evidence that further significant targeted highways measures will be justified to more logically distribute transport demands across the town's highways network, and provide a level of redundancy in the network that is today almost entirely lacking. It is illogical and unsustainable to seek to increase the mode share of cars to the town centre and around what remains a relatively compact town. However, the extent of the built up area has already reached a size where cycling is reaching limits, and topography is also quite unhelpful. The size and nature of the town lends itself very well to developing the local bus offer. The serious congestion arising from the interaction of north-south flows with east-west across the town centre reflects both a huge challenge, but, equally a major opportunity, as the town centre, lying at this convergence of flows, offers potential to act as a radically better public transport hub if central area congestion can be tackled to give buses direct, reliable and efficient passage across the town centre. This is actually not so very difficult to achieve. In line with our longstanding advice, the following interventions could be effected to achieve this while offering nil detriment to motorised traffic, and potentially significantly improving wider conditions for other road users:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A short section of northbound bus priority on Cherwell St between George Street and Bridge Street</li> <li>• Substantial rationalisation of turning movements at Bridge Street/Cherwell Street junction, removing almost all right hand turns, and repurposing carriageway space to prioritise straight ahead movements</li> <li>• Creating a westbound bus-only link using a very short section of High Street East and Broad Street.</li> </ul>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 18	<p>a combination of growth to the south, with limited additional expansion to the north and northwest, represent the logical directions of growth. Stagecoach considers that landscape and coalescence issues constrain the further growth of Banbury in most directions, apart from the south and south west, south of Salt Way, and in smaller pockets west of Southam Road. The ability of landscape to accommodate material growth to the west is evidently very low. Growth to the east of the M40 lies close to the interurban service to Brackley, but will require an exceptional level of care and creativity to provide a replacement bus route through the middle of any development south of the A422, that is faster than the existing nonstop link between the M40 junction and Middleton Cheney. Growth east of the A361, north of the A422 for employment purposes, might have modest merit, but this is already hard to integrate into the bus service offer and it is likely to become harder. The least constrained sites are south of the current BAN 17 allocation at Wykham Farm, which could easily "hang" off the master plan already consented to the north. We are aware that passive provision for a loop road extending into this land has been made that would be able to accommodate an extension of a bus service already anticipated to serve the consented development. As such the potential extension would consolidate demand substantially and support a higher frequency bus service, as well as local services and retail. Consolidating development west of the A361 Bloxham Road also provides some modest but meaningful additional capacity, and would take advantage of both the existing 488 service, which we anticipate increasing in frequency at least as far as Bloxham, and the ne salt way service. We consider this a sustainable option. Options around Broughton Road and Crouch Hill have seen a great deal of promotion that to date has been unsuccessful. These sites have multiple challenges. As far as public transport is concerned, they are virtually impossible to provide a meaningful relative service to. North of the town, we have repeatedly stressed that consolidating development on Southam Road is now essential, to assure the longerterm delivery of a sustainable bus service (current service B3 running about every 30 minutes) and potentially increase its frequency. Both promotions west of Southam Road have great merit in our view, but require a comprehensive approach to secure an efficient extension of the current terminal loop through all the land to the west.</p>

LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 19	<p>Stagecoach recognises that even if all the logical green field opportunities around Banbury are taken up, these are most unlikely to offer sufficient capacity to meet the levels of housing need that the evidence already suggests exist into the longer term. It is likely that beyond the plan period it will therefore become necessary to limit growth at Banbury and seek opportunities that are closely linked, but beyond the immediate built-up area. The third option, which implies a corridor focus, therefore becomes appropriate and if pursued intelligently and with care, is likely to offer a much more sustainable approach than attempting to further incrementally expand the town itself. The corridors that present themselves as existing and potential high quality public transport corridors are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A4260 Oxford Road, suggesting further development on an appropriate scale at Adderbury and Deddington; and potentially a new village on the A4260 south of Deddington. Development must directly relate to the A4260, where we see scope for a substantial improvement in the existing S4 service. The identification and delivery of comprehensive bus priority on the Oxford Road, or by some other means using Bankside, will be essential to making this work sustainably.</li> <li>• A361 Bloxham Road, suggesting further modest development at Bloxham, but avoiding greatly extending the settlement greatly to the east away from the public transport corridor. It would be possible to expand Milcombe, especially to the east, but a new settlement between Bloxham and Milcombe might be a more appropriate way to meet needs. A key consideration is the distance a single bus can reach within an hour's scheduled round-trip running time from Banbury. This makes it essential that comprehensive bus priority measures on the bus route into Banbury are identified and delivered.</li> <li>• As we outline above, the promotion south of the A422 east of Banbury could offer some intriguing possibilities. This is likely to depend on creating a bus advantage corridor directly into the site, using Overthorpe Road and creating one and possibly two bus gates. The access and movement strategy for the site could credibly present exceptional opportunities for active travel and bus, and we urge both the promoter and the Council to look at this very seriously.</li> </ul>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 21	<p>Stagecoach is a landowner with a significant site with important frontage to Cherwell Street within the BAN1 allocation. We have long sought to make plain to the Council that this site offers a very advantageous location to operate the local bus network from. However, the site is physically highly constrained and is increasingly ageing. As we look to decarbonise operations, it will also be increasingly unfit for purpose. Relocating our operation for the existing site carries two separate sets of cost issues for the business – the opportunity costs and additional capital cost uplift of finding and creating a new site, and the risk a replacement site out-of-town will burden the company with additional operating costs in the long term arising from a materially less efficient operation. The fact that to date BAN 1 has not come forward in supportive market conditions for residential development makes plain that for a range of existing occupiers, the existing change of use value is insufficient to justify relocation. Therefore, the Council needs to consider carefully a policy environment that maximises the net present value of sites. An approach that broadly accords with Option 2 is probably the most likely to achieve this. It might also need to identify specific sites for relocation of businesses – an approach that Stratfordon-Avon District Council has employed within their Local Plan, for a similar canalside regeneration, and which is already starting to bear fruit. For Stagecoach's operational needs, we have very particular requirements which we will need to discuss with the Council, if we are to release our current site for redevelopment.</p> <p>We also consider that evidence suggest that a viability gaps exists and the Council is likely to need to broker a land assembly exercise supported with additional funding from the Department of Levelling Up Housing and Communities. we are aware that particular funding streams for this express purpose are identifiable.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Addressing Inequality in Banbury	<p>The most deprived communities are on the west of the town centre. The existing and growing employment areas are mainly to the east. Crosstown connectivity by bus is essential to maximise access to all kinds of opportunity. Improving the quality and efficiency of cross town bus links, which we have already started to put in place, is essential. As we continue to urge this demands focused and concerted measures in and around Banbury town centre, to get buses through increasingly chronic traffic congestion</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 22	<p>we have a strong and fundamental concern that allocating a further very large quantum to Bicester over and above that already allocated in the adopted Local Plan Part 1, will merely compound a number of problems already inherent in the existing Local Plan strategy. The existing Plan focuses the largest amount of growth at Bicester despite it being far from the largest settlement. To date the majority has yet to show signs of delivering at scale or at pace, or, indeed, at all. we are also concerned that appropriate directions for further growth beyond that allocated, will present particular challenges for public transport provision, and, probably more relevant still, to the provision of services that could credibly be relevant enough to attract sufficient use to be both effective or sustainable in the longer term. Large scale urban extension of Bicester, much beyond current commitments, looks to have run its course. The constraints are by no means only transport related either. Thus we do not endorse Option 1, and this suggests that an approach along the lines of Options 2 and 3 is most likely to prove to offer a more sustainable approach. Should new or expanded settlements be pursued, as we would recommend should it prove necessary to accommodate an additional quantum in this part of the District, this would be on the basis that they are directly on existing or demonstrably deliverable direct high quality inter-urban bus corridors. We would point out that the town now benefits from new links direct to Headington via Ambrosden, run as service H5; and we would also stress the potential we see for a regular new corridor towards Brackley, and beyond to Silverstone and Northampton. We see a case for further growth at Ambrosden that would both consolidate the settlement further, help to increase local self-containment, and benefit from and help support a substantial increase in the frequency of H5 to half-hourly as well as its extension to Brookes and Churchill hospital, as one obvious option. We can see that employment development pressure is strong around both M40 junctions 9 and 10. If a substantial employment allocation is seen as being appropriate, especially in the Barnard Gate area, we could see a strong case for this to be complemented by a residential element of sufficient scale to support a local centre and a primary school. This would need to be sited such that a fast service on the B4100/A43 could serve it with minimal diversion or delay.</p>



LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 23	<p>Option 5 is our response, based on limited growth to the north and north west, and potential for development to the south on a larger scale. These all carry significant caveats and nuances. Stagecoach is of the very clear view that directions for further growth of Bicester, on any kind of strategic scale, are exceptionally hard to identify, in such a way that these extensions are well integrated into the existing urban form, and local sustainable transport networks. The use of local intermodal hubs to facilitate broader access to these services existing and future, from off-line neighbourhoods- existing and proposed - needs to be leveraged to the full by the Plan and its supporting transport strategy. There is a vital opportunity to rethink the Infrastructure Delivery Plan within the current Plan to 2031 in Bicester, as it is insufficiently geared to securing the transport outcomes that are now required by local and national transport policy. Comments provided on land to the north west of Bicester - The Eco Town: there is an important opportunity, so far unidentified, to create a high-quality bus corridor linking Bucknell Road to the B4100 that should be designed to facilitate an inter-urban service between Oxford, Bicester, Brackley and Northampton, as well as accommodate local services. Such a service would help anchor for the first time a genuinely relevant PT offer on the northern flank of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. Given the level of development anticipated even under the existing Local Plan, progress at Silverstone Park and plan-led growth at Brackley and Towcester, such a service should form a major articulating feature of the transport strategy for the Plan, as well as the West Northants Spatial Framework, now in preparation. It could also support delivery of a more local bus link between Bicester and Banbury. We are very keen to discuss this further with the current promoter and the planning and highways authorities as soon as possible. Comments on land to the north of the town - Caversfield: modest extension north of Caversfield to the west of the A4421, is under active promotion. This is of a scale that respects landscape and other constraints. In our view very importantly, it also tackles the lack of self-containment of the existing housing by proposing a school and local centre, and as such it synergistically addresses an existing set of problems, not least by reducing the need of local residents to go a longer distance offsite into Bicester to meet most day-to-day needs. We have identified that there is an opportunity to further improve inter-modality, as well as directly serve this promotion with the X5 service. We are prepared to lend our conditional support to the promotion as a potentially very sustainable option, the more so when set against the reasonable alternatives round Bicester. Comments on land to the east of Bicester: The wider eastern side of Bicester suffers hugely from the severance caused by the rail line – severance that will get substantially more severe with the delivery of the next phases of East West rail. The bus service offer to the east is exceptionally poorly developed. There is very little provision on which to build. The recently introduced hourly service 17 to Aylesbury is the best service that has ever been offered, and while this helpfully replaces an hourly facility we used to run only as far as Launton, we have to stress that levels of patronage for this service, which also provided a direct link to Oxford, were exceptionally low. Nor do we see the longer term potential for the Aylesbury-Bicester route, in the way we do for provision on the broad A43 corridor. Comments on options south of Bicester: there is no potential to create a new public transport spine through land between the A41 and the Oxford-Bicester Rail Line, which forms a part of East-West Rail. It is conceivable that some remaining portions of the MoD Estate that do not form part of the current allocation or consent could be released in due course by the DfT and if so, this would very effectively help to consolidate development and in so doing, greatly enhance the potential for a much higher degree of local self-containment. There is nevertheless a potentially very significant opportunity south of Bicester, immediately south of Graven Hill, north and east of Wendlebury, which we are aware is under active promotion. This is for development on a very substantial scale, and could be characterised better as a “linked new settlement” than an urban extension. These proposals would take advantage of an existing rail overbridge constructed to replace the Langford Lane level crossing. Forming a high quality connection north-south through Graven Hill, to its south west edge, then seamlessly through this area and over the bridge to the A41 presents a very important opportunity to open up a single new bus corridor east of the railway. This would offer a single logical bus route running from Launton Road in the north, passing past or through Wretchwick Green, then through Graven Hill and finally through this promotion. Towards the northern end, it would also provide direct links from all these sites to the largest concentration of existing and</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Question - Reducing Car dependency in Bicester	<p>As far as transforming the attractiveness of bus, national and local experience, including vast amounts of survey work done by Transport Focus simply reflect the fact that the convenience and control that car use represents will be almost impossible to beat, without a substantial rebalancing of the use of road space to allow buses to “close the convenience gap”. There is no doubt that this will also involve a quantum leap in both frequencies and connectivity of bus services, including new direct links to major destinations beyond the town. Our responses above indicate that substantial opportunities exist to align transport planning for public transport, with the development strategy for the town, to achieve this outcome. It is essential that these opportunities, having been identified are fully taken up – unless there are overwhelming planning factors that prevent this. We must stress that the approach of the Council in continuing to consent major out of town retail schemes, on the A41 in particular, featuring extensive free parking, has substantially contributed to reducing the relative attractiveness of the town centre as a venue, while the new developments are in most cases difficult to provide a relevant bus choice to, from most areas of the town, despite the presence of the S5 on the A41. By contrast, accessibility by car to any of these sites could hardly be more convenient. The development strategy for Bicester and its environs must support a bus offer that can deliver the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much higher frequencies, to maximise convenience and flexibility, not just during the day but on evenings and Sundays</li> <li>• More direct services on highly efficient routes, and better connectivity to key destinations, to close the journey time gap with driving</li> <li>• More reliable journey times</li> <li>• ... as well as faster ones. For both reasons bus priority – including the use of filtered permeability on key links- must be seen as essential.</li> </ul>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Kidlington	<p>We recognise that NPPF and primary legislation require that Green Belt boundaries should be enduring in the long term, and since a strategic Green Belt Review was undertaken recently for the Local Plan Part 1 Partial review, it is not appropriate for this plan to re-open the matter at a strategic scale.</p>

LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 26	<p>emphatically supports option 1. In particular we would advise that no bus operator has sufficient space at their current Operating Centres to undertake additional operations that are certain to be necessary to support even current levels of plan-led growth. Not only that, but it is becoming apparent that the planned accelerated transition to battery electric buses in Oxford, as well as any future decarbonisation of longer distance services, requires more depot space per vehicle. Thus, even to maintain current operations will require additional depot space in the very foreseeable future. Finally, both the main bus depots in Oxford – our own and Oxford Bus Company’s- are on the far eastern edge of the City. These are ideal to service the city routes east of the Cherwell and Isis, but far less so for other services. Furthermore, the implementation of the County Council’s “Connecting Oxford” strategy, understood to be by 2024, demands the very great augmentation of the bus service offer in this part of the city in particular. As such, there will be a further call on space at the existing depots to accommodate this – whichever operator ends up providing these services. It thus would be especially advantageous, to seek to meet these requirements on that side of the City. Providing additional reasonable opportunities to accommodate bus service Operating Centres should be regarded</p> <p>in our view as much as “essential transport infrastructure” to support the delivery of the plans strategic objectives with regard not only to transport but also carbon mitigation, and thus necessary to support the wider soundness of the plan in the sense of NPPF Chapter 9.</p> <p>We consider that this issue goes beyond even the basic need for the Council to demonstrate that it is “positively planning to meet the identified economic development needs of the District”. Stagecoach is one of the largest employers in the area, and one would hope that these generic economic arguments would be reason sufficient to treat these representations very seriously.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 29	<p>further development at Heyford Park should be limited. the prospects for creating and sustaining a relevant public transport offer could not credibly exist, by virtue of the location of the site, which is extremely remote from key larger centres of activity, very close to the national SRN, and as a result sees travel demand expressed in a multiplicity of directions. There is no density of flow to leverage – in fact, the opposite is true. The occupation of substantial numbers of new homes has, we understand, had virtually no impact on patronage on the service. We can see a case for a very limited amount of development, perhaps up to about 300-350 additional units that consolidates the current, already substantial Local Plan commitment.</p> <p>There is employment on the site, local retail and a 11-18 education provision, so self-containment is relatively high, notwithstanding the poor choices to leave the sites by more sustainable means. This would help meet local housing needs in the central part of the District. More than this would inappropriately and disproportionately skew the pattern of development away from one that is focused on high quality sustainable transport corridors – which a local service to Bicester even every 30 minutes, does not really exemplify.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 30	<p>A corridor-based strategy is inherently flexible in meeting a range of housing needs spread quite broadly across the District. This includes rural housing needs which can obviously be best met, while avoiding excessive car dependency, in rural settlements where a regular direct and reliable bus offer to multiple destination on the line of route are available. Such services should also be expected to offer regular evening and Sunday services – essential to reducing car dependency in any context and especially in rural areas. The BSIP will be looking to start to secure such outcomes across many more routes in the near term. We are sceptical that sufficient land immediately adjoining the two main towns at Banbury and Bicester can be identified to meet longer term needs, to the degree that it might, in the case of Bicester in particular, it is arguable that market absorption on the scale available is sustainable. Accordingly, we think it likely that the Plan will need to accommodate a significant quantum in the most sustainable locations, including new or expanded settlements, which are not directly adjacent to the towns themselves. These could well be described as “rural areas”</p> <p>The question is too binary, and unhelpfully reduces the issue to a simple urban and rural split. However, there is a world of difference between development in a sustainable service centre settlement just a 10- 15 minute bus ride from facilities jobs and amenities in Bicester or Banbury, and much less discriminate dispersal of development across a large number of small and relatively remote settlements.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 31	<p>The use of the Neighbourhood Planning mechanism to identify land for housing gives rise to substantial risks. It is obvious from national experience that the appetite of NPBs to assume this responsibility greatly varies, as well as the organisation and other substantial resources involved to do this in a sound manner. Examples of extraordinarily sophisticated approaches by NPBs do exist – we can point to Lenham in Maidstone Borough, Kent, as one such. But these are quite exceptional. A hybrid approach having regard to the willingness and capacity of the NPB is likely to be required, informed by an approach to a spatial distribution that sets out clear expectations of what level of development is appropriate at settlements where significant development (that involving more than 10 units of open market housing) is considered necessary. None of this prejudices the role of LPBs in bringing forward very small-scale sites to meet demonstrable acute housing needs arising in the community, under rural exceptions provisions.</p>
LPR-B-387	Stagecoach	Option 32	<p>Stagecoach considers that the presence of 11-16 education, and a medical (primary care) facility should be afforded considerable weight. We also consider that the existing and potential level of public transport provision should also be given substantial weight where this already, or credibly could provide an attractive alternative to car use. We could not agree more strongly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites on routes running at least every hour, within 30 minutes bus journey of key town centres should be given very substantial additional weight.</li> <li>• Where two major centres are available within 40 minutes this should be given even more weight.</li> <li>• Where a 30 minute daytime frequency is offered (or can be achieved and sustained) this would afford a further weighting</li> <li>• A 20 minute service should be seen as carrying as much as double the weight of even a 30-minute frequency, given the transformative effect of this on service use. Additionally if a safe segregated cycle route can be provided to a secondary school within 3 km of a site, this should be given very great weight.</li> </ul>
LPR-B-388	Alan Hand	LPR-A-214	<p>strong objection. Village is already severely impacted by its close proximity to Banbury and to consider making a bad situation even worse is beyond belief. There is still a clear boundary of woodland and a couple of fields protecting the village and if these are destroyed, along with all the wildlife that reside there, you are essentially making the historic village of Hanwell a part of Banbury town. Consider the countryside and the villages when you consider these proposals; the countryside and villages need to be protected and that building Banbury right up to the county border, destroying all the countryside and villages in its path is not a sensible solution when there are other, less destructive places, that you could build in the town.</p>

LPR-B-389	Alexis Stevens	LPR-A-175	Objects. the scale and number of houses is totally out of proportion to the village's capacity and surrounding area's sustainability. Such a number of houses could see the need for extra capacity at Cropredy School which is unlikely to be available on that scale. The existing sewerage system would not cope. The new development's drain would go straight down the main road, have bigger capacity and cause the rest of the village's drains to be a side conduit and therefore back up and flood the land it is going across. The sheer number of houses proposed would mean a density that would demand a wholesale clearance of the land as it stands. Such a density of houses and the accompanying hard landscaping would push rain water outwards into the rest of the village and back on to the road. Fields are used for sheep grazing. New development would require streetlighting which is at odds with the dark sky status and its position at the highest point of the village would be a beacon of light. Additional houses will add to the existing traffic issues including additional congestion at the M40 roundabout. Much of the village is without footpaths which is getting more dangerous to walk through the village.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	Option 21	The current Local Plan (2015 - 2031) has yet to achieve many of its objectives. great deal of new housing constructed but many unfinished and Canalside has no progress. Perhaps Canalside should be revisited in relation to climate change and possible flooding concerns
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Rail and bus connections with Bicester must be improved and a reliable, frequent link between Bicester North and Town stations established to open employment opportunities along the revitalised East/West railway to residents of Banbury and the surrounding area.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	Banbury	Little evidence of affordable housing needs having been addressed. Evident from the public comments in the review that there is much disquiet and frustration that physical and social fabric ( eg. roads, schools, medical and dentistry surgeries, library facilities etc,) infrastructure has not kept pace with the demands for such features arising from the increases in population provoked by the Local Plan. The Review must address this aspect if any amendments are to have general community support. Development on land around the perimeter of the current developed areas must be resisted. Brownfield sites should be targeted for housing. Ribbon development such as that along Broughton Road must not be allowed. Public transport is minimal and unlikely to improve. The Review should concentrate on the social and economic health of Banbury as infrastructure for those purposes has declined. Opportunities for 'higher-end' employment provided in the first stage of the Plan have been squandered in favour of quick gains, which do not accord with the aspirations of five years ago and this present opportunity must be grasped to 'plug' Banbury and district into the OxCamArc.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	LPR-A-107	Brownfield sites should be targeted for housing. Ribbon development such as that along Broughton Road must not be allowed. Public transport is minimal and unlikely to improve.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	LPR-A-129	Brownfield sites should be targeted for housing. Ribbon development such as that along Broughton Road must not be allowed. Public transport is minimal and unlikely to improve.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	LPR-A-159	Brownfield sites should be targeted for housing. Ribbon development such as that along Broughton Road must not be allowed. Public transport is minimal and unlikely to improve.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	LPR-A-166	Brownfield sites should be targeted for housing. Ribbon development such as that along Broughton Road must not be allowed. Public transport is minimal and unlikely to improve.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	LPR-A-182	Brownfield sites should be targeted for housing. Ribbon development such as that along Broughton Road must not be allowed. Public transport is minimal and unlikely to improve.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	LPR-A-004	Brownfield sites should be targeted for housing. Ribbon development such as that along Broughton Road must not be allowed. Public transport is minimal and unlikely to improve.
LPR-B-391	Peter Monk	Option 20	The revitalisation of Banbury Town Centre as a retail, commercial and community 'hub' is of paramount importance and policies must be put in place to provide attractions for children and teens to augment those of the primary shopping area. This will encourage 'footfall' and enhance the attractiveness of the existing facilities. The Mill is inadequate for a town and catchment area the size of 'Banburyshire' and this glaring need must be addressed.
LPR-B-393	Danielle Tolson	LPR-A-086	Plan should be reviewed and altered. The site is disproportionately large versus the village as it stands now. Adderbury has already seen at least 5 new housing developments in very recent years. Village boundaries are being pushed out, eroding the intrinsic nature of Adderbury being a village. Adderbury has taken more than its fair share of Cherwell's development. if housing is absolutely necessary the brownfield site near Twyford Mill would be a more suitable location for building in the village, however I feel that large brownfield sites such as Heyford Park could take a much greater proportion of housing, as could outlying industrial / ex MOD areas to the North of Banbury and South East of Bicester. Adderbury does not have the infrastructure to support any more housing developments or additional people and the traffic they bring with only one school, one small shop and a part time post office. Development would worsen the constant stress and disrepair of the roads with additional traffic. development around the outskirts of the village has incredibly poor access to public transport with no walkable access to shops, doctors, schools etc. so traffic and cars will continue to increase. This is both a health hazard and a danger. countryside included on the plan is home to many native species of plants, animals and insects and further building will destroy these and have a massively negative effect on the local environment and ecology. Air, noise and light pollution will increase, causing a decrease in the quality of living for current residents.

LPR-B-393	Danielle Tolson	LPR-A-218	Plan should be reviewed and altered. The site is disproportionaely large versus the village as it stands now. Adderbury has already seen at least 5 new housing developments in very recent years. Village boundaries are being pushed out, eroding the intrinsic nature of Adderbury being a village. Adderbury has taken more than its fair share of Cherwell's development. If housing is absolutely necessary the brownfield site near Twyford Mill would be a more suitable location for building in the village, however I feel that large brownfield sites such as Heyford Park could take a much greater proportion of housing, as could outlying industrial / ex MOD areas to the North of Banbury and South East of Bicester. Adderbury does not have the infrastructure to support any more housing developments or additional people and the traffic they bring with only one school, one small shop and a part time post office. Development would worsen the constant stress and disrepair of the roads with additional traffic. Development around the outskirts of the village has incredibly poor access to public transport with no walkable access to shops, doctors, schools etc. so traffic and cars will continue to increase. This is both a health hazard and a danger. Countryside included on the plan is home to many native species of plants, animals and insects and further building will destroy these and have a massively negative effect on the local environment and ecology. Air, noise and light pollution will increase, causing a decrease in the quality of living for current residents.
LPR-B-393	Danielle Tolson	LPR-A-258	Plan should be reviewed and altered. The site is disproportionaely large versus the village as it stands now. Adderbury has already seen at least 5 new housing developments in very recent years. Village boundaries are being pushed out, eroding the intrinsic nature of Adderbury being a village. Adderbury has taken more than its fair share of Cherwell's development. If housing is absolutely necessary the brownfield site near Twyford Mill would be a more suitable location for building in the village, however I feel that large brownfield sites such as Heyford Park could take a much greater proportion of housing, as could outlying industrial / ex MOD areas to the North of Banbury and South East of Bicester. Adderbury does not have the infrastructure to support any more housing developments or additional people and the traffic they bring with only one school, one small shop and a part time post office. Development would worsen the constant stress and disrepair of the roads with additional traffic. Development around the outskirts of the village has incredibly poor access to public transport with no walkable access to shops, doctors, schools etc. so traffic and cars will continue to increase. This is both a health hazard and a danger. Countryside included on the plan is home to many native species of plants, animals and insects and further building will destroy these and have a massively negative effect on the local environment and ecology. Air, noise and light pollution will increase, causing a decrease in the quality of living for current residents.
LPR-B-393	Danielle Tolson	LPR-A-156	Plan should be reviewed and altered. The site is disproportionaely large versus the village as it stands now. Adderbury has already seen at least 5 new housing developments in very recent years. Village boundaries are being pushed out, eroding the intrinsic nature of Adderbury being a village. Adderbury has taken more than its fair share of Cherwell's development. If housing is absolutely necessary the brownfield site near Twyford Mill would be a more suitable location for building in the village, however I feel that large brownfield sites such as Heyford Park could take a much greater proportion of housing, as could outlying industrial / ex MOD areas to the North of Banbury and South East of Bicester. Adderbury does not have the infrastructure to support any more housing developments or additional people and the traffic they bring with only one school, one small shop and a part time post office. Development would worsen the constant stress and disrepair of the roads with additional traffic. Development around the outskirts of the village has incredibly poor access to public transport with no walkable access to shops, doctors, schools etc. so traffic and cars will continue to increase. This is both a health hazard and a danger. Countryside included on the plan is home to many native species of plants, animals and insects and further building will destroy these and have a massively negative effect on the local environment and ecology. Air, noise and light pollution will increase, causing a decrease in the quality of living for current residents.
LPR-B-393	Danielle Tolson	LPR-A-178	Plan should be reviewed and altered. The site is disproportionaely large versus the village as it stands now. Adderbury has already seen at least 5 new housing developments in very recent years. Village boundaries are being pushed out, eroding the intrinsic nature of Adderbury being a village. Adderbury has taken more than its fair share of Cherwell's development. If housing is absolutely necessary the brownfield site near Twyford Mill would be a more suitable location for building in the village, however I feel that large brownfield sites such as Heyford Park could take a much greater proportion of housing, as could outlying industrial / ex MOD areas to the North of Banbury and South East of Bicester. Adderbury does not have the infrastructure to support any more housing developments or additional people and the traffic they bring with only one school, one small shop and a part time post office. Development would worsen the constant stress and disrepair of the roads with additional traffic. Development around the outskirts of the village has incredibly poor access to public transport with no walkable access to shops, doctors, schools etc. so traffic and cars will continue to increase. This is both a health hazard and a danger. Countryside included on the plan is home to many native species of plants, animals and insects and further building will destroy these and have a massively negative effect on the local environment and ecology. Air, noise and light pollution will increase, causing a decrease in the quality of living for current residents.

LPR-B-393	Danielle Tolson	LPR-A-077	Plan should be reviewed and altered. The site is disproportionately large versus the village as it stands now. Adderbury has already seen at least 5 new housing developments in very recent years. Village boundaries are being pushed out, eroding the intrinsic nature of Adderbury being a village. Adderbury has taken more than its fair share of Cherwell's development. If housing is absolutely necessary the brownfield site near Twyford Mill would be a more suitable location for building in the village, however I feel that large brownfield sites such as Heyford Park could take a much greater proportion of housing, as could outlying industrial / ex MOD areas to the North of Banbury and South East of Bicester. Adderbury does not have the infrastructure to support any more housing developments or additional people and the traffic they bring with only one school, one small shop and a part time post office. Development would worsen the constant stress and disrepair of the roads with additional traffic. Development around the outskirts of the village has incredibly poor access to public transport with no walkable access to shops, doctors, schools etc. so traffic and cars will continue to increase. This is both a health hazard and a danger. Countryside included on the plan is home to many native species of plants, animals and insects and further building will destroy these and have a massively negative effect on the local environment and ecology. Air, noise and light pollution will increase, causing a decrease in the quality of living for current residents.
LPR-B-393	Danielle Tolson	Option 10	In general there is a significant shortage of good sized family homes with good sized gardens. The amount and density of housing we have seen spring up on new developments in this area largely does not meet the needs of family life (ie tiny houses on tiny plots) nor does it help any sustainability plan as we look to reduce climate change and environmental damage. In general a good proportion of new houses should have a minimum size garden, should have to have a certain number of trees planted per sq meter of house, should be built from sustainable materials, should have high performance windows and should have non-carbon / non-fossil fuel heating. At present all I see is more concrete, more carbon heavy building materials, more fitting of gas heating systems, more destruction of nature and wildlife and more cutting down of trees and this simply can not continue to happen. Sites that must be allocated for building and development in Cherwell come with outstanding environmental and ecological requirements for any building firm so that our district can lead the way in cleaner living for all our futures.
LPR-B-394	Susan Roe-French	Shutford	Development in the village would cause a number of problems. The local roads are 'B' classified and one or two are little more than a single track. This is a vital consideration as we have no public transport in the village so rely on private cars. New housing will generate many more cars. Services such as water, drainage and sewage systems would need to be upgraded. We have very little street lighting, and few facilities. The village has no shop, or school. Suggest improving and updating the existing housing in Banbury town. Potential to redevelop a former department store and other commercial areas. Perhaps providing mixed accommodation, some small units along with larger ones for larger families. The town has a good rail station with fast links to London and elsewhere. It would be great to regenerate our market town and encourage visitors too, and hopefully bring back prosperity to a place that that was thriving and attractive a few decades ago and could be again.
LPR-B-395	Vincent Arts	Adderbury	Plans to build 750 homes in Adderbury is not acceptable and will transform the village into a suburb of Banbury. Gone is the scenery, the wildlife, the pleasant atmosphere, the comradeship, the tranquil roads, a seat on the bus, community spirit, no antisocial behaviour etc. The list is long. Development will be resisted.
LPR-B-396	Sarah and Stewart Cato	Adderbury	Adderbury village has seen substantial development in recent years without any increase in amenities or infrastructure to cope with the increased demand. The rural feel and character of the village has already been compromised with recent developments and this will be lost forever with the proposed developments. The size of the development proposed is not in keeping with the village environment. Much of the proposals contravene the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan with development outside the accepted boundary of the village. This would result in Adderbury morphing into Bodicote and/or Bloxham. Size of the proposed developments is not proportionate to the existing size of the village. Developments of such size should be restricted to towns not small villages. The village would be more than doubled by some of the proposed developments. Development would obstruct views of the church when entering the village. Infrastructure is not sufficient at present nor to accommodate the proposed development. Congestion on the main road is severe; lengthy queues and gridlock at peak times, resulting in dangerous circumstances for residents. Pollution is also a problem which will increase with increased traffic, noise and light. Safety of children on the roads with increased traffic is also a concern. The proposed developments would further disturb existing network of fields, footpaths, ecological and wildlife habitats.
LPR-B-397	Kidlington & District Historical Society	Question - Green Belt	Given the extent of the areas removed from the Greenbelt in the partial review, no further changes to the Greenbelt boundaries around Kidlington and the neighbouring villages should be considered in the period to 2040. Given the scale of economic development occurring or proposed in Kidlington and at Begbroke there is no need for a limited review of the Greenbelt for employment land. The Society supports point 2 of Option 26.
LPR-B-397	Kidlington & District Historical Society	Option 26	Given the scale of economic development occurring or proposed in Kidlington and at Begbroke there is no need for a limited review of the Greenbelt for employment land. The Society supports point 2 of Option 26.
LPR-B-397	Kidlington & District Historical Society	Option 28	Support Point 1. Specifically, the Society supports the designation of the sites put forward by Kidlington Parish Council and Kidlington Development Watch as LGS (LPA -A-237). In particular, the sites on the NE boundaries of the Village help preserve historic landscapes and preserve the setting of Grade 1 Listed St Mary's Church. The site to the East of the Church is, of course, a Conservation Area as well as Greenbelt.
LPR-B-398	Peter Gay	Deddington	Respondent relies on the Deddington Development Watch representation submission and supplements with further points. Concerned that Deddington and other villages are at risk of being overwhelmed by over-development. With the current new builds and already granted planning permissions for rural villages as here in Deddington there appears to be no planned improvement in the infrastructure. Village developments where local public transport is scarce or non-existent with limited local employment invariably leading to unsustainable commuting with the consequential unnecessary parking and pollution problems. Greater housing requirements threaten incalculable harm to our environment and rural character of our villages.

LPR-B-399	Stephanie Lea	Adderbury	Against further development in the village due to infrastructure issues. Concerned about the significant increase in traffic on Oxford Road, Milton Road and through the village itself. Already dangerous on these roads and pressure at medical facilities. The 2018 neighbourhood plan didnt propose further development in the village; with the plan being to develop Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and protect the villages. The village voted for the protection afforded by our current residential settlement boundary and local gaps between Adderbury and Bodicote and Milton. Further development is not what our (already large) village needs, and would severely damage what defines a village- its community, individual identity, charm and history.
LPR-B-400	Jay and Hikari Jopling	LPR-A-175	Object to the proposed developments. It is our understanding that these sites are outwith the settlement boundary. Further, the land in question affords essential open space that contributes to the sense of place and landscape quality which is such a fundamental aspect of the village and area. We completely accept that sensitively designed, well planned and environmentally sustainable residential development can be appropriate where considered in conjunction with a community's needs and aspirations and where local attributes, historic, environmental, archaeological etc. are respected. These two sites do not comply with these criteria and the land's existing designation as adjoining a conservation area and adjoining (and including part of) a registered battlefield render it <b>wholly inappropriate for consideration.</b>
LPR-B-400	Jay and Hikari Jopling	Sustainability Appraisal	objection is in relation to all rural housing sites that have not been the subject of detailed sustainability consideration, not just in Wardington. We think it is fundamental to promote the benefits of more sustainable options including higher density development in well-connected areas like Banbury or Bicester. development in rural areas. This is the least sustainable option and would appear to be open to significant scrutiny. The SA should be investigating whether the expansion of small rural areas should be taking place at any scale, noting that their original historic functions may have diminished. Development in rural areas would result in a heavily car dependant model, creating issues with air quality, climate change, congestion, social isolation and does not promote active travel. Development in rural areas will also result in high infrastructure costs per capita leading to the need for significantly higher levels of public subsidy; more limited local employment opportunities and greater requirement to travel; and Issues concerning the loss of rural landscapes and local identity. Due to their small size, hamlets and villages are particularly susceptible to losing their historic identity through new development.
LPR-B-401	Terence O'Connor	LPR-A-175	Object. If approved this would enable future residential developments of up to 450 homes to be planned. An expansion of this scale raises considerable concerns as the village has a current population of 600 people. The infrastructure is currently ill-equipped to cope with the additional demands of any such development. The highway infrastructure within the village itself predates modern highway standards and as such is limited in its ability to safely accommodate higher volumes of traffic particularly in areas where there is onstreet parking. Limited forward visibility and the narrow geometry frequently require vehicles to give and take. The village is limited in terms of utility supplies in particular gas, where many of the properties are currently fuelled by oil powered heating systems. The carbon emissions of new development in the Wardington area is likely to compare poorly with more urbanised areas better served by existing utility supplies and would not be in keeping with the Local Authority's efforts towards reducing carbon emissions. Wardington is a remote location with little pedestrian or cycling facilities or bus services that connect local residents to schools, shops or jobs. This remote location offers limited strategic value in terms of developing affordable housing as many of those in need of affordable housing may not have access to a car. The noise caused by additional traffic along A361 not to mention the construction traffic and site activities associated with the construction of any future development is of particular concern to me as my property already receives considerable noise disturbance from traffic.  Some of the land proposed for the local plan would conflict with the possible alignment for a bypass around the village which would benefit the village and be a key strategic consideration for the Local Highway Authority where future improvements to the A361 corridor may be necessitated to enable other developments. Wardington is in a conservation area and development will significantly change the appearance and character of the village. The character of the village with houses dating back to the 1800s and The Church of St Mary Magdalene would be irreversibly diminished by replacing its rural setting to one dominated by a modern housing development

LPR-B-402	Jill Mayer	LPR-A-002	<p>Strongly object. Development would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of present infrastructure. Concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. Small villages such as Adderbury can become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community. The Victorian sewage system is struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, the Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC has installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. Development will directly place additional cars on these dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development are entirely unsustainable and every new household would need to drive to access facilities. Several of the sites would, if developed, destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banbury villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests and will provide no benefits to the majority of residents.</p>
LPR-B-402	Jill Mayer	LPR-A-077	<p>Strongly object. Development would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of present infrastructure. Concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. Small villages such as Adderbury can become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community. The Victorian sewage system is struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, the Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC has installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. Development will directly place additional cars on these dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development are entirely unsustainable and every new household would need to drive to access facilities. Several of the sites would, if developed, destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banbury villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests and will provide no benefits to the majority of residents.</p>

LPR-B-402	Jill Mayer	LPR-A-081	<p>Strongly object. Development would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of present infrastructure. Concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. Small villages such as Adderbury can become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community. The Victorian sewage system is struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, the Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC has installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. Development will directly place additional cars on these dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development are entirely unsustainable and every new household would need to drive to access facilities. Several of the sites would, if developed, destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banbury villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests and will provide no benefits to the majority of residents.</p>
LPR-B-402	Jill Mayer	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Development would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of present infrastructure. Concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. Small villages such as Adderbury can become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community. The Victorian sewage system is struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, the Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC has installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. Development will directly place additional cars on these dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development are entirely unsustainable and every new household would need to drive to access facilities. Several of the sites would, if developed, destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. LPR-A-086 would change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. LPR-A-086, if developed, would double the size of West Adderbury. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose existing connection with local farmland. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to these houses being completely subsumed by new estates. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banbury villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests and will provide no benefits to the majority of residents.</p>



LPR-B-402	Jill Mayer	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Development would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of present infrastructure. Concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. Small villages such as Adderbury can become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community. The Victorian sewage system is struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, the Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC has installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. Development will directly place additional cars on these dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development are entirely unsustainable and every new household would need to drive to access facilities. Several of the sites would, if developed, destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. Development at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose existing connection with local farmland.</p> <p>Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to these houses being completely subsumed by new estates. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banbury villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests and will provide no benefits to the majority of residents.</p>
LPR-B-402	Jill Mayer	LPR-A-156	<p>Strongly object. Development would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of present infrastructure. Concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. Small villages such as Adderbury can become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community. The Victorian sewage system is struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, the Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC has installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. Development will directly place additional cars on these dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development are entirely unsustainable and every new household would need to drive to access facilities. Several of the sites would, if developed, destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banbury villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests and will provide no benefits to the majority of residents.</p>

LPR-B-402	Jill Mayer	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Development would result in a huge increase in the area of housing and would result in severe overloading of present infrastructure. Concerned about the loss of green spaces and land that could be used for food production and/or local renewable energy systems. Small villages such as Adderbury can become overwhelmed by infill and ribbon developments that completely change the nature of the community. The Victorian sewage system is struggling to cope with increased volumes of sewage and run-off water and we will continue to have issues until this problem is tackled strategically. In Sweden they have managed to establish separate systems for some of the rain-water and sewage systems. This reduces peak flows and the likelihood of overflows from sewage water treatment systems. These systems can best be installed in towns and cities rather than dispersed rural areas. The site falls outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding, particularly along the A4260, the Aynho Rd, Berry Hill Rd, Milton Rd and Horn Hill/Cross Hill/New Roads. OCC has installed traffic calming measures on Berry Hill Rd and Milton Rd. Development will directly place additional cars on these dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities. The proposed development are entirely unsustainable and every new household would need to drive to access facilities. Several of the sites would, if developed, destroy the rural entrances to the village. The Adderbury Fields estate is set well back from the road with a green space acting as a buffer. The Henge Close development is shielded from the road by established hedgerows. At the other end of Berry Hill Rd, green fields are very gradually replaced by large, individual houses which are again well set back from the road. Development of these sites would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious well used public footpaths over these sites would be lost. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose existing connection with local farmland. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banbury villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests and will provide no benefits to the majority of residents.
LPR-B-403	Toni Ramsay	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. The village cannot sustain the amount of traffic currently so to almost double in size will cause even more chaos than the A361 has to deal with at the moment along with the additional HS2 traffic. Wardington is a small and not well serviced village that does not need many additional residents to be an additional draw on the lack of facilities.
LPR-B-404	Linda Leonard	LPR-A-152	Object. I know how much they value their village identity and I feel that the inclusion of the site for potential development in the new local plan is a travesty. LPR-A- 152 which brings the outskirts of the town to within 100m of the conservation area and would be a blight to the landscape. It is vital to retain a buffer between our towns and villages in order to protect the character of the area. Preserve the integrity of a beautiful conservation area. I am extremely concerned about the ramifications of additional traffic that would be an inevitable result of further development to the North of Banbury. Hanwell already suffers from a high throughput of traffic through the single main street, which at times winding and single track. Passing traffic goes at dangerous speeds. Increased traffic would endanger residents of the village.
LPR-B-404	Linda Leonard	LPR-A-214	Object. I know how much they value their village identity and I feel that the inclusion of the site for potential development in the new local plan is a travesty. It is vital to retain a buffer between our towns and villages in order to protect the character of the area. Preserve the integrity of a beautiful conservation area. I am extremely concerned about the ramifications of additional traffic that would be an inevitable result of further development to the North of Banbury. Hanwell already suffers from a high throughput of traffic through the single main street, which at times winding and single track. Passing traffic goes at dangerous speeds. Increased traffic would endanger residents of the village.
LPR-B-405	Greg and Jane Mullane	North Newington	North Newington is a small parish with its main facility being our Primary School and a village pub. We have no shops, no Church, no GP Surgery, no public transport and no acceptable communication technology. A car is required if you settle in the village just to commute to Banbury- getting to and from the M40 from North Newington is now a 20 minute trip to cover 5 miles. Main Street would not cope with any increase in traffic. The school buses struggle to get a free flow of traffic in the morning and at school pick up time. The village is used as a shortcut to the recycling centre at Shenington, a shortcut to the M40 Northbound from Gaydon as well as surrounding villages. Traffic to and from Wroxton and Shutford is already at a premium, any significant increase in housing in those areas as well as the North Newington parish would truly escalate this problem. Our village streets become running streams after any significant rainfall, any development, particularly the southern plot from Main Street would cause the possible flooding the current on Main Street as the proposed area is well above the current ground level of the properties. North Newington residents experience constant water pressure and sewerage problems. This is due partly to the Victorian drainage/sewer system in place which is at capacity. Any significant property development would exacerbate these current problems. We also suffer from extremely weak mobile phone signals for most major suppliers and poor quality broadband speeds. North Newington has approximately 135 homes that have been developed over the last 200 odd years. We never have had the infrastructure to accommodate any significant property development, organic growth is still the best way forward.
LPR-B-406	Joseph Caulfield	LPR-A-091	Object. There have been a number of new housing sites built in Bodicote and the surrounding area and the Village would struggle to accommodate more. This proposed development would lead to significant disruption to local residents and would require changes to the roads, schools and other infrastructure .

LPR-B-407	Megan Bowdler	LPR-A-185	Object. The proposal does not contribute to or enhance the natural environment. Nethercote is home to a range of local species as well as an array of birds which we should be striving to conserve and protect. The proposed plans remove large areas of fields and trees, completely diminishing their habitats and neglects ecosystems. Nethercote is classified as a green buffer. The proposal will add further strain onto existing traffic issues and affect local residents health through decreasing air quality and potential leading to an air quality management area being designated. It would worsen the issue on Hennef Way in terms of air quality and traffic. The noise, air and light pollution brought by this development would be detrimental to Nethercote residents health.
LPR-B-408	Banbury West End Tennis and Squash Club	LPR-A-077	Object. The site is an important area for flood mitigation in the Sor Valley and throughout the village. Development will reduce the gradual soak into the underground aquifers and in the event of heavy rain will increase the speed that water rises across the valley effecting properties in Adderbury. You will be aware that homes throughout the village are now regularly flooded by the Sor Brook. Banbury Westend Tennis and Squash Club is also affected. Flooding of our tennis courts 5 and 6 and the squash courts has significantly increased in regularity, depth and extent over recent years. Development of these sites will exacerbate this risk not just to 5&6 and the squash courts, but to tennis courts 3 and 4, which are unable to withstand flooding and will be destroyed. We do not have the reserves to withstand such a loss and we cannot get insurance to cover flood. We endeavour to keep the costs of tennis and squash to an absolute minimum so more people can play racket sports in the village. The additional local flooding that will result from these developments present an existential risk to the longterm existence of the club. As a sports club we appreciate the importance of exercise to health and quality of life. The site has highly valued footpaths forming part of local and longer distance routes. Twyford, eastern and central areas of Adderbury have very few rural footpaths so greatly depend upon these open spaces for daily recreation. The footpaths form a network for the wider Banburyshire area, notably, the Adderbury and Bloxham circular walks. Development and urbanisation of these areas, albeit whilst maintaining public rights of way, will erode the value of these amenities to the much wider district.
LPR-B-408	Banbury West End Tennis and Squash Club	LPR-A-156	Object. The site is an important area for flood mitigation in the Sor Valley and throughout the village. Development will reduce the gradual soak into the underground aquifers and in the event of heavy rain will increase the speed that water rises across the valley effecting properties in Adderbury. You will be aware that homes throughout the village are now regularly flooded by the Sor Brook. Banbury Westend Tennis and Squash Club is also affected. Flooding of our tennis courts 5 and 6 and the squash courts has significantly increased in regularity, depth and extent over recent years. Development of these sites will exacerbate this risk not just to 5&6 and the squash courts, but to tennis courts 3 and 4, which are unable to withstand flooding and will be destroyed. We do not have the reserves to withstand such a loss and we cannot get insurance to cover flood. We endeavour to keep the costs of tennis and squash to an absolute minimum so more people can play racket sports in the village. The additional local flooding that will result from these developments present an existential risk to the longterm existence of the club. As a sports club we appreciate the importance of exercise to health and quality of life. The site has highly valued footpaths forming part of local and longer distance routes. Twyford, eastern and central areas of Adderbury have very few rural footpaths so greatly depend upon these open spaces for daily recreation. The footpaths form a network for the wider Banburyshire area, notably, the Adderbury and Bloxham circular walks. Development and urbanisation of these areas, albeit whilst maintaining public rights of way, will erode the value of these amenities to the much wider district.
LPR-B-409	Sandra Bird	LPR-A-185	Object. Corned about the increase in fumes, noise and light pollution any commercial development would bring. The proposal is not a sustainable development. Huge warehouse units along both sides of the M40 would make Banbury look like a major storage depot rather than an English market town. People would not be attracted to the town which would have diastrous effects on the town's economy, especially impacting Banbury's local businesses. At the momemnt there is a green buffer between the motorway and scenery towards South Northamptonshire and the proposed works <b>would be an awful decision for the hamlet of nethercote.</b>
LPR-B-410	Elizabeth Campbell	LPR-A-175	Object. The village has a unique character as a conservation village. To tack the proposed development onto the village would be inappropriate, not only because of the sheer size of the area, but because it is completely out of character of the existing village. Existing services would not be able to cope with the sheer size of any development. To increase both services and housing would decimate the environment and character and the conservation status of this village. At a time when we are being asked to preserve a balance of nature, and environmental issues are uppermost, it seems wrong that this land is being considered for change of use. HS2 work is already causing untold damage and it is so important to be able to hang onto some vestige of the local flora and fauna.
LPR-B-410	Elizabeth Campbell	LPR-A-034	Object. The current warehouse is an eyesore. The threat of many more threatens to completely overshadow and blight the small historic villages that nestle either side of the A361: Chacombe, Wardington, Williamscot and Cropredy. Development on this site seems wholly unnecessary and inappropriate. The countryside must be preserved, the <b>character of the existing villages must be preserved.</b>
LPR-B-411	Annette Reed	LPR-A-175	Object. Are these sites within the boundary of Wardington village, especially the 10 hectares on the which is the opposite side of the A361 to the village itself. The proposal is for 20 houses on 4 hectare site & 5 on the 10 hectare site, will this be hijacked by the council and 300-400 houses built as has happened in other areas. The proposed development will be out of scale by doubling the size of the village. The village is a conservation area. The facilities within the village are very limited: a pub, village hall & a church. No shop, doctors surgery or school. Proposed access to the site onto the A361 will be dangerous. The additional traffic that this sort of development will bring will put added pressure on an already very busy roundabout over the M40, especially with the current development of warehouses being built on land next to the M40. The council is already building 30% more houses than stipulated by the Government. With agreed development of another 8500 houses already in the pipeline and land put aside for a further 8000 houses, this more than cover the Government required build for the next 20 years. Whilst I understand that new houses are <b>required, the sites in Wardington are not in keeping with the area.</b>

LPR-B-412	Katy Fletcher	LPR-A-152	Object. I was lead to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Village life is very important for well being. We have noticed a higher volume of traffic using the village as a rat run and can only expect this to increase due to the proposed additional housing. The roads going through the village have no traffic calming and the roads are being eroded away where I have had to make requests to fix my street due to the increase of traffic. Additional housing will be to the determent of wildlife and there has been littering in the surrounding countryside due to the increase of population. More houses = more people and this in my eyes will only get worse. I understand there is a need to create additional housing but there has already been a huge volume of new homes in the area and in a very short amount of time, the impact has already been huge. The choice to move to the village was to be surrounded by a caring community, not to live in a litter site with a growling influx of speeding cars with little respect in some cases of the local residents.
LPR-B-412	Katy Fletcher	LPR-A-214	Object. I was lead to believe by the Local Authority that there would be no development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Village life is very important for well being. We have noticed a higher volume of traffic using the village as a rat run and can only expect this to increase due to the proposed additional housing. The roads going through the village have no traffic calming and the roads are being eroded away where I have had to make requests to fix my street due to the increase of traffic. Additional housing will be to the determent of wildlife and there has been littering in the surrounding countryside due to the increase of population. More houses = more people and this in my eyes will only get worse. I understand there is a need to create additional housing but there has already been a huge volume of new homes in the area and in a very short amount of time, the impact has already been huge. The choice to move to the village was to be surrounded by a caring community, not to live in a litter site with a growling influx of speeding cars with little respect in some cases of the local residents.
LPR-B-413	Emma Flint	Adderbury	Object. The infrastructure can't cope. I am particularly concerned about the significant increase of traffic and pollution, in particular on Oxford Road, Milton Road and through the village. It is already becoming very dangerous on all these roads, particularly at junctions and where cars use the village as a cut through. There is already pressure on our medical facilities. Our Neighbourhood Plan 2018 agreed by residents and CDC, did not propose further development. The strategy was to develop Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and protect our villages. Prior to the Neighbourhood plan being finalised 2 significant developments were approved in Adderbury, The Milton Road and Ayhno Road. The village consequently voted for the protection afforded by our current residential settlement boundary and local gaps between Adderbury and Bodicote and Milton in order that we remain a village. Further development is not what our village needs and would severely damage what defines a village.
LPR-B-414	Robert Bradlow	Adderbury	Object. UK has something that does not really exist anywhere else in the world, which is the unrivalled community that surrounds traditional village life. As these communities have been built up over many centuries there is a sense of uniqueness to them. Proposed development will no doubt destroy the fabric of the village, as it expands such a large area surrounding it. I do believe that it would make much more sense to look at alternative sites that are on the edge of the town of Banbury, which is an already developed town. A dramatic increase in traffic congestion and problems that are arising out of the lack of investment in basic infrastructure, such as public transport and local schools. Continued development in Cherwell area should be halted until an infrastructure investment plan has been put in place that can help to mitigate the overly hasty plans to develop the fabric of the villages that surround Banbury.
LPR-B-415	Paul Harry	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPRA-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-415	Paul Harry	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPRA-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-415	Paul Harry	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPRA-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-415	Paul Harry	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-415	Paul Harry	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-416	Dawn Harry	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-416	Dawn Harry	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-416	Dawn Harry	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-416	Dawn Harry	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-416	Dawn Harry	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Option 1	Support the general approach of the review and the overarching vision, particularly with regards to: targeting growth on areas which benefit from sustainable transport links and other infrastructure hubs which are required to support existing and new neighbourhoods; maintaining good transport links and infrastructure to support a flexible economy; and, focusing employment land in/around Kidlington (as well as Bicester and Banbury) which are all aligned with the long-term potential and ambitions for development at/adjacent to Oxford Parkway.
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Option 2	Support for: KO1, KO2 and KO16. KO16 would reduce the dependency on the private car as a mode of travel, facilitating the creation of a zero-carbon transport network. These are aligned with the long-term potential and ambitions for development at/adjacent to Oxford Parkway
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Option 3	Support the principle of focusing employment land around the main urban centres of Banbury and Bicester, and in particular, Kidlington. Support the rationale for focusing employment at significant transport changes, which is aligned with the long-term potential and ambitions for development at/adjacent to Oxford Parkway
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Option 4	Support a mix of employment uses as critical to strengthening Cherwell's key commercial sectors. This is fundamental to the district vision to take a leading role in the Regional and National economy. The type of employment should have regard to the location and capacity of the site and the benefits of being in close proximity to major transport infrastructure hubs such as Oxford Parkway (and the land adjacent), which would be able to deliver employment uses which can meet multiple criteria in relation to reducing car travel and climate change targets.
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Question - Supporting Employment	We would like to express the need for flex within town centre uses to allow scope for commercial/retail centres to evolve and respond more rapidly to demand, both within town centres and in strategic/sustainable employment sites on the edge of primary urban settlements, as per the long term potential and ambitions for on/adjacent to Oxford Parkway.
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Option 5	Support options to protect and support defined areas but promoting long term flex to enable demand to be met quickly, which is aligned with the long term potential and ambitions for development on/adjacent to Oxford Parkway
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Question - Green Belt	Support policy which enables the Green Belt to be reviewed to accommodate employment land where exceptional circumstances exist. The land at/adjacent to Oxford Parkway is a logical and sustainable location for green belt release given the existing commitments and development potential over the longer term.
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Policies should: capitalise on existing/planned investment in sustainable modes including P&R and other improved bus infrastructure and rail networks; and, require attractive and safe pedcycle connections which align with the long term potential and ambitions for land at/adjacent to Oxford Parkway
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Option 17	Sensible to review methodology as part of the plan process against wider objectives for the longer term. Catchment and accessibility reflects a more appropriate approach based on how the area functions.
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	We believe there is a need for pooling of shared contributions where infrastructure is to be secured in connection with multiple development allocations.
LPR-B-417	EDSS Rural Ltd for Mr M Smith	Option 26	Support a small green belt review to test for exceptional circumstances for employment uses. The land on/adjacent to Oxford Parkway is one such site outside the Green Belt boundary location which could provide a sustainable location for employment use, be supported by the strong transport links provided by Oxford Parkway rail station and Park & Ride as well as the general proximity of existing and future settlements of Kidlington, North Oxford and PR6a.
LPR-B-418	Anne Court	Adderbury/Twyford	Strongly object. The site covers mainly Agricultural land. The village will almost double in size putting stress on the already very busy roads, causing even more air pollution. The infrastructure in the village does not allow of such expansion. To build huge housing estates which will encircle the village is just abhorrent, no doubt squashing houses together with small gardens. Any further developments in the village should be on brownfield sites such as Twyford Mill and other small infiltrated sites. Any future housebuilding in the Adderbury village to be eco housing with no gas boilers fitted, all to have thermal heat pumps/air source heating and solar panels on the roof, extremely efficient windows and doors. Thoughts should be given for future houses to use recycled water and unless any future houses aren't ecological, I don't want to see any houses built at all. It is not the way forward. With regards to all housing built in the Cherwell area I certainly do not want to see mass housing built of standard construction as this is not the way forward and no contracts should be allowed to go through unless they are built as houses for the future

LPR-B-419	Tim and Teresa Shardlow	LPR-A-155	Object. The proposed development will increase the risk of flooding to Station Road, Cropredy School and neighbouring properties. The proposed development would be in flood zone 1, but the surface water run-off from the site would be discharged into the Sow Burge in an area of zone 3 flood risk. The Sow Burge is a tributary of the River Cherwell and flows adjacent to the School. The School and grounds are situated in a zone 3 flood risk area and very vulnerable. The school has flooded 3 times in the last 14 years. Significant flood events have occurred in recent years. In July 2007 Cropredy School was seriously damaged, contaminated by sewage and closed for 9 weeks. The channel capacity of the Sow Burge was exceeded. In December 2013 Station Road was closed and vehicles damaged. In March 2016 the school was closed for a day. October 2021 flooding occurred under the railway bridge after just 2 hours of rainfall.
LPR-B-420	Gill Slade	LPR-A-175	Object. The proposal would potentially more than double the number of dwellings currently in the village, with new housing being built on an area which is a fraction of the size of that now providing housing. This would alter the character of this conservation area village. The potential increase in traffic would add considerably to existing traffic. Building on the proposed areas would remove any possibility of there being a bypass to relieve the traffic problem through the village. There was considerable disruption during the 'widening' of the A361 for HS2 traffic, and yet there is still insufficient room for two HGVs to pass without one of them stopping. The land in question would be far better used for a bypass
LPR-B-421	David Collingwood Turner	Hanwell	Object. Hanwell is a self-contained vibrant community of people who have chosen to live in a village away from the town. Encroaching development over recent years and empty assurances has left the village feeling dismayed and distrustful of local government. Hanwell is a rural village and conservation area. The last local Plan stated that such areas are to be protected. A rural perimeter is required. Hanwell is highly biodiverse which needs to be protected. Hanwell is a historical village. It has a C12th church and a Castle with a rare C17th century Italian water garden that is being excavated by archaeologists. Hanwell has a long standing Astronomical Observatory and in recent years the night sky has been increasingly light polluted from developments The proposed development joins Hanwell to Banbury. A single field distance is inadequate. The town boundary to be set at the edge of the current development. I would like to suggest that Hanwell is made even more attractive. The fields offered for sale could be purchased and turned into native woodland to assist in the fight against climate change and achievement of net zero carbon dioxide. Incentives could be given to turn the fields around Hanwell into smaller units with the replanting of hedgerows and return of livestock. .
LPR-B-422	Peter Gough	Adderbury	Object. There seems no overall strategy for development of the village beyond trying to control of this housing development. Adderbury is becoming a sizable village but there is no Health Centre and the village shop is sub scale and so difficult as a commercial enterprise Everyone will use their car as footpaths and cycleways are not being developed as part of any village development plan, which would see new facilities provided as part of any planned development There will be no new employment opportunities. Greenfield sites in places like Adderbury are top of the developers list for commercial reasons so it's sad they are setting the agenda on where to build not Cherwell.
LPR-B-423	John Berry	Sibford Gower	Object. If the sites are included in the plan would inevitably lead to any planning application being in accordance with the plan and be hard to challenge. Development would effect the local highways, Pound Lane has no footpath and currently is in a disgraceful state of repair. Increased traffic would lead to further deterioration to Pound Lane and other roads e.g. Main Street which is in need of major repair. A development on this site would lead to an increase in the population of between 400 and 500 which would double the size of the existing population. Such an increase is inappropriate in a small village with no shop, limited road and public transport facilities, limited water supply and would increase the carbon footprint which I believe Cherwell are legally obliged to do. Any increase in attendance at the Primary School will lead to increased traffic flows and congestion within the village, there being no access by foot/cycle from the proposed development sites. Increased demand for mains water could lead to an additional reservoir at the top of Pound Lane and increased communications requirements would probably mean a higher mobile phone tower to accommodate additional antennas or another base station. Hard surfaces of estate roads and drives would result in increased disposal requirements and flood risk in Colony Road down the valley where surface water drainage is an issue. Disposal of foul sewage is under strain with the development off Hook Norton Road in Sibford Ferris, such developments on the proposed sites would result in further sewage works at the existing works or even on the proposed development. Sibford Gower is currently in a dark sky region which should remain. The area in between Chipping Norton and Banbury in which Sibford Gower is sited is one of the last unspoilt areas in the county and any development on this scale would erode this valuable and sensitive landscape which should be preserved.
LPR-B-424	Rev Jeffrey Ian Smith	LPR-A-091	Object. It would eliminate one of the footpaths between Bodicote and Adderbury to allow additional housing. This is one of a network of interconnected and interlocking footpaths between the two settlements that adds so much interest and value to walking in that area. These footpaths are well used. This area is not contiguous with any present 'settlement' (only the odd, isolated, houses) and it would seem wanton destruction of a very valued amenity to create such a settlement. I very much agree with the sentiment expressed in the Report that Banbury has had more than its fair share of development and the 'environs' of the town are already being badly marred by such developments. The area south of the town (ie Bodicote to Adderbury) is already very narrow and any such developments will irreversibly damage the character and nature of both places. Both of them have very distinctive identities and 'atmosphere' and to 'bleed them into each other' would be wanton vandalism.
LPR-B-425	Emma Ross	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. Development would fundamentally change the character of Wardington, which is a conservation village. Development would be out of scale with the size of Wardington. The need for services to sustain an increase in population including a school and sewerage would surely make other areas on the outskirts of Banbury a better choice. Given the new developments proposed to the A361 and need for access to the M40, a by-pass around Wardington will become necessary. The only logical land to use for this future by-pass is that which is currently designated in the Local Plan.
LPR-B-425	Emma Ross	LPR-A-168	Strongly object. We already have the ugly warehouses being built along that stretch of road, which will inevitably cause traffic issues and have massively spoiled the countryside. There is no need to spoil what's left of the beautiful area with further commercial development. The A361 is a vital road for access to the M40 and to the rail station in Banbury, and to clog it with more traffic will make coimmuting awful for residents of Wardington, Cropredy and Williamscot in particular.



LPR-B-425	Emma Ross	LPR-A-034	Strongly object. The scale of what is being proposed is ridiculous and completely out of tune with the local character and surrounding villages. Traffic has already been impacted by the two existing warehouse structures and they're not finished yet. A warehousing site of such proportions would be absolutely awful. Eye sores, traffic congestion, disrupting wildlife, and impinging on the character of the nearby villages.
LPR-B-426	Keith Allen	LPR-A-107	Object. This small village would be swamped with more cars. There is not any pavement into the village or even sufficient room to build a pavement, as close to the crossroads only one car at a time can navigate the road. When visiting the primary school/church/village hall/Sibford Ferris shop, the junction is inadequate in width to take more traffic. Doubling the population of a rural village is completely out of proportion with the local infrastructure and therefore inappropriate to the area with countryside adjacent to the village. Sibford Gower is an important example of understanding the environment by being a 'dark sky' village – any development of this size would completely destroy this vital issue. I hope Cherwell look at brownfield sites rather than greenfield sites.
LPR-B-427	Patrick and Sandra Clay	LPR-A-107	Strongly object. Due to successive governments failing to invest in local infrastructure, our roads are in very poor condition and are not maintained. We have no cycle ways and footpaths are inadequate in Pound Lane. Access to the local primary school from Pound Lane is dangerous due to a lack of footpaths and a bottleneck near the school junction. We have no street lighting in Sibford Gower. A massive increase in the population of the village would increase commuter traffic, damaging our valuable countryside. Due to a lack of local employment opportunities, people will commute as public transport links are very poor in our village. Development does not go hand in hand with CDC investing in public transport, infrastructure, road development and services such as water. The only investment in infrastructure we have seen has been in towns or cities such as Banbury where significant development has taken place, we recommend that if more houses need to be built, they should be built where the infrastructure can support them. By building in Banbury, CDC would benefit in terms of its investment in new development within the town. Changing the use of good quality productive agricultural land into concrete is not within the Council's plan regarding climate change and a carbon negative future. This will not leave the natural environment in a better state than it was before.
LPR-B-428	Stephen Flint	Adderbury	Object. In addition to the four recent and significant developments in Adderbury; the proposed 12 future developments would have a catastrophic impact on the local infrastructure. The significant likely increase in traffic (and pollution) particularly on the already busy Oxford, Milton and Aynho roads is a concern especially at the crossing points for the primary school. The existing pressure on medical facilities will only get worse. The Oxford road has become noticeably busier following recent developments in Adderbury and Bodicote, and has led to an increase of traffic using the centre of the village as a rat run to avoid congestion. There will be increased instances of flooding due to surface water runoff as consequence of the further urbanisation of the village. The 2018 Neighbourhood Plan did not propose any further developments. I understand that the strategy was to develop Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and to protect villages. Prior to the Neighbourhood plan being finalised, 2 significant developments were improved in Adderbury- the Milton and Aynho Road sites. The village consequently voted for the protection that was afforded by our current settlement boundary and the local gaps between Adderbury and Bodicote, and Milton to remain a village not become subsumed into a suburb of Banbury. While I appreciate the need for more houses nationally, further development is not what our village needs given the additional four recent and significant developments that have already been incorporated to Adderbury. Further development would catastrophically damage what defines a village.
LPR-B-429	Alison Rippon	LPR-A-107	Strongly object. There is no basis for the inclusion of these sites. While permission might not be sought for this number initially I have seen large developments creeping across greenfield sites in villages nearby and believe this is completely at odds with a sustainable approach to planning. Cherwell have an opportunity to put a stop to unscrupulous and greedy development. Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris do not have the infrastructure to sustain even medium-scale development. The foul and surface water drainage is completely inadequate. More houses in Sibford Gower would lead to an increase in commuter traffic which the narrow roads could not sustain. The 25 houses planned for Sibford Ferris are going to create problems of access for cars and additional threat to pedestrians. Most importantly is the threat to the beautiful countryside and an erosion of a rural way of life. The areas offered as potential for development are adjacent to land designated as being of outstanding natural beauty and part of the Ironstone Downland. There would be damage to hedgerows, mature trees and to the water table. To include the sites in the plan would be contrary to progressing towards a carbon negative future and ensuring our distinctive natural and built environment is protected and enhanced.
LPR-B-429	Alison Rippon	Option 31	I do not believe that rural areas should support more than their communities need to thrive. It makes much more sense to develop brownfield sites in towns where there is more employment and development will not materially increase traffic on the roads
LPR-B-430	Charlotte Clark	Hanwell	Object. Development would have a big impact on my day to day life because I walk my dogs everyday around where the houses are planning to be built. The new homes would disrupt the countryside I enjoy and would cause a lot of upset for me and many other walkers. We are proud of our village, it's history and beautiful surrounding countryside, we do not want this to be taken away from us
LPR-B-431	Simon Clark	Hanwell	Object. Development will encroach into the village of Hanwell. 800 year old village with a 12th century church that would lose its identity like many others and identity should be protected. This development would now ruin that move which is grossly unfair. I am also concerned that this will devalue my property as people pay a premium for an isolated village lifestyle. Traffic through the village will increase on an already narrow road. The lose of wildlife would be sad. The views from these fields are breathtaking and that vista will be lost

LPR-B-432	Luke, Vanessa and Mary Mulley	LPR-A-107	<p>Object. Large developments on this scale are contrary to 'natural development' which I believe should be the norm for villages. Houses developed all at the same time or in large batches mean the design visually jars with the rest of the village. Large developments prevent local businesses benefitting, no local architect will design the houses, no local builder will be employed, no local merchants will be used to source materials etc. and any money made will not stay in the community. Sibford Gower is a good distance from any town, this means that any new development would increase traffic on the road between Shipton and Banbury making the traffic situation in Swacliffe, Tadmarton, Broughton and Brailles increasingly difficult. At present the width is restricted by road side parking and the twists and turns in the road, more traffic is not going to solve this. Sibford Gower does not have nor will ever have a wealth of modern leisure activities or amenities so most social and leisure interests will require a car journey. Increases in traffic increase pollution through co2 even if all the vehicles are all going to be electric, due to the need to generate the electricity. We have a small village school, although I am sure they have space to increase their numbers slightly they certainly do not have the space to take on the potential huge number of children the possible future 350 houses could generate. The area around the school does not allow for enlargement and families in the current community and catchment area would be forced to look elsewhere. The site is an area of good, fairly flat farm land and should be 'ear marked' to stay as such, the local plan should include the need to feed people, we can't keep on removing farm land from our country in order to house people.</p> <p>Development land should always be brownfield sites or contaminated land in order that the development improves the environment. Please protect the villages of this special area, they are a real asset</p>
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 1	Supports the Vision in general. Regarding 14) 'Our rural communities', suggests including a statement about maintaining villages rural identity by preventing coalescence of settlements and protecting the rural character and quality of village by preventing inappropriate and disproportionate development.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 2	Considers the draft objectives are comprehensive and balanced. Particular important are: KO1, KO4, KO5, KO9, K10 to KO19, KO23, KO25, KO31. Any development should not damage the character and quality of rural areas.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 3	Employment Land should be focussed at our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and mostly on previously developed land, including in less sustainable locations. Favour some employment land in rural areas provided it is of an appropriate type and size so as not to damage the rural character and environment.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Further 'out of town' retail development should be prevented. The evidence is the detrimental effect that the Gateway Development appears to have had on Banbury Town centre.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	For Banbury, recognise fully the importance of the urban landscape as an attractor and enhancer of civic pride and wellbeing. For example, continue to enhance streets such as Parsons Street encouraging independent retail and catering outlets; make more use of the Market Square, better the town to the canal; notwithstanding the planned restaurant and leisure outlets, the town tends to turn its back on the canal.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	A policy about separation would be helpful, but it would need to be context specific as higher densities are appropriate in some settings.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	Supports the provision of affordable housing (particularly shared ownership) to provide the opportunity for residents' children to be able to return or stay in the village. Any development would need to be proportionate to the village and not be detrimental to the rural character of the village. There is a need to provide smaller dwellings for elderly residents wishing to downsize to a more 'manageable' house.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Support a sensitive and bespoke approach to historic buildings. Regarding older 'non-historic buildings', the policy should be informed by technological advances.

LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Encourage a standard approach for considering all proposals for renewable energy generation including micro generation. Strengthen policies on promoting Electric Vehicles, including addressing issues in rural areas such as providing charging points for the those houses that do not have offroad parking. Policies related to carbon capture such as tree planting and sustainable farming.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	CPC welcomes these policies.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 14	Seek opportunities to integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. However, the detail of the policy would need to be set out.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. Could provide better value for money provided the existing facilities were of an adequate standard and easily accessible from the new development
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	CPC will consider whether there are any sites within the parish that could be nominated as Local Green Space.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	CPC considers the policies in relation to protecting the historic environment specified in the Options Paper appear comprehensive.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	CPC agrees with updating the Cherwell Residential Design Guide Supplementary Document and that it would be helpful to include other buildings such as offices and shops. CPC considers that the 'Design Advice' should reflect urban and rural environments and have a specific section on villages.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The 20-minute neighbourhood is a very useful concept in urban areas, and suggests that the approach could be amended as '(10-minute?) Neighbourhood" in villages, including noting which facilities are available only through transport links to the nearest town
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agrees with the proposed approach of prioritising reducing the need for travel and active travel. In rural areas some allowance is needed as it is not possible to meet all needs locally, but low carbon transport can mitigate the effects of additional travel. This could be helped by encouraging electric vehicles in villages through subsidies for charging points at homes and in public areas. A frequent and regular bus service from Cropredy to Banbury and Banbury railway station. CPC would welcome a review of existing cycleway provision including consultation with local cycling groups. This could include a review of the potential to connect villages by cycleways and footpaths to the nearest urban area
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 16	1)Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). 2) Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure. 3) Provide a criteria based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	CPC agrees with identified range of policies and documents. CPC suggests including a specific policy on promoting 'low carbon' transport in rural areas through provision of Electric Vehicle charging and 'low carbon' buses, and cycleways, particular connecting rural and urban areas.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 17	The methodology for infrastructure delivery should consider the wider factors listed (social and environmental benefits and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy. CPC considers that 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan' by place makes sense apart from the general category for 'rural areas' as this does not allow for variation in different rural settings. Therefore, some differentiation of rural areas should be considered.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 19	Any development of Banbury should be on vacant and previously developed land within the existing town boundaries.

LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Important Views of Banbury	There should be policies to protect 'views' and to protect historic buildings and settings.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission? Option 1 as this would provide more control, although it is acknowledged that appropriate conversion to residential can be beneficial by increasing the number of people in the town centre
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Provided the residential development maintains/enhances the historic character of the Oxford Canal.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Supports the objective of the 'north- south' linear park and of enhancing the Oxford Canal.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Addressing Inequality in	Planning policies should consider the social and well-being impacts of developments and the provision of facilities.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Considers car dependency would be reduced by better public transport, cycle ways and walking routes.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 30	Housing development in rural areas should primarily meet local needs and that any additional development should be proportionate to the current size of the village and matched by appropriate infrastructure.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 32	Additional weight should be given to accessibility (particularly by public transport) to urban areas otherwise residential development based on the existing hierarchy would increase car dependency. Not taking account of accessibility to urban centres in the Village hierarchy could lead to an inappropriate housing allocation. CPC considers that settlement boundaries should be defined as this would prevent disproportionate development and/or sprawling development.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 33	Option 1 as this ensures that all developments are considered in relation to the policies.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Option 34	CPC would prefer a combination of the two approaches as it is important to define particularly valuable landscape features but also provide protection for features in all areas which may be important locally.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Welcome help and advice in producing a 'community plan' to provide a vision for the future of Cropredy that takes account of the community's views and local evidence. Production of a Neighbourhood Plan for Cropredy is not currently viable due to resource constraints and the need to have something in place by Summer 2022 to be the basis for CPC's response to Cherwell's Draft Local Plan.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	LPR-A-155	Any development in Cropredy should be proportionate to the size of the village (340 dwellings est.), beneficial to the village, and that any housing development should be primarily for local needs, and any development should not be detrimental to the rural character of the village and its setting. CPC considers that any appraisal of this site for potential development should take account of the following: sensitivity of the adjacent Conservation Areas of Cropredy and the Oxford Canal, the adjacent residential areas of Kyetts Corner, Creampot Lane and the dwellings between Creampot Lane and the Oxford Canal; the rural setting of Cropredy Marina; additional traffic generated; potential increase in run off with consequences for flooding; and, housing developments should be proportionate to the size of Cropredy, which has approximately 340 dwellings and not be detrimental to the rural character and setting of the village. Any development would damage the setting of the listed building, 'Springfields'. (This was the reason for the dismissal of an Appeal (24/04/2018). This would be the case with any proposed housing development. Other concerns raised in connection with previous planning applications still apply including that development would harm 'the character, rural setting and quality of the village and its heritage assets; highways safety and effects on public infrastructure, and increased risk of flooding.
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	LPR-A-202	Any development in Cropredy should be proportionate to the size of the village (340 dwellings est.), beneficial to the village, and that any housing development should be primarily for local needs, and any development should not be detrimental to the rural character of the village and its setting. CPC considers that any appraisal of this site should take account of 'traffic issues' in School Lane, which is unadopted and poorly surfaced, and passes between Cropredy Church of England Primary School and the planned school car park (planning permission granted).
LPR-B-433	Cropredy Parish Council	LPR-A-044	Any appraisal of potential development of this site should take account the consequential risk of coalescence of the villages of Bourton and Cropredy, contrary to Cherwell's planning policy.

LPR-B-434	Joseph Woodward	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. Parts of Wardington have been designated a conservation area which is a status achieved through very careful maintenance of an area and its character. The concept of granting an area conservation status and then a few years later potentially approving the application for what could potentially be 400 new build houses immediately neighbouring the area is completely nonsensical and would bring great concern to the integrity and motives of organisations such as yourselves granting such permissions. Given the overdevelopment at M40 J11 and continued applications for development, this land could be crucial for development of a potential future bypass. Surely it makes more sense to develop other areas for consideration which have many of the amenities required for new housing than the areas around Wardington. Wardington has no schools, no shops, runs on oil, has 1 bus per hour. Development would be a blatant disregard for the character of the area which is carefully and meticulously maintained by the community, and a disregard for the environment. We cannot even prune a tree without council permission so the concept of the area being developed for new housing when alternative areas are to be considered should be a complete non starter.
LPR-B-434	Joseph Woodward	LPR-A-168	Strongly object. Commercial development would wipe out acres and acres of natural habitats and add hundreds of load bearing lorries to the A361 potentially causing all sorts of issues for surrounding villages. Development has already taken place with huge warehouses already being erected. Traffic congestion has already been impacted and the sites are not yet even functioning. To entertain the idea of additional warehousing being built would surely further add to the traffic congestion on the A361, a road which is certainly not designed to take heavy traffic. The A361 would surely see increased traffic all the way from the M1 with huge lorries potentially using the road as a cut through, an issue which would make the road much less safe and also have knock on detrimental effects to traffic levels and pollution in villages further along the A361.
LPR-B-434	Joseph Woodward	LPR-A-034	Strongly object. The A361 would undoubtedly see increased traffic all the way from the M1 with huge lorries potentially using the road as a cut through to the potential warehouse, an issue which would make the road much less safe and also have knock on detrimental effects to traffic levels and pollution in villages further along the A361. We are all trying to help nature and maintain the beauty of our countryside and are now faced with commercial developments which millions of natural habitats and add hundreds of load bearing lorries to the A361 potentially causing all sorts of issues for surrounding villages.
LPR-B-435	David and Susan Bradley	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-435	David and Susan Bradley	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-435	David and Susan Bradley	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-435	David and Susan Bradley	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-435	David and Susan Bradley	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 1	2) 'New developments are built to high energy efficiency' - this statement is open to interpretation, it should demonstrate greater positivity, e.g. All new developments are built to energy efficient standards equal to Passivhaus Standard, that will not provide any additional strain on existing resources. 10) 'Our distinctive natural and built environment. market towns define its distinctiveness' - this point should be split to create an extra distinct point. 11) 'Cherwell maintains its rural character where its landscapes, its vast range of natural and built heritage and its market towns define its distinctiveness, by limiting growth and loss of valued green space'.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 2	KO 9: Should Social be introduced after economic in the objective? This would support "as a place to live and work" KO 13: Re-word to - Protect existing biodiversity and maximise opportunities for biodiversity net gain and the enhancement of Cherwell's natural capital, and minimising pollution across the whole of Cherwell.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and at significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above. Steps need to be put forward to secure the viability of the existing town centre, making it an attractive place to visit.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Supporting Employment	Regarding the appearance and operation of Employment buildings policies could include the use of: green roofs and walls; appropriate tree planting; low level lighting, appropriate building height so that surroundings are not overshadowed; rainwater capture; grey water capture and reuse; exploit solar energy capture; minimise external energy pollution; minimise internal pollution; incorporate business signage on building fronts rather than standalone signs and flags; and, reduce unsightly fencing and use trees to form boundaries

LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 5	Flexibility should be available, but consideration needs to be given to resultant use of cars. At present the town centres are not laid out to encourage excessive traffic use. Town Centres present a complex problem that would benefit from in depth consideration To take account of current retail trends, viability of leisure business, the need to provide small retail units for entrepreneurial endeavours.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?. If Option 2 was to remain then a condition should be included that there would not be a further change to the set amounts once the build had commenced
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 7	There should be a flexible approach to provision of Social Housing dependant on location. An underlying factor should be for the Social Housing Provider to prioritise local residents.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?. The space standard being the minimum is questioned. Should Cherwell consider the number of new homes recently built that submitted Planning Applications for expansion, and perhaps set a Standard that goes beyond the minimum and is more in line with what is required.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Separation Distances	It would be helpful for minimum distance separation standard to be set, as often subsequent expansion applications can infringe sufficient access to both privacy and natural light.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 9	Bloxham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan BL8 addressed this topic, and this should be built on by Cherwell District Council in the Local Plan, especially bearing in mind the current enforcement and lack of rigor of Building Regulations
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Travelling Communities	The county-wide GTAA should be used to inform the Plan.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Housing Policies	It would be appropriate to have clear policies relating to sub-division of homes, infilling, use of modular buildings, conversion of retail to residential and agricultural buildings. Rather than rely on a Design code.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government? Cherwell District Council should be aware of its scarcity of resources e.g., water, removal of sewage and electricity, therefore it should set its own target which should be above those required nationally. This would enable developers to be clear in what is expected from them.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation and use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?. Should consideration be given to placing solar panels on large bodies of water e.g., Grimsbury Reservoir rather than the conflict of using agricultural land.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Thinking should not be limited to only providing domestic EV charging points. There needs to be proactive action for domestic energy production via a variety of means including consideration for Hydrogen provision. All new Developments would need to provide onsite energy to heat dwellings ( possibly through Ground Source Heat pumps), all dwellings having integrated solar panels, management of sewage waste on site and utilise both rain water and grey water on site.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Green Belt	Giving consideration to the difficulty in securing "Green Belt" status now and that the "Green Buffers" originally proposed by Cherwell were not given due respect by either developers or planning inspectors, if the Alternative is to put in place "Valued Landscapes" then the weight given to these would need to be established
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 12	All development should ultimately seek to reduce harmful impact to the site. If this is not possible then minimise impacts by design or effective mitigation and compensate onsite to provide equivalent or better, should be aimed for. When designing the site care should be given to the green infrastructure of native UK grown trees and shrubs, also avoiding excessive street lighting and where it is used appropriate cowls should be in place.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain;
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Policies on Biodiversity and Natural Environment need to be robust and include reduction in light and Noise Pollution, improvement in Air Quality and improvement in Water Resource and Protection of valued Landscapes. There should be an emphasis on Native plants and trees that are UK grown. Provision for nesting sites for protected birds and bats known to frequent the District. Inclusion of native hedgerows that provide both shelter and feeding habitats. A policy on the percentage of the site that will need to accommodate tree and shrubs e.g. 30%. There needs to be "sign off" confirmation that all the required measures have been installed, as monitoring, certainly at present can not be carried out by the inhouse ecologist. The Policy for bird and bat boxes should also apply to any Applications made for existing buildings. For all sites integrated boxes should be recommended as standard. Use of up-to-date information on locations of species in Cherwell.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 14	All future developments should incorporate sufficient space to provide an informal open space complete with trees. This should allow for creative and imaginative play as well as informal gathering spaces for families (allowing for integration). Existing structured play facilities should be improved via Developer funding and ongoing maintenance of such also provided by Developer funding. The use of Management Companies for such areas should be discouraged by Cherwell, as often these arrangements are fraught with difficulties in getting any remedial work carried out. When Play areas that require contributions by residents of the development, this sometimes leads to conflict when others use the areas
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 15	When assessing strategic development sites, the provision of pitch provision on site should be considered as well as housing. If "hubs" are to be considered, then additional funding to provide community transportation to avoid unnecessary traffic on congested routes

LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Local Green Spaces	No Green Space provision was put forward as part of this consultation for Bloxham. Bloxham Parish Council did identify 5 such spaces in it's NDP. Space No 5 shown on Map3 of the NDP is designated as Amenity space on the Miller Homes development on Milton Road. The land was meant to be transferred to the Parish Council. Without any consultation the Parish Council was informed by CDC that the land would be retained by the developer <b>and managed by them possibly at a cost to residents of Weavers Field.</b>
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Good Design and Beauty are subjective. The CDC Design SPD whilst a reasonable base does not appear to have sufficient depth. It could be helpful for Planners to collaborate with areas that have produce NDPS to include either revisions or Policies relating to Good Design for their area.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Agree with 20-minute neighbourhood concept. Further extensions to village locations removes this aspect and introduces the use of vehicles.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Congestion in rural areas appears to be increasing, despite the lack of road haulage drivers, the A361 through Bloxham appears to be as busy as ever. Any resultant congestion leads to an increase in Air pollution. As many of the main pavements are below standard requirements the air pollution is worse especially for children using these paths. An approach of diverting heavy goods vehicles away from rural roads and utilising the larger trunk routes and where possible using rail to transport goods.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 16	Possibly Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing) and provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Transport Policies	Agree with the range of transport policies.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy?. Continue to prepare the IDP by place or look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are should be actioned
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Greater weight needs to be given to comments by Primary Care Teams for Health. The Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group have reported Practices experiencing significant growth in recent years. Many GP Practices are grouping together and working closely with Community Health and Social Care Agencies. It may be that eventually space will become an issue.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 30	Work with Local Communities and assess Housing Allocations in NDPs.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. Work with Communities and use NDPs. Assess the availability of the infrastructure to support additional housing.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 32	Work with local communities and review villages to include the so-called 'satellite' villages that depend on the main village facilities. Consideration should also be given to establishing Settlement Boundaries in conjunction with the Parish Councils
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals. Support should be given to the Rural Economy especially in encouraging agriculture and farming. When farmland is put forward for development weight should be given regards its value a farmland and could tenant farmers be encouraged with support of CDC.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district and define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Provide ongoing support to review and revise NDPs
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-049	This site borders the Slade Nature Reserve and the Country Park with attenuation pond established as part of the Woodlands development. Consideration should be given to the provision of Native trees (UK grown) on at least 30% of the site that borders the Slade Nature Reserve (a long established woodland). This would be in line with the England Tree Action Plan. The site proposes an extension to the settlement boundary and moves development outside the 20-minute neighbourhood ideal. Access would be from a narrow rural road just above a junction adjacent to a Primary School. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed.



LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-052	This site would surround the village Primary School removing the current green outlook especially from the school playing fields, turning Bloxham Primary School into an urban school. Consideration should be given that at least 30% of the site, that borders the Primary School and houses, these should be allocated to the planting of Native UK grown trees. The England Tree Action Plan should be considered. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-070	The access to this site would be from a rural Road that already has a compromised junction with the A361. The England Tree Action Plan should be considered. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-075	The access to this site appears to be from the A361 at a known accident hotspot.The England Tree Action Plan should be considered. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-094	This site would border The Slade Nature Reserve and as such consideration should be given to at least 30% of the area adjacent to the Slade being allocated to Native UK grown established trees.The England Tree Action Plan should be considered. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-100	This development would compromise several Public Rights of Way, by altering their current rural open aspect to one enclosed by housing.The England Tree Action Plan should be considered. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-115	This site is contra to Policies BL2 BL9 BL11a of the Bloxham Neighbourhood Development Plan.The England Tree Action Plan should be considered. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed.
LPR-B-436	David and Jenny Yates	LPR-A-151	This site would require access onto Bloxham Grove Road, opposite the Warriner Secondary School, and then onto the A361 at an already compromised junction.The England Tree Action Plan should be considered. The issue of wastewater removal at present means most new development sites have required "pumping stations". This together with the increased need for Electric vehicle charging points could place a burden on the present fragile supply. Their impact on the connecting roads and current infrastructure provision such as Doctors, Dentists and Schools should also be part of the criteria. Retention of existing hedgerows, that provide both feeding and shelter habitat that is not easily replicated once removed.
LPR-B-437	Autumn Edwards Hayter	LPR-A-091	Strongly object. The highlighted land is inappropriate for development and conflicts with the National Planning Policy framework and the current Adopted Local Plan. The land is currently accessed via Church street and Austin way. Both of these roads offer restrictions to two way traffic due to characteristically narrow roads, and properties without driveways. There is no scope to enhance these roads to a residual level which would sustain increased traffic volume, thus conflicting with NPPF 9, point 110 (D). Should access be considered through Cotefield way, portions of woodland would require removal, which would conflict with NPPF 15. Access to the site conflicts with NPPF 2, point 8. NPPF9, point 105 and 106. NPPF 11 points 120, 124 and 125 highlights the importance of undeveloped land, and improving access to the countryside. This land is the last remaining, undeveloped corner of the village. Longford park to the East, Banbury to the North and ongoing development West of White Post Road, the villages rural aesthetic, and existing communities enjoyment of the countryside will be detrimentally impacted. Properties upon Sefton place, Wards Crescent and Deers farm with southern facing gardens which currently overlook the countryside will be detrimentally impacted by any proposed development. This would conflict with NPPF11 point 124(D). NPPF15 point 174 highlights the importance of protecting an enhancing valued landscapes, and recognising intrinsic value of the countryside. To develop this land, as the final undeveloped corner of the village would conflict with these points. The proposed sites will only sustain a limited volume of properties. This conflicts with NPPF 11 point 125 stating policies should 'avoid homes being built in low densities', which equally conflicts with CDC policy BSC2. The proposal offers no consideration to the existing communities within the village. The site offers limited scope to contribute to the districts strategic housing targets yet offers unacceptable conflict with existing communities.

LPR-B-438	West Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-438	West Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-438	West Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-438	West Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-438	West Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-439	Robert James	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. In addition to this the extra traffic would be untenable with Oxford Road already at a stand still at peak times. Not only would this become worse with the development but it would severely increase traffic throughout the village
LPR-B-439	Robert James	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. In addition to this the extra traffic would be untenable with Oxford Road already at a stand still at peak times. Not only would this become worse with the development but it would severely increase traffic throughout the village
LPR-B-439	Robert James	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. In addition to this the extra traffic would be untenable with Oxford Road already at a stand still at peak times. Not only would this become worse with the development but it would severely increase traffic throughout the village
LPR-B-439	Robert James	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. In addition to this the extra traffic would be untenable with Oxford Road already at a stand still at peak times. Not only would this become worse with the development but it would severely increase traffic throughout the village
LPR-B-439	Robert James	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. In addition to this the extra traffic would be untenable with Oxford Road already at a stand still at peak times. Not only would this become worse with the development but it would severely increase traffic throughout the village
LPR-B-440	Trevor Easterbrook	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-440	Trevor Easterbrook	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-440	Trevor Easterbrook	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-440	Trevor Easterbrook	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-440	Trevor Easterbrook	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-441	Jason and Charlotte Davies	LPR-A-045	Strongly object. Sibford Ferris already has proposals for 25 new homes. Future housing should be distributed to more sustainable locations with suitable public transport, facilities, services and employment. These future development undermines the theme of the Oxford 2050 plan. Sibford Ferris currently has issues with transport which would become worse with these developments. There is a very limited bus service. These developments would increase car ownership, as this is the only realistic mode of transport, as the nearest town with all the necessary facilities required to live in Sibford Ferris is 7.5 miles away. There are a significant number of cars parked on Main Street with limited pavements. We have difficulty walking safely to the local primary school due to the number of cars, narrow roads, lack of pavements on Main Street and with even more houses planned, driving to school will be the safest and only option hence increasing even more traffic at rush hours. Houses would be built using oil heating, which when burnt emits co2 and would require more tankers in Sibford Ferris to deliver this oil. There would be a further negative visual impact on the rural character of the village. Development on high quality agricultural land versus urban development The government has recently announced a change in policy were money has now been directed to encourage brownfield land to be targeted for new homes. This plan should review this change in policy and pursue more brownfield options for housing rather than use high quality agricultural land. Main street in Sibford Ferris is the main bottle neck for transport and cannot be widened or even have the possibility of adding new footpaths. The only facilities are a local shop with no parking located on Main Street. This bottleneck would only increase with more cars from these new developments.
LPR-B-441	Jason and Charlotte Davies	LPR-A-139	Strongly object. Sibford Ferris already has proposals for 25 new homes. Future housing should be distributed to more sustainable locations with suitable public transport, facilities, services and employment. These future development undermines the theme of the Oxford 2050 plan. Sibford Ferris currently has issues with transport which would become worse with these developments. There is a very limited bus service. These developments would increase car ownership, as this is the only realistic mode of transport, as the nearest town with all the necessary facilities required to live in Sibford Ferris is 7.5 miles away. There are a significant number of cars parked on Main Street with limited pavements. We have difficulty walking safely to the local primary school due to the number of cars, narrow roads, lack of pavements on Main Street and with even more houses planned, driving to school will be the safest and only option hence increasing even more traffic at rush hours. Houses would be built using oil heating, which when burnt emits co2 and would require more tankers in Sibford Ferris to deliver this oil. There would be a further negative visual impact on the rural character of the village. Development on high quality agricultural land versus urban development The government has recently announced a change in policy were money has now been directed to encourage brownfield land to be targeted for new homes. This plan should review this change in policy and pursue more brownfield options for housing rather than use high quality agricultural land. Main street in Sibford Ferris is the main bottle neck for transport and cannot be widened or even have the possibility of adding new footpaths. The only facilities are a local shop with no parking located on Main Street. This bottleneck would only increase with more cars from these new developments.
LPR-B-441	Jason and Charlotte Davies	LPR-A-068	Strongly object. Sibford Ferris already has proposals for 25 new homes. Future housing should be distributed to more sustainable locations with suitable public transport, facilities, services and employment. These future development undermines the theme of the Oxford 2050 plan. Sibford Ferris currently has issues with transport which would become worse with these developments. There is a very limited bus service. These developments would increase car ownership, as this is the only realistic mode of transport, as the nearest town with all the necessary facilities required to live in Sibford Ferris is 7.5 miles away. There are a significant number of cars parked on Main Street with limited pavements. We have difficulty walking safely to the local primary school due to the number of cars, narrow roads, lack of pavements on Main Street and with even more houses planned, driving to school will be the safest and only option hence increasing even more traffic at rush hours. Houses would be built using oil heating, which when burnt emits co2 and would require more tankers in Sibford Ferris to deliver this oil. There would be a further negative visual impact on the rural character of the village. Development on high quality agricultural land versus urban development The government has recently announced a change in policy were money has now been directed to encourage brownfield land to be targeted for new homes. This plan should review this change in policy and pursue more brownfield options for housing rather than use high quality agricultural land. Main street in Sibford Ferris is the main bottle neck for transport and cannot be widened or even have the possibility of adding new footpaths. The only facilities are a local shop with no parking located on Main Street. This bottleneck would only increase with more cars from these new developments. LPRA-068 is disproportionate to the size of the village. It is used as a popular bridal walkway in beautiful countryside and these developments should have no impact on the local environment.
LPR-B-442	Suzanne Nixon-Eckersall	LPR-A-152	Object. The agricultural land has been encroached upon by more and more housing developments, each time with the assurance from Cherwell District Council that this would be the last one. There is a fairly defined line between the latest developments and Hanwell. It makes no sense for ribbon development to straggle on further along the Warwick Road. The increased traffic flow through the narrow and bendy main street of the village is dangerous and increasing air pollution. With more housing in the nearby vicinity, this would escalate by an alarming rate. Both old and more recently planted trees would have to be felled and the loss of habitat would spell the death knell for wildlife in the area. This will do nothing for the efforts to reduce climate change and global warming There would inevitably be much more light pollution. With fields built on/paved over, where is all the surplus water going to go? Down the slope to Hanwell? The facilities eg schooling, doctors' surgeries, shopping etc for an ever-increasing population are simply non-existent and would put a great strain on those of other near-by villages. To ruin this attractive and much-admired village would be a tragedy. There must be other sites within the environs of Banbury itself with a more suitable infrastructure which would be more practical and suitable.

LPR-B-442	Suzanne Nixon-Eckersall	LPR-A-214	Object. The agricultural land has been encroached upon by more and more housing developments, each time with the assurance from Cherwell District Council that this would be the last one. There is a fairly defined line between the latest developments and Hanwell. It makes no sense for ribbon development to straggle on further along the Warwick Road. The increased traffic flow through the narrow and bendy main street of the village is dangerous and increasing air pollution. With more housing in the nearby vicinity, this would escalate by an alarming rate. Both old and more recently planted trees would have to be felled and the loss of habitat would spell the death knell for wildlife in the area. This will do nothing for the efforts to reduce climate change and global warming There would inevitably be much more light pollution. With fields built on/paved over, where is all the surplus water going to go? Down the slope to Hanwell? The facilities eg schooling, doctors' surgeries, shopping etc for an ever-increasing population are simply non-existent and would put a great strain on those of other near-by villages. To ruin this attractive and much-admired village would be a tragedy. There must be other sites within the environs of Banbury itself with a more suitable infrastructure which would be more practical and suitable.
LPR-B-442	Suzanne Nixon-Eckersall	LPR-A-205	Object. The agricultural land has been encroached upon by more and more housing developments, each time with the assurance from Cherwell District Council that this would be the last one. There is a fairly defined line between the latest developments and Hanwell. It makes no sense for ribbon development to straggle on further along the Warwick Road. The increased traffic flow through the narrow and bendy main street of the village is dangerous and increasing air pollution. With more housing in the nearby vicinity, this would escalate by an alarming rate. Both old and more recently planted trees would have to be felled and the loss of habitat would spell the death knell for wildlife in the area. This will do nothing for the efforts to reduce climate change and global warming There would inevitably be much more light pollution. With fields built on/paved over, where is all the surplus water going to go? Down the slope to Hanwell? The facilities eg schooling, doctors' surgeries, shopping etc for an ever-increasing population are simply non-existent and would put a great strain on those of other near-by villages. To ruin this attractive and much-admired village would be a tragedy. There must be other sites within the environs of Banbury itself with a more suitable infrastructure which would be more practical and suitable.
LPR-B-442	Suzanne Nixon-Eckersall	LPR-A-154	Object. The agricultural land has been encroached upon by more and more housing developments, each time with the assurance from Cherwell District Council that this would be the last one. There is a fairly defined line between the latest developments and Hanwell. It makes no sense for ribbon development to straggle on further along the Warwick Road. The increased traffic flow through the narrow and bendy main street of the village is dangerous and increasing air pollution. With more housing in the nearby vicinity, this would escalate by an alarming rate. Both old and more recently planted trees would have to be felled and the loss of habitat would spell the death knell for wildlife in the area. This will do nothing for the efforts to reduce climate change and global warming There would inevitably be much more light pollution. With fields built on/paved over, where is all the surplus water going to go? Down the slope to Hanwell? The facilities eg schooling, doctors' surgeries, shopping etc for an ever-increasing population are simply non-existent and would put a great strain on those of other near-by villages. To ruin this attractive and much-admired village would be a tragedy. There must be other sites within the environs of Banbury itself with a more suitable infrastructure which would be more practical and suitable.
LPR-B-442	Suzanne Nixon-Eckersall	LPR-A-047	Object. The agricultural land has been encroached upon by more and more housing developments, each time with the assurance from Cherwell District Council that this would be the last one. There is a fairly defined line between the latest developments and Hanwell. It makes no sense for ribbon development to straggle on further along the Warwick Road. The increased traffic flow through the narrow and bendy main street of the village is dangerous and increasing air pollution. With more housing in the nearby vicinity, this would escalate by an alarming rate. Both old and more recently planted trees would have to be felled and the loss of habitat would spell the death knell for wildlife in the area. This will do nothing for the efforts to reduce climate change and global warming There would inevitably be much more light pollution. With fields built on/paved over, where is all the surplus water going to go? Down the slope to Hanwell? The facilities eg schooling, doctors' surgeries, shopping etc for an ever-increasing population are simply non-existent and would put a great strain on those of other near-by villages. To ruin this attractive and much-admired village would be a tragedy. There must be other sites within the environs of Banbury itself with a more suitable infrastructure which would be more practical and suitable.
LPR-B-443	Collete Heuwen	LPR-A-004	Object. The infrastructure in terms of roads, access, water, drainage and sewage is extremely limited. The Epwell Road site is unsuitable, the junction of West Street/High Street is already dangerous with the lack of visibility, a daily issue for motorists, cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. Any additional development would compound the situation. The road network could not cope with increased traffic, the majority of which would need to travel along the High Street where there is ever increasing difficulty in passing, leading to the single track pinch point at Banbury Hill. The single track road at Lower End/Plot Road again is not suitable for increased traffic. The village is not suitable for construction traffic, major issues around access, parking and the general flow of traffic occur when small infill developments, property renovation/general works are carried out. The lack of suitable access has previously led to further quarrying in the area to be refused. The sewage system in the village struggles to cope, and given the nature of the landscape, ground conditions would make the upgrading of the system difficult and expensive. There have been issues with raw sewage overflowing into Sor Brook in the village. The building on green sites would increase the probability of flooding. The development of Thistle Hill would severely impact on the flood defence in the area, and takes away the vehicular access to the allotments. The electrical supply to the village only supports the village as it stands. Shutford has no bus, no school, we are several miles from doctors and dentist surgeries and every additional home in the village would increase traffic to travel to these venues, with doctors and dentists already over stretched. We have less facilities in the village. These facilities bring focus to the village and are an integral part of the rural village life the residents of Shutford work together to build a strong sense of community. The community spirit was tested and survived the COVID 19 pandemic , with everyone playing their part to support the life and soul of the village that would be diluted and lost with major developments. The village simply cannot cope with major developments , the green belt needs to be respected and the environment preserved and the bio diversity in the area respected.

LPR-B-443	Collete Heuwen	LPR-A-171	Object. The infrastructure in terms of roads, access, water, drainage and sewage is extremely limited. The Epwell Road site is unsuitable, the junction of West Street/High Street is already dangerous with the lack of visibility, a daily issue for motorists, cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. Any additional development would compound the situation. The road network could not cope with increased traffic, the majority of which would need to travel along the High Street where there is ever increasing difficulty in passing, leading to the single track pinch point at Banbury Hill. The single track road at Lower End/Plot Road again is not suitable for increased traffic. The village is not suitable for construction traffic, major issues around access, parking and the general flow of traffic occur when small infill developments, property renovation/general works are carried out. The lack of suitable access has previously led to further quarrying in the area to be refused. The sewage system in the village struggles to cope, and given the nature of the landscape, ground conditions would make the upgrading of the system difficult and expensive. There have been issues with raw sewage overflowing into Sor Brook in the village. The building on green sites would increase the probability of flooding. The development of Thistle Hill would severely impact on the flood defence in the area, and takes away the vehicular access to the allotments. The electrical supply to the village only supports the village as it stands. Shutford has no bus, no school, we are several miles from doctors and dentist surgeries and every additional home in the village would increase traffic to travel to these venues, with doctors and dentists already over stretched. We have less facilities in the village. These facilities bring focus to the village and are an integral part of the rural village life the residents of Shutford work together to build a strong sense of community. The community spirit was tested and survived the COVID 19 pandemic, with everyone playing their part to support the life and soul of the village that would be diluted and lost with major developments. The village simply cannot cope with major developments, the green belt needs to be respected and the environment preserved and the bio diversity in the area respected.
LPR-B-444	Paul Heuwen	LPR-A-004	This proposed site if developed would be a crime, this area is not only an area of natural beauty and a haven of wildlife but also acts as a natural defence against flooding of the Lower End area. Thistle Hill is part of the local allotment community, it may not look like a traditional allotment but is in fact supported by the local community as a valued part of the village as garden allotments, and has some of the best blackberries in the area. The road infrastructure could not take the additional traffic that the development would bring as all roads are basically single track and to increase traffic would be a danger to the local community, this along with the fact that the drainage system and energy supply to Shutford would need to be significantly improved makes any development in Shutford unfeasible and unacceptable. Shutford does not have schools, doctors, shops or other amenities, and does not need or want them, any new development would mean an unacceptable increase in vehicle movement in the surrounding area on roads that were not built for this kind of volume. Shutford is a beautiful quite village and it should be allowed to stay that way.
LPR-B-445	Paul Heuwen	LPR-A-171	This land is totally inappropriate for development as the access to this land would endanger other road users and pedestrians alike due to poor visibility when entering or exiting the land, traffic from the proposed site would be entering an already overloaded and dangerous roadway, any additional traffic especially traffic heading to Banbury traveling along the High Street, which is basically a single track road with several pinch points that cannot be made wider without knocking down current houses. This makes the land proposed totally unsuitable for development, 99% of traffic would go through the village as its the only way to get to major roads leading to local towns, this route would be used by the increased level of delivery vehicles servicing any new development on this site. Other considerations that should be taken into account are the local drainage system and electricity supply that at best only just supports the village of Shutford in its current state, the disruption and damage to the area that expanding the sewer system and energy supply that would need to be done to support any new development would be unacceptable. Shutford does not need or want further developments as they are not beneficial to the local community in any way shape or form.
LPR-B-445	Paul and Michelle Street	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-445	Paul and Michelle Street	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-445	Paul and Michelle Street	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-445	Paul and Michelle Street	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-445	Paul and Michelle Street	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.



LPR-B-446	Richard and Karen Irons	LPR-A-107	<p>Object. Development would double the number of houses in this historic rural area. Dramatic increase in the number of motor vehicles using the narrow and unsafe roads, most do not have footpaths and already have issues with speeding and HGVs, which have created bad road surface conditions, and would make those conditions even worse. The increase in motor vehicles would increase pollution and contribute more to global warming, as most motorists would have to commute to work. The roads are unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians. There is inadequate sewage treatment for the village as it stands, another approximately 700 to 1000 residents would lead to treatment failure. The water supply to the village is only just adequate at the moment, an increase of this nature would lead to issues. Surface water drainage is a big problem, with my road frequently turning into a river, as current drainage is inadequate and flooding often occurs, less fields with more tarmac will result in significantly greater flooding issues.</p> <p>There will be an inevitable installation of street lighting, we are a dark sky village, this will be destroyed by a development. The local school is only adequate for the population, this would mean new child residents would have to be driven to other schools, again increasing carbon output. This development would mean the loss of the good agricultural land and significant damage to mature trees, old hedgerows and the water table</p>
LPR-B-447	Stuart Green	LPR-A-175	<p>Object. Fundamental change to the character of a conservation village- every village in the area is being systematically destroyed and some villages need to be at least kept with some village character, unless CDC wish to change forever the feel of villages within Cherwell Valley</p> <p>Out of scale to the size of the village - CDC should consider the damage already being seen in Wardington and the surrounding areas/villages by the growth of the area without proper access, facilities roads and safety. Environmental - COP26 needs to start somewhere, and CDC needs to present plans that are required, needed and supported by their community given funding for them comes from the community. This level of expansion and housing can easily be consumed by other more relevant areas closer or within the town areas within CDC or within other villages that have facilities and infrastructure to support. Not sustainable because of needs for services; schools; sewerage; shop; doctors; emergency service support etc- along with fundamental infrastructure not being available in Wardington, again coming back to effect to environment for every new household built needing to use cars and other infrastructure to get basic needs from external to the village and if located and invested in the village the additional investment that would require. The designated land would be needed for any future bypass; traffic will increase with huge new developments proposed to the A361 and M40 access areas. HS2 traffic/diversions etc has already destroyed the road in the village many times and is constantly needing attention.</p> <p>The designated land also forms part of the greenspace, open access and public footpaths which are well used.</p>
LPR-B-448	Aleksandra Obiedzinska	LPR-A-175	<p>Object. Fundamental change to the character of a conservation village- every village in the area is being systematically destroyed and some villages need to be at least kept with some village character, unless CDC wish to change forever the feel of villages within Cherwell Valley</p> <p>Out of scale to the size of the village - CDC should consider the damage already being seen in Wardington and the surrounding areas/villages by the growth of the area without proper access, facilities roads and safety. Environmental - COP26 needs to start somewhere, and CDC needs to present plans that are required, needed and supported by their community given funding for them comes from the community. This level of expansion and housing can easily be consumed by other more relevant areas closer or within the town areas within CDC or within other villages that have facilities and infrastructure to support. Not sustainable because of needs for services; schools; sewerage; shop; doctors; emergency service support etc- along with fundamental infrastructure not being available in Wardington, again coming back to effect to environment for every new household built needing to use cars and other infrastructure to get basic needs from external to the village and if located and invested in the village the additional investment that would require. The designated land would be needed for any future bypass; traffic will increase with huge new developments proposed to the A361 and M40 access areas. HS2 traffic/diversions etc has already destroyed the road in the village many times and is constantly needing attention.</p> <p>The designated land also forms part of the greenspace, open access and public footpaths which are well used.</p>
LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Option 2	KO13 is an excellent objective, but how can this really be achieved with such huge areas of green belt being covered with housing developments?
LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges and Mostly on previously developed land, including in less sustainable locations.
LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Kidlington	<p>Object. Proposed development threatens the village's most valuable amenity and identity: its green setting, and the separation from other village identities. In the latest round of developments, Kidlington has already sacrificed a lot of this. While it's good that the community woods next to the Cherwell are to be preserved in the plan, one wonders if the willow warblers, chiff chaffs, the roe deer, the barn owls and kingfishers will stay if there is human habitation so near, and if the woods become more like a park. Certainly, where feasible, routes for cyclists, through or round fields such as these could be created to create green transport infrastructure while promoting healthy activity and enjoyment of the biodiversity. It's great that the canal towpaths have been and are being developed to promote cycling. Routes to prioritise for promotion of cycling to reduce car dependency: We are particularly conscious that there is not a safe cycle route to Gosford School, or from Kidlington to Woodstock/Marlborough School. This means our young people's first experiences of cycling alone are on dangerous roads/include dangerous junctions. We would like to put this land between the Moors and the Cherwell forward as a LGS due to its richness of wildlife and recreational value for walkers (connecting St Mary's fields with Thrupp with a varied network of paths). We are unable to locate the form for proposing this formally. Neither can we find any LGSs in Kidlington listed in Appendix 1.</p>
LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Option 13	Not require major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment.
LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries?

LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington.
LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Protect and enhance the existing ones.
LPR-B-449	Kirsten and Tom Hall	Question - Green Belt	All the original reasons for protecting the Green Belt are not only still valid, but there are many more benefits than were known about when the land was first designated as such. It tackles air pollution, slows the impacts of climate change, and preserves biodiversity. We need it now all the more- both to protect what biodiversity we still have and to connect Oxford city residents with countryside (with wellbeing and awareness benefits). The most weighty 'exceptional circumstances' impacting the need for the green belt are these arguments for keeping and enhancing it.
LPR-B-450	Ian Hall	LPR-A-041	<p>Strongly object. Lack of local facilities and unsustainable development for instance schools, doctors, dentists, local shops, post offices do not exist. In local villages existing dentists and doctors are already oversubscribed to existing residents who cannot access them. Damaging the environment and increasing global warming. All new residents would have to drive to work or any local convenience further damaging the environment. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever.</p> <p>Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-450	Ian Hall	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Lack of local facilities and unsustainable development for instance schools, doctors, dentists, local shops, post offices do not exist. In local villages existing dentists and doctors are already oversubscribed to existing residents who cannot access them. Damaging the environment and increasing global warming. All new residents would have to drive to work or any local convenience further damaging the environment. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever.</p> <p>Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-450	Ian Hall	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Lack of local facilities and unsustainable development for instance schools, doctors, dentists, local shops, post offices do not exist. In local villages existing dentists and doctors are already oversubscribed to existing residents who cannot access them. Damaging the environment and increasing global warming. All new residents would have to drive to work or any local convenience further damaging the environment. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever.</p> <p>Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-450	Ian Hall	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Lack of local facilities and unsustainable development for instance schools, doctors, dentists, local shops, post offices do not exist. In local villages existing dentists and doctors are already oversubscribed to existing residents who cannot access them. Damaging the environment and increasing global warming. All new residents would have to drive to work or any local convenience further damaging the environment. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever.</p> <p>Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-450	Ian Hall	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Lack of local facilities and unsustainable development for instance schools, doctors, dentists, local shops, post offices do not exist. In local villages existing dentists and doctors are already oversubscribed to existing residents who cannot access them. Damaging the environment and increasing global warming. All new residents would have to drive to work or any local convenience further damaging the environment. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever.</p> <p>Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-451	Keith Shackleton	LPR-A-104	Objection. Concerns that site is totally unsuitable for development. Access to the site via Chapel Close is impracticable as the road is very narrow in places. This issue is exacerbated by fact some properties fronting road have no off street parking and so have to park on road. There is no footpath on either side of road and if the site were to be developed it would not be possible to construct footpath as this would reduce width of road further. The south end of Chapel Close is a popular bridleway that is used as part of Deddington Circular Walk and those using route would be put at risk by increased traffic in Chapel Close. Access into field from the end of Chapel Close could only be achieved by removing the village green, which is one of few green spaces within the village, as well as removal of a mature oak tree. Stormwater drainage on the road through village, the B4031, and along Chapel Close does not function properly, which means some sewage has to be taken away by tanker. Chapel close would not be able to accommodate vehicle movements of tanker and those from development. If the field was developed at full density, this would result in approximately 75% increase in the number of dwellings in the village, which would totally change character of the village. There are no amenities apart from a pub and additional housing would result in occupants travelling to Deddington to access essential services, which would increase traffic in this village and put pressure on parking. The site is currently a wildlife haven, with woodlands surrounding and, as well as many bird species, mammals such as deer and foxes are regularly seen. Recent infill development has taken place in village and there appears to be little space left for further development.
LPR-B-452	Richard Davis	Adderbury	Objection to site submissions for Adderbury. The scale of proposals is vast and totally disproportionate to the size of the village and whilst housing growth is planned there are no places to increase amenities, of which currently there is only one small shop and pubs. This will force residents to drive out the village to access services and leisure activities. Traffic is already bad on Oxford road through the village and a development will make this worse. There is also limited parking in the village, an issue which will be exacerbated by further development and will cause distress to the older generation. Lastly, how do these development plans fit in with the governments targets to reduce carbon emission and protect biodiversity? Development of this scale will cause huge carbon emissions and will deplete forests for timber. Land that was used for crops and wildlife will become concrete.
LPR-B-453	Hanna Loof	Hanwell	Object. Hanwell is a small village with rich history and wildlife can be spotted on a daily basis around the village. Its close location to Banbury is a bonus, but it was previously made clear that the village was never at risk of being swallowed up by Banbury. Residents are proud of the small community and feel strongly about keeping it that way. The proposed planning applications risk losing the community that has been created and have the potential to <u>destroy the village.</u>
LPR-B-454	Steve Cobb	Hanwell	Object. Understands the need for more housing in England and within Cherwell District, but feels expansion of housing is not being adequately supported with investment in local infrastructure and services. Particular areas of concern in Banbury are: access to M40, access to Banbury railway station, reduction in services at Horton hospital. Development to the north of the town would be a significant breach of Cherwell DC's own goals of <u>preserving rural life and beauty.</u>
LPR-B-454	Steve Cobb	LPR-A-152	This development would further erode the current separation between Banbury and Hanwell. The existing committed/active developments lie to the south of 2 complete agricultural fields both of which have large woodland margins that protect the views of and from Hanwell which is a Council declared/ mandated Conservation area. Development of this site would weaken the village character of Hanwell and would increase traffic using <u>Hanwell Main Street.</u>
LPR-B-454	Steve Cobb	LPR-A-214	This development would further erode the current separation between Banbury and Hanwell. The existing committed/active developments lie to the south of 2 complete agricultural fields both of which have large woodland margins that protect the views of and from Hanwell which is a Council declared/ mandated Conservation area. Development of this site would weaken the village character of Hanwell and would increase traffic using <u>Hanwell Main Street.</u>
LPR-B-455	Dr Judith Webb	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We are in a climate crisis/climate breakdown and peat is an important aspect of Natural Capital resource in the whole county and Cherwell needs to consider what peat resource is within the District (respondent has included table at end of submission with table of District's peat resources). There is a suite of very important SAC/SSSI & LWS wetland alkaline spring fens within Oxon which may sit upon accumulated reserves of peat. These are protected for their biodiversity, but it should be emphasised that: I suspect there is currently no policy to protect the green rainwater catchments of important SSSI and LWS spring fens (and so far undesignated sites) from damaging urban development. These sites have important reserves of peat, which are a huge county carbon store which must be kept wet and protected from drying and consequent oxidation. The resource area of peatland within the District is not well-known or mapped and the carbon tonnage in these wetlands, as depths of peat deposits have not been investigated (estimate for county peatland is currently 155.71ha, probably an underestimate). Restoration of peatlands in the county may not be well recognised in plan policies. I work within Freshwater Habitats Trust who are heavily involved in important work in 5 key fen sites in county, see: <a href="https://freshwaterhabitats.org.uk/projects/oxfordshire-fens-project/">https://freshwaterhabitats.org.uk/projects/oxfordshire-fens-project/</a> . The FHT Saving Oxford's Wetland Wildlife Project important work involves re-wetting drained peat in fens to save species and protect peat carbon store from oxidation and to restart peat accumulation. Should also be recognised that important carbon stores are present in soils of flood plain meadows and other types on ancient meadows. We should invest in carbon that is already in the ground and have policies to protect our Oxon peat store and get peat accumulating again. This would be much more effective than policies that promote vast amounts of tree planting to remove CO2 from the air. I am willing to give further advice on this- please just contact me, I already work with Oxford City Council on this important issue. I'm also involved in the Nature Recovery Network Strategy and mapping of networks being carried out by TVERC.

LPR-B-456	Dr Grant James Coleman	LPR-A-175	Strong objection. The village is small and the development proposal on 15.4ha is likely to almost double the existing number of properties within the parish. The existing amenities likely do not have the capacity to support this. There are no schools, shops or medical facilities in the village. There is no gas supply to the village and I assume development would require significant investment in water, electrical and sewage infrastructure. The narrow section of the A361 running through the village is dangerous. Doubling the local traffic on this and the small roads of the village itself would be perilous. Given massive increase in industrial and domestic developments on A361, both closer to Banbury and towards Daventry, combined with ongoing HS2 works, traffic volume has and will continue to increase. This has resulted in bypass of almost all villages along road from here to Brackley, with exception of Wardington. Parcel of land to the north of village in proposal would be better placed for this use. The village largely lies within a conservation area and the construction of hundreds of homes are likely to be densely built and would display architectural blandness and uniformity that is familiar in modern developments.
LPR-B-457	Kevin Foley	LPR-A-091	Object. There have been a number of new housing sites in the Bodicote area in recent years and further development in this area is not needed as the traffic levels in the village will become unmanageable
LPR-B-458	Mrs E J R Aitken	Hanwell	Object. Hanwell is a quiet village with little pollution and traffic. There is a strong sense of community in Hanwell, which was brought to the fore with Covid and the national lockdowns. Villagers were promised that Banbury would not come any closer than Dukes Meadow Drive, but since there has been a deluge of houses built past Dukes Meadow. The promise then was that development would remain at least two fields away. The plan is for Drayton parish to effectively come up to our village conservation boundary and bring us into the town. We don't want to be another Bodicote. Whilst it is can be applauded that the council extended the shopping centre in Banbury, due to Covid, people's shopping habits have changed. It is unlikely Banbury will be able to cope with the level of development proposed and the increase in traffic levels is having a profound impact on the town. The village of Hanwell is historic, with a 12th century church and castle, a community observatory (which is being impacted by light pollution), a range of wildlife lives around the village. This will all be destroyed or moved with the encroachment of Banbury.
LPR-B-459	Cathherine White	LPR-A-065	Object. The village is not big enough to support such development and has no services or amenities. There is no public transport linking to either Deddington or larger towns of Banbury, Chipping Norton or Oxford. The road infrastructure is not suitable for increased traffic flow from further development. New development access onto the B4031 on the western side of village would be highly dangerous and cause further traffic issues. The village has no mains gas, poor water pressure, electricity supply provisions are not sufficient/reliable. The local primary school at Deddington is already oversubscribed and the local GP surgery at Deddington is already over stretched. Local hospital provision is not sufficient to support further developments. There are also an alarming number of sites being put forward around Deddington, but the village is not able to support these developments. Future development should not be in isolated rural areas and should instead be sited close to existing amenities and services. Satellite villages, which are significantly smaller, that form part of a wider Parish (such as Hempton & Clifton which sit in the Parish of Deddington) should not be covered by the same policies as those that cover the larger village within the Parish, as they do not have the same amenities, transport links etc. A Parish approach is not appropriate, instead a settlement by settlement basis should be adopted.
LPR-B-460	Cathherine White	LPR-A-148	Object. The village is not big enough to support such development and has no services or amenities. There is no public transport linking to either Deddington or larger towns of Banbury, Chipping Norton or Oxford. The road infrastructure is not suitable for increased traffic flow from further development. New development access onto the B4031 on the western side of village would be highly dangerous and cause further traffic issues. The village has no mains gas, poor water pressure, electricity supply provisions are not sufficient/reliable. The local primary school at Deddington is already oversubscribed and the local GP surgery at Deddington is already over stretched. Local hospital provision is not sufficient to support further developments. There are also an alarming number of sites being put forward around Deddington, but the village is not able to support these developments. Future development should not be in isolated rural areas and should instead be sited close to existing amenities and services. Satellite villages, which are significantly smaller, that form part of a wider Parish (such as Hempton & Clifton which sit in the Parish of Deddington) should not be covered by the same policies as those that cover the larger village within the Parish, as they do not have the same amenities, transport links etc. A Parish approach is not appropriate, instead a settlement by settlement basis should be adopted.
LPR-B-460	Avril Stretton	Hanwell	Object. It is a lovely village with thatched cottages and a historical church. Any developments would have a huge impact on the surrounding area. There has long been a problem with traffic as people use the village as a rat run, and the thought of more cars is ridiculous. It was said that the boundary of Banbury was not to extend beyond Dukes Meadow Drive but this has been ignored. Hanwell is an old village and should stay as a village surrounded by fields and trees.
LPR-B-461	Pamela Ascott	LPR-A-107	Objection to 360 homes on 30 acre plot on Pound Lane. The population of the village is just over 530 and a potential 1000 more would change the village forever. The Prime Minister has said that there will be no more building of homes on Green Belt and that there is enough brownfield land to be developed in towns cities. There is already enough additional housing being built in Sibford against the wishes of residents. The fields in consideration are next to the Ironstone Downland AONB, which would be damaged by development through harm to ancient hedgerows and nature trees. The roads in the village cannot cope with current levels of traffic and additional development would bring at least 700 more cars onto the road, and also more delivery vehicles. There are no footpaths on the road and people do not adhere to speed limits. The road is in bad repair and when it rains the silt cascades down the road like a river. If houses are built there will be less fields to soak up water and more water flowing down Colony Road. There is no industry in the village than farming so there will be a huge number of cars travelling daily to local towns or to train station in Banbury. COP26 has highlighted we need to lower carbon footprint, but there is no suitable public transport in the village. The school has always been full and there is no parking at the school. We are a dark sky village.

LPR-B-462	Paul and Elizabeth Wingrove	Adderbury/Twyford	Objection to development on Land west of Twyford, between Kings Sutton Road and Aynho Road, and Land west of Twyford. The scale of development would impact the daily lives of residents, especially those that currently face open fields. The development proposals are not proportionate to the immediate Twyford area. Traffic through the village has increased in recent years as a result of housing in area. Twyford is already used as a rat run to get from Banbury to Aynho Road. Access to Banbury and Oxford would be made by accessing village and an inevitable bottleneck will occur. King Sutton would be impacted severely by this. Access by emergency vehicles will be hampered due to increased traffic at peak times. There are no local amenities to support an increase of this size. Adderbury/Twyford has already met its obligations for housing development as a village. The health and well-being of residents will be impacted by development.
LPR-B-464	Holly and Paul Clewlow	Adderbury	All the sites proposed in Adderbury, Milcombe and Boxham fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on site north of Berry Hill Road. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, which has been traditionally rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding. The proposed development sites will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. West Adderbury is a distinct area of the parish, distant from the vast majority of facilities listed in the Parish Profile. The proposed development sites are unsustainable and would force new residents to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. The rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Development sites in Milcombe and Bloxham would also further erode green spaces around these villages. Increase in development would cause traffic and pollution on the roads, which are already congested.
LPR-B-464	Holly and Paul Clewlow	LPR-A-041	Additional development around Henge Close would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of listed buildings on Horn Hill Road. Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east.
LPR-B-464	Holly and Paul Clewlow	LPR-A-086	The proposed developments would destroy the rural entrances to the village, creating a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. If developed, the proposed sites would double the size of West Adderbury, this type of development is more suited to a town or city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be swamped by development at this scale. Footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by residents, would be lost forever. Residents of St Mary's Road would lose their existing connection with local farmland. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to these houses being completely subsumed by new estates.
LPR-B-464	Holly and Paul Clewlow	LPR-A-146	Additional development around Henge Close would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of listed buildings on Horn Hill Road. Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east.
LPR-B-464	Holly and Paul Clewlow	LPR-A-258	The proposed developments would destroy the rural entrances to the village, creating a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development of the field adjacent to the existing Adderbury Fields estate (LPR-A-258) would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space.
LPR-B-464	R D Ascott	LPR-A-107	Object. The two parcels of land proposed at this site are not brownfield sites, which is contrary to the government's new focus of boosting construction on brownfield sites. Development of 360 new homes on the site, when the total population of the village is 533 is completely inappropriate. The fields in consideration are next to Ironstone Downland AONB. The roads, pathways and footpaths are totally inadequate, there is ongoing development at nearby Mawles Farmhouse, a brownfield site that I have no objection to, but the contractors have damaged the verges there is not room for two cars to pass safely there. Increased traffic leaving the village would make the road from Banbury that turns into Pound Lane more difficult. The sites lie at the highest point in the village and I believe that there would be problems with water supply and drainage. Even with fields currently absorbing water, there are too many occasions when rain washes silt down the Colony. After hosting COP26, we should encourage sustainability and low carbon living. There is very little work or business here and shopping would largely be done on line. Even with a population of 533, deliveries cause disruption on the village's roads. The school could not cope with a further influx of children and it would not be possible to remedy the parking situation. The village would lose its identity as a dark sky community and would become another commuting stop, in contravention of key objective 16. The council should also be limiting growth in rural areas and should maintain rural character, in line with key objective 15.

LPR-B-465	Oliver Rowbory	LPR-A-077	<p>Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District's housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. The existing 2015 Local Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031. Twelve potential sites measuring a total of 109.28 hectares could provide a minimum of 3,250 new houses (adopting CDC's Site Capacity Sense Check methodology- Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution para B.102 - It is also important to make efficient use of land. In general, new housing should be provided at a net density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. &amp; Policy Policy BSC 2) have been proposed around Adderbury including a large 60 hectare site between Twyford and the M40, stretching from the Kings Sutton Road to the Aynho Road. This compares to a current population of approximately 2,811 (Census 2011). These proposals, contradict contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Indeed, sufficient land has already been allocated in the district to meet predicted demand for the next 13 years. Development on these sites expressly contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. Adderbury is not a sustainable location . These locations contradict both the current Local Plan Policy and contradict the Key Objectives of the CDC Local Plan Review and therefore the proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development should be dismissed. Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development on these sites would be contrary to Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. This area should remain free of substantial new build structures. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA (Conservation Target Area – Other Sites) and as such, according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. The proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development would result in the loss of the remaining open space. Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Increased traffic congestion as a result of this over-development has therefore substantially increased vehicle emissions and has degraded air quality for residents.. This is most noticeable on the Oxford Road/Anyho Road traffic light junction but now as a consequence of increased traffic volumes vehicles are often queuing along the High Street in Adderbury as far as Chapel Lane. Further residential development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. Proposals to increase residential development in Adderbury will place unnecessary and restrictive burdens upon the health, mental wellbeing and accessibility of the village and place developer profit ahead of recreational, social and community needs and vastly increase social exclusion.</p>
LPR-B-466	Alex Rippon	LPR-A-107	<p>Obect. The development would double the housing stock of the village, but there are also many other reasons why this site should not be included in the Local Plan. I endorse all the points made in Sibford Gower Parish Council's submission. The proposal would be contrary to a number of Cherwell's own planning policies; it would represent a development site that must come towards the very bottom of any sensible measure of local or regional sustainable development; the development would have serious adverse consequences for the existing residents of Sibord Gower; the development would be a serious abrogation of Cherwell's duty to protect the best interests of Sibford Gower's present residents against opportunistic development based on greed.</p>
LPR-B-466	Alex Rippon	Sibford Ferris	<p>I also agree with the Sibford Ferris submission and think that sites at this location are not appropriate for inclusion in Local Plan.</p>
LPR-B-466	Alex Rippon	Option 31	<p>In terms of sustainability, it makes sense to focus future development in Cherwell in the Banbury area.</p>
LPR-B-466	Alex Rippon	Option 32	<p>In terms of sustainability, it makes sense to focus future development in Cherwell in the Banbury area.</p>
LPR-B-466	Alex Rippon	Option 33	<p>In terms of sustainability, it makes sense to focus future development in Cherwell in the Banbury area.</p>
LPR-B-466	Alex Rippon	Option 34	<p>In terms of sustainability, it makes sense to focus future development in Cherwell in the Banbury area.</p>
LPR-B-467	Mr & Mrs Bond	Wardington	<p>The A351 cannot currently cope with the amount of traffic on it and it is dangerous when lorries come round the bends. The noise through homes adjacent to A361 is horrific and the pollution from cars from new households will become a problem. The exit of A361 to m40 junction is quite frankly already an issue and will become worse with extra housing. The roads are already not safe to walk or cycle on. Lorries are already seen regularly to reverse out of the edgecote road on to A361 at any time day and night causing delays in traffic but are also a huge concern in terms of accidents happening. These lorries don't know where they are going and reversing and turning on the bends is already dangerous ad if more houses are built in the village more traffic will come too increasing fatality risks. The land being use for houses should be used for a bypass around the village.</p> <p>Infrastructure in the village is weak with no shop, no school, reduced bus services and more houses would put pressure on GP practice in neighbouring village. The natural beauty of the village will be ruined and habitats too. Pollution will increase from rubbish build up on housing estates and extra routes for bin collection and postal delivery. Emergency services will be more stretched getting into the village.</p>

LPR-B-468	Christine Shafe	Adderbury	<p>Objects to all proposed development in Adderbury. consider the proposals obscene and totally out of proportion. appears that Adderbury is being 'sacrificed' and allowed to be swallowed up by Banbury and turned into an urban sprawl in an attempt to 'save' the more outlying villages. Since the 2011 census there has been a 17% increase in housing in adderbury, adding to this the consented developments still to be built, there will be a 21% increase since 2011. Assuming a 30 dph build out, the sites proposed would equate to 3,278 dwellings which would increase the village by 4 times; if only half are developed this would still alter the village beyond recognition in an unacceptable way. The Adderbury Neighbourhood plan was created but permission granted on appeal contravene the ANP as to several of the 12 sites proposed. particularly object to the fact that much of this proposed building, being outside the accepted boundary of the village, extends the village, ribbon fashion, into an urban sprawl. Furthermore, this extension of the built-up area narrows the amenity gap between Adderbury and Bodicote, Bloxham/Milton and also Deddington. Adderbury risks being swallowed up in a huge urban sprawl. The developments to date have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. Adderbury's infrastructure, in terms of both roads and local services, is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue and several of the sites proposed, would encourage or even necessitate the use of cars to access the village. Increased traffic and congestion would directly increase air pollution. Christopher Rawlins Primary School - Although it isn't currently quite at full capacity any further large housing developments would mean that children have to travel outside the village for school as there is no room on the site for expansion. The risk of flooding could also increase; development of these sites could dramatically increase runoff, compromise the floodplain and increase the risk of flooding to properties around Sor Brook. a number of the development sites proposed, particularly in West Adderbury, contain what are presently rural public footpaths which are very popular. Were these developments to go ahead it would render the experience of a 'country walk' totally pointless as people would be walking amongst houses in 'suburbia'. Development of any or all of these Greenfield sites would have a massive destructive impact on these and this at a time when we are being encouraged to protect nature and the environment. if these sites are indeed developed, then the traditional character would be lost forever. Since Brexit we have been made more aware that we should be trying to grow more food rather than rely on imports and that climate change is reaching crisis point which should see us retain green spaces. If house building within the village over the coming decade mirrors or exceeds the rate and scale of development of the past ten years, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent and completely undesirable and unsustainable way. If Adderbury were obliged to have any further development at all, the least worst options would be the infill sites which don't extend the footprint of the village, such as LPRA- 002, the 0.4 hectare part of LPR-A-077, or, if push comes to shove, the 0.7 hectare site of LPR-A-041; Anything else would be abhorrent. obvious and sensible thing would be to develop brown field sites within the towns. Converting shops and other buildings in towns which are empty would enable people to live at the heart of the community. logical solution would be to develop the already existing nucleus of a town in Upper Heyford and on the old airfield site.</p>
LPR-B-468	Christine Shafe	General	<p>concerned about the fact that this Consultation Document has not been at all well publicised and that I only came across it a matter of days ago by accident.</p>
LPR-B-468	Christine Shafe	Option 26	<p>agree entirely with KO26.</p>
LPR-B-468	Christine Shafe	LPR-A-086	<p>object to and oppose the development of the sites that comprise LPRA- 086. Not only are these agricultural fields used for the production of grain and other crops, but their development would extend the existing boundaries of the village by a vast amount. Residents living in new developments there would have no direct access to the rest of the village and would be forced to use cars to access the village and any facilities. Furthermore, such totally inappropriate development for a village would further impact on the residents of St Mary's Road who have already had to accept developments immediately to the West and North. These have already impacted on the lives of residents, changing the nature and feel of their homes. If the two fields to the West of Berry Hill Road were to be developed, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in and subsumed by new estates and all connection with the countryside lost. Adderbury's infrastructure, in terms of both roads and local services, is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue and several of the sites proposed, such as LPRA-086 referred to above, would encourage or even necessitate the use of cars to access the village.</p>
LPR-B-469	Helen Holbech	Wardington	<p>Object. Wardington is a rural village with a conservation area and an increase in size to potentially 1000 residents would change character of village. The village does not have the infrastructure to support an increase in residents like this. Wardington is threatened by an increase in HS2 construction traffic and there is a risk those living close to or on the A361 might not be able to travel safely to and from their homes. An increase in traffic would exacerbate already frequent problems with leaking drains and loose manhole covers on the A361. New development would have to be accompanied by a bypass for the village.</p>
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	Question - Housing Policies	<p>It is unclear why the OGNA methodology which you describe on p36 as being the "standard method (adjusted)" generates a higher demand for houses than the government's own model (footnote 6) by 5%. I think the presentation of this modelling is potentially misleading and should be carefully reviewed, and opened up to challenge/scrutiny before it is used to anchor any recommendations on housing numbers</p>
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	General	<p>I want to register that I do not think the approach to consultation is fit for purpose. It purports to be a public consultation. I have, however, had multiple complaints from local residents and parish councils within my division that the consultation is complex, unclear and very hard to respond to. Specifically, two points. (1) For those following the online prompts to submit responses via Let's Talk Cherwell, there are multiple login credentials required (including multi-factor authentication) before a response can be submitted. This seems like cybersecurity overkill and a barrier to participation. (2) For those wishing to comment on proposed sites, the drop down menu permits comment on only 10 specific sites even though some parishes (like Islip) have more than 10 proposed sites. Taking all of this into consideration, I think you should proceed very carefully in the analysis of responses and bear in mind that vested interests with the resources to participate are likely to be disproportionately reflected in the responses while local residents may be underrepresented due to barriers to participation. It is very hard for residents to comment on the vague spatial statements from the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 (stated on p16). For this reason, I suggest that comments to this consultation should not be used to substantiate specific conclusions on these options. Instead, I hope the sponsors of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 will re-consult openly and fully once the implications of these choices are clearer.</p>

Page 1733



LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	Option 2	Support for KO16, KO29, KO3, KO4, KO9, K13, KO10, KO11, KO20, KO21, KO6. I want particularly to underscore the importance of the Local Plan having a robust and precautionary approach to the potential impacts of climate change (KO12). With regard to flooding in our area, the threshold for assessing impact should be at the high central end of modelling and I would advocate the opportunity for the planning authority to take more extreme scenarios into consideration. It makes no sense for planning decisions to be made on central cases out to only 2050 when buildings should stand long past that and our forecasts for extreme weather events only grow after that time.
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	Question - Green Belt	The Green Belt should be maintained and consideration should be given to the use of a Green Belt around other significant- and growing - towns like Bicester. There is, for example, considerable concern in communities like Wendlebury and Merton that the relentless march of Bicester's town boundaries will eventually swallow them up. The Local Plan is an opportunity to reaffirm commitment to protecting green spaces and to ensuring that current communities can retain their identity and distinctiveness by having clear separation from neighbouring conurbations. For this reason, there should NOT be a mini-review of the Green Belt around Kidlington (option 26 on p89). However, providing that the boundaries are consulted upon with parish councils and local communities are part of agreeing them, there is merit in examining the idea of settlement boundaries (p98) so long as this is not used to expand villages into neighbouring farmland when there are infill or brownfield opportunities to be developed first. In terms of the proposed development sites in appendix 2, my general comment is to be astonished by the ambition of a series of landowners to elevate the value of the land even when the sites they propose are individually or collectively inappropriate for many villages and towns. I trust your team will proceed to scrutinise these closely and fairly with a view to consistency with the other principles proposed for the local plan. In particular, sustaining (but not overwhelming) rural villages, upholding the Green Belt and protecting our district's historic and natural capital
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	LPR-A-160	Together, these proposals would remove any sense of a Green Belt around the southeastern perimeter of Bicester and would envelope these three villages in a way that would damage their historic and social character.
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	LPR-A-095	Together, these proposals would remove any sense of a Green Belt around the southeastern perimeter of Bicester and would envelope these three villages in a way that would damage their historic and social character.
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	LPR-A-143	Together, these proposals would remove any sense of a Green Belt around the southeastern perimeter of Bicester and would envelope these three villages in a way that would damage their historic and social character.
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	LPR-A-123	This land at Gavray Drive is subject to a current outline planning application on which I have commented. My major concerns are to protect the current Wildlife Site and to ensure it is well managed in future and to ensure that any development takes full account of a precautionary approach to flooding risk. LPR-A-223 (all sites): the proposal from the Church Commissioners to build a new
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	LPR-A-125	This land at Gavray Drive is subject to a current outline planning application on which I have commented. My major concerns are to protect the current Wildlife Site and to ensure it is well managed in future and to ensure that any development takes full account of a precautionary approach to flooding risk
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	LPR-A-223	The proposal from the Church Commissioners to build a new town in Islip is preposterous. The scale of their proposal is totally out of keeping to the scale of the village and is inappropriate for other reasons: (i) Green Belt; (ii) flood risk; (iii) pre-existing congestion and the intention of Chiltern/ East West Rail not to use Islip as a stopping point on EWR services and on a diminishing number of Marylebone peak time services, meaning that more car journeys are required.
LPR-B-470	Cllr Calum Miller	LPR-A-221	I strongly support development on this site and, moreover, suggest that CDC reconsider the classification of the site to brownfield. It is a former aviation fuel depot with considerable concrete installations (fuel tanks etc) that would be required to be removed to permit development. Allowing development on this site (only) in Islip would allow for a suitable growth in the village. By re-classifying it as brownfield, the Green Belt policy could be left in tact.
LPR-B-471	Prof & Mrs S Jefferis	Adderbury	Objection. The proposals are totally out of proportion with the historic character of Adderbury and will overwhelm the existing community. The rural setting will be destroyed and there is no justification for increasing population when they are no jobs, sufficient schools or a medical facility. The public transport is totally inadequate for such expansion. Road infrastructure in the village is already at breaking point from development of Milton Road, the Anyhoe Road and Oxford Road towards Banbury. Within the context of COP26, the development of such a large amount of farmland seems to go againsts the plans to mitigate climate change and encourage rewilding of farmland
LPR-B-472	David Blowers	Question - Green Belt	Objection to reviewing Green Belt use as there has already been a lot and it needs protection. Agree that there should be connected network of Local Green Spaces around Kidlington and believe this should follow the existing boundary of the built up area and include all of the existing Green Belt
LPR-B-473	Langford Community Orchard Group	Question - Local Green Spaces	Langford Community Orchard, off Dunlin Court, Bicester is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. The site was proposed for LGS designation in the previous Cherwell Local Plan Review Issues consultation in September 2020. The Langford Community Orchard Group wish to apply for an extension of the area to be designated as LGS. A site location plan has been supplied

LPR-B-474	Gillian & Percy Bidwell	Adderbury	All of these sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. The proposed developments will place additional cars on already dangerous roads. The proposed development sites are unsustainable and every household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-474	Gillian & Percy Bidwell	LPR-A-041	Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east.
LPR-B-474	Gillian & Percy Bidwell	LPR-A-086	The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 and LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. The proposed sites listed as LPR-A-086, to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Berry Hill Rd, would, if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have already suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose their existing connection with local farmland. Constructed in the 1950s/60s, St Mary's Rd and Norris Close provide low-density housing with large gardens backing onto fields. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to these houses being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury.
LPR-B-474	Gillian & Percy Bidwell	LPR-A-146	Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east.
LPR-B-474	Gillian & Percy Bidwell	LPR-A-218	All of these sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. The proposed developments will place additional cars on already dangerous roads. The proposed development sites are unsustainable and every household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-474	Gillian & Percy Bidwell	LPR-A-258	The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 and LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development of the field adjacent to the existing Adderbury Fields estate (LPR-A-258) would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space.
LPR-B-475	Tim and Ann Brooks	General	Thank you for seeking residents' input for your Local Plan preparation. We salute the consultative spirit. In practice, however, we note that almost none of CDC's residents are actually aware of this process. This is not perhaps surprising: a visitor to the CDC website, for instance, would have to already know that they were looking for the plan development process. It is not mentioned on the Council's home page; there is not even any reference to it on the main Planning page; you have to work out for yourself that you must click through to 'More about planning policy' at the foot of that page. This presents a marked contrast to the participation of the property development sector, who of course stand to profit from any increase in building in CDC, and accordingly have returned their considerable resources to bombarding CDC with development proposals. This disparity between the interests and resources of the property industry, and residents, is a democratic deficit which we hope will be considered carefully by CDC in finalising its plan. We congratulate CDC. It is well ahead of its own targets for new housebuilding, as set out in its current plan: halfway through the present plan period, you have 43% of your housing target already built; and no less than 80% delivered or permissioned.
LPR-B-475	Tim and Ann Brooks	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Reducing car use is imperative for both long term sustainability of climate but also given fact Banbury is irremediably choked with traffic. Much of the centre of Banbury is dominated by retail premises but in-person retail is constantly shrinking – as evidenced by the many vacant properties on all of Banbury's most central streets, not to mention Castle Quay. This trend is national and irreversible. The amount of property – perfectly useable, and containing huge amounts of embodied carbon – in the town centre, which is no longer required for its historic use, is growing and will continue to do so. These properties should be repurposed for residential use, which will not only represent sustainable development, but have the very desirable effect of revivifying the town centre.

LPR-B-475	Tim and Ann Brooks	Option 18	The area CDC identifies, adjacent to the canal and the railway station, as a possible locus for residential development, should be CDC's flagship sustainable community for Banbury. Many hundreds of sustainable new homes can and should be accommodated on this site. As with redevelopment in the town centre, the need for car use will be reduced by proximity to all essential services. Development should not be directed to villages north of Banbury, which is the opinion held by the majority of residents there. Their identity has remained the same for hundreds of years and aggressive development would destroy this. Car use is unavoidable from these locations and more development will result in more traffic. The water systems and electrical supply also could not cope with further development. The development proposals are outside the village boundaries and will result in coalescence between Banbury town and Little Bourton and Hanwell. Key objective 23 assures this would not happen.
LPR-B-475	Tim and Ann	Option 19	Development should be limited to protect Banbury's landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-475	Tim and Ann	Option 30	The Canalside development is an ideal area for sustainable affordable housing.
LPR-B-475	Tim and Ann Brooks	Option 32	Agree, development proposals should be extended beyond which development would not normally be permitted as much time and resource is currently spent dealing with planning proposals from developments who think they can profit from stretching village boundaries.
LPR-B-476	Dr Bridget Atkins and Richard Clarke	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We are concerned about flood plain management. Climate change is going to increase flooding areas. Building houses (especially near flood plains) will reduce the run off of water and increase the risk of flooding to existing and new houses.
LPR-B-476	Dr Bridget Atkins and Richard Clarke	General	Population figures from ONS predict a decrease in population from 2040 therefore targets for housing should be significantly reduced and take into account predicted population. Increasing housing will put unmanageable strain on other infrastructures - such as health care (which we know from professional life is struggling to contend with the current high population), water and other services. On a bigger picture the government should be looking at investing in the development of areas in the North of England rather than contributing to overpopulation of the South East.
LPR-B-476	Dr Bridget Atkins and Richard Clarke	Question - Green Belt	With the global climate and environmental emergency, anyone considering building on green belt (or even any green areas) should be ashamed. The loss of plants, trees, wildlife would be irreversible for future generations. We should be protecting and these areas and moreover encouraging more woodland, habitats for pollinators and other wildlife.
LPR-B-476	Dr Bridget Atkins and Richard Clarke	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Rep includes images of commuter traffic. The commuter traffic is already too much for Oxford to manage. The queues of traffic in and out of Oxford negate any hoped-for benefit from emission free zones in Oxford. Adding more traffic pressure will make carbon emissions significantly worse.
LPR-B-477	Dr Bridget Atkins and Richard Clarke	Question - Local Green Spaces	It is important for people's wellbeing to have areas of natural beauty and for recreation. This especially refers to the areas around East Kidlington which are a very popular site for walkers, runners, cyclists, dog walkers, nature lovers etc. We support the Kidlington Parish Council and KDW proposal for a linked network of local green spaces around the village and think this is the minimum that should be considered.
LPR-B-477	Fiona Smith	Deddington	Objection. The development proposals are not sustainable. Building on greenfield sites is catastrophic for the environment, releasing more carbon into the atmosphere and destroying habitats. We need to preserve farmland to continue to grow enough food to feed everyone. Deddington is a rural village without good public transport links and large scale development will inevitably increase traffic and pollution levels. The health centre is already struggling and there is little room to expand on the current site. Parking within the village and around market square is already under strain. Large scale development, even if phased, will irreparably change the very nature of this village. Need for housing is partly being driven by desire for second homes and I have been unable to find housing for family due to this. Banbury Guardian in 2018 highlighted the fact that over 300 homes were empty in Cherwell and some had not been lived in for over 10 years. The recent pandemic has led to what many see as a permanent change in retail habits, resulting in many empty shops in our town centres. These spaces could and should be the first sites converted into housing.
LPR-B-478	Bletchington Parish Council	Option 1	Our vision for Bletchington is for our parish to be safe, attractive and well maintained; and for our parish and the rural community to be resilient and sustainable. We support the 3 themes and the draft vision for Cherwell described within the Local Plan Review.

LPR-B-478	Bletchington Parish Council	Bletchington	Support the overarching intentions in the Oxfordshire Plan and the draft Cherwell plan to deliver sustainable communities within acceptable levels. The inclusion of a site in Bletchington listed for development possibilities in the future is providing an additional 4.58 hectares of development which we feel is as much as should be accommodated, especially as we are in a green belt area. We want due consideration given to the local traffic infrastructure. Bletchington has accommodated a recent new development at Duchy Fields, increasing the size of the village by 20%. Additional dwellings have increased traffic volume and the poorly designed access to the development from Station Road created a danger spot. This is a priority for Bletchington Parish. The B4027 runs through the parish, this a main Oxfordshire route providing access to the A34 with high traffic volumes. Bletchington primary school, village hall, and Co-op are on the North side of the B4027 with much of the housing on the South side of the B4027. There is significant footfall across this road and frequent passage by HGVs – for which this route is highly unsuitable due to the proximity of housing and a narrowing of the road at the Eastern point. Bletchington Parish Council remains very concerned about traffic management along this busy route. We are concerned that insufficient consideration is given to the implications of new developments on existing traffic routes in rural areas at the planning stages. Traffic management and calming measures for villages where new development is taking place should be considered at early planning stages, and funded by developers. Traffic implications of Bletchington's recent development were foreseeable and mitigations should have been planned and funded as part of the development. Bletchington is currently served by the 250 bus route, running through the village from Bicester to Oxford. This service is well used by local residents, pre-pandemic the peak time buses were often full. Long term sustainability of this route is in jeopardy and are concerned that without this route Bletchington Parish will be inaccessible except by private car. This is unacceptable and contrary the environmental and sustainable aspects of the Cherwell Local Plan Vision. Access to our neighbouring villages is only possible by private car. This is particularly challenging for accessing medical care, we do not have a GP practice in the village and many residents travel by car to Islip. Transport strategies should consider not just access to main urban areas but access between villages. It is only possible to support businesses in villages if it is possible to access them.
LPR-B-478	Bletchington Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	Regarding Traffic Management Policies, we urge Cherwell District Council to develop a specific policy to assess the traffic impact of new developments in rural communities. It should be mandatory that this assessment is undertaken and published.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 1	Objective 4 of the proposed Vision should recognise that whilst meeting the housing needs, it is also important that they are located in the right location in relation to both delivering sustainable forms of development and responding to market demand
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 2	KO31 needs to be expanded to recognise that planned growth of rural communities including market housing, is key to sustaining local services and facilities, and not just affordable housing. Successive local plans in Cherwell have severely limited the growth of rural settlements which has been to the detriment of its rural communities and evident by the continued decline in the viability of sustaining services and facilities in such areas.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington; at significant transport interchanges and at the larger villages represent the most sustainable options both in terms of minimising the need to travel and improving the self-containment of existing established settlements, and where travel is necessary alternative transport modes exist other than by private car.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above will offer for a balanced and diversified employment market in the district.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. The flexibility of use of town centres and retail space has become more necessary to try and ensure active uses within such areas are maintained.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District). Affordable housing rates in the district have been established based upon viability considerations. Increasing the percentage requirement of affordable housing risks rendering some sites unviable and undermining housing delivery rates in the district.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent? A mix of tenures is important in terms of providing balanced and inclusive communities, with significant demand in the district for both social rent and shared ownership.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Question - Separation Distances	The issue of separation distances between properties should continue to be assessed on an individual basis, rather than rigorous standards, as in different circumstances a greater or lesser degree of separation maybe appropriate.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 9	Housing accessibility standards should continue to rely on building regulations as this will ensure standards do not start varying between authority areas, which makes it much more difficult for developers to keep track of.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Question - Housing Policies	A specific policy is required to encourage entry level exception sites in accordance with Paragraph 72 of the NPPF.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan. Sustainable construction standards should rely upon building regulations. This will ensure standards do not start varying between authority areas, which makes it much more difficult for developers to keep track of.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation? The market will determine the suitability and availability of sites and bring them forwards through the development control process

LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district. It should be recognised that often in the case of smaller sites, delivering a biodiversity net gain is hard to achieve with insufficient land available and that offsite mitigation is the only means of delivering such an outcome.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. The impact of major development proposals should be identified as part of the application process as it represents a material consideration in determination of the proposal
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Banbury and the other county towns have absorbed a significant majority of growth in Oxfordshire over the last 30 years resulting in significant pressure on its infrastructure which has not been sufficiently invested in. The town has expanded significantly into the surrounding countryside and development should now be limited to protect its remaining landscape setting and avoid coalescence with surrounding settlements.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. As with Banbury, continued expansion of Bicester is not sustainable when its infrastructure has not been sufficiently improved to accommodate an ever expanding population. The remaining countryside surrounding the town should now be protected and avoid coalescence with nearby settlements.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 30	Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. Housing needs of the rural areas have been insufficiently provided for within previous local plans resulting in a continued decline in rural services and facilities, and the ageing of the rural populations due to insufficient housing opportunities for younger generations. The allocation of smaller sites is an important component of housing land supply in the district, with such sites being capable of being delivered quickly and with fewer constraints in terms of infrastructure upgrades etc. This is recognised within the NPPF which requires local planning authorities to identify at least 10% of housing land supply requirements to be on sites of up to 1ha (Paragraph 69). A more balanced distribution of growth is required in the district to reverse the decline in rural communities, with the allocation of more medium scale sites that can deliver a full range of housing opportunities. This includes affordable housing as the reliance upon small windfall proposals delivers little in the way of this form of housing. Further, increasing the scale of growth in the rural areas will also secure more infrastructure investment to address any identified local deficiencies or issues, as again, small scale proposals are generally below the threshold to require financial contributions although collectively these developments do add to the burden on local services.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Local communities need district level support in allocating specific sites to meet identified housing needs whilst not all communities intend to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Option 32	Give additional weight to the availability of certain services and facilities (which do you think are the most important?). For instance, schools and GP surgeries generate significant traffic movements and have a high level of use so if a settlement provides such infrastructure this should be recognised in its categorisation. The local planning authority should also consider whether through increasing the scale of growth at certain settlements, what the scope is to facilitate the delivery of new facilities and services for its population
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Call for Sites Promotion - Land south of Main Street,	Land south of Main Street, Fringford is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Call for Sites Promotion - Land west of Main Street,	Land west of Main Street, Fringford is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Call for Sites Promotion - Land east of Heyford Road, Kirtlington	Land east of Heyford Road, Kirtlington is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-479	Abbeymill Homes	Call for Sites Promotion - Land east of Barford Road, Bloxham	Land east of Barford Road, Bloxham is promoted for housing.

LPR-B-480	Carly Castle	LPR-A-077	<p>Object. Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District's housing supply with Adderbury seeing a significant amount. These proposals contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Development contradicts Policy ESD 1. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. The increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development of this land would be contrary to NPPG - Rural housing para 78. In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development would be contrary to Policy ESD 10- Development which would result in damage to or loss of a site of biodiversity or geological value of regional or local importance including habitats of species of principal importance for biodiversity will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm it would cause to the site, and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in biodiversity/geodiversity. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. This area should remain free of substantial new build structures. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA (Conservation Target Area – Other Sites). Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Increased traffic congestion as a result of this over-development has therefore substantially increased vehicle emissions and has degraded ambient air quality for residents. Further residential development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury. Any development on this land would be contrary to Adderbury Local Plan Policy AD5. Development on this land will harm both the function and open character of the village in the Conservation Area. Proposals to increase residential development in Adderbury will place unnecessary and restrictive burdens upon the health, mental wellbeing and accessibility of the village and place developer profit ahead of recreational, social and community needs and vastly increase social exclusion. This is of particular relevance given the lack of affordability of new developments in Adderbury. Any residential development in Adderbury does not support this Local Plan objective and does not meet the existing local plan objective that 'seeks to deliver growth as part of an 'urban focused strategy',</p>
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Loop Farm, Wolvercote	Land at Loop Farm, Wolvercote is promoted for mixed uses. Update to HELAA374. A site plan and letter from Stagecoach have been submitted with the representation.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 1	Support the suggested Vision for Cherwell as identified at paragraph 4.7, including on achieving climate action targets (point 1), energy efficiency (point 2), well designed homes to meet our needs (point 4) and a sustainable, flexible economy with good transport links (point 6). Further explanation should be given as to how the Vision will be extended into measurable targets or objectives. For example, what does the vision for new development being built to high energy efficiency mean in practice over a plan period? With regard to the reference to Covid 19, whilst we agree that the impacts of it are significant, it is difficult to predict how long term these may be. We suggest that further consideration is given as to whether the Plan, especially if it is for a 30 year period, should be significantly informed by the impacts of Covid. We suggest that point 12 is either reworded or explained elsewhere in the Plan in terms of how Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington are to be 'reshaped and adapted' to maintain their roles as attractive, vibrant, retail, cultural and social centres for communities and visitors. We consider that the inclusion in this Consultation Document of the Oxfordshire Strategic Vision and a Draft Oxfordshire Plan Vision (July 2021) could be confusing for the reader. In addition, the inclusion of these other Visions could in part duplicate what is within the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050. We suggest the strategic element is left to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 2	The Local Plan Review will need to meet the tests of soundness within the NPPF. This includes being consistent with the emerging Arc Spatial Framework and the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050. The latter includes spatial options for the entire County and it acknowledges that ultimately, through testing, the preferred approach is likely to comprise a selection from among the spatial options within the consultation document. These options are included in the section on vision for the emerging local plan and so will need to be kept under review. Themes: We agree with the Themes contained in the Consultation Document (i.e. Maintaining and developing a sustainable Economy; Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change; and Healthy Place Shaping). These follow on from the previous consultation version. Key Objectives: Although the 31 Key Objectives are generally supported we consider there to be more objectives than is necessary and that these should be simplified and reduced in number. The following objectives are most important: KO 1, KO 2, KO 3, KO 10, KO 11, KO 13, KO 16, KO23, KO 24, KO 26, KO 28, KO 29, KO 30 and KO 31. Objective KO1 is essential to provide support for the living standards within the County and relates well to the vision for the District. KO23 should explicitly include reference to sustainable urban extensions and planned expansion on the edge of Oxford City. The spatial strategy in the Oxfordshire Plan, whilst likely to comprise a combination of options under the emerging plans for the area, is likely to have a focus on edge of Oxford growth being such a well connected location.

LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 3	The draft Local Plan refers to the current 'urban focussed strategy' for delivering growth and, in looking to where new development will go, points to some of the answers being given by the Oxfordshire Plan (paragraph 5.1.1). Employment land should be well connected to centres of population, both existing and proposed, and hence accessible to the workforce. This can take many forms including sustainable urban extensions and planned expansion of existing settlements. Locations for significant employment development should also be well related to the strategic transport network, including major roads and public transport corridors. The allocation of future employment land should include previously developed land, it is unlikely that this will be sufficient and in sufficient quantity to promote economic growth in sustainable locations, for example in close proximity to the edge of Oxford. We note that CDC has commissioned an Employment Land and Needs Assessment, to complement the OGNA, but we would need to see the details of this to comment further. Changes to the Use Classes Order and increased flexibility in Class E will also be important in the emerging strategy, especially for town centres and business parks.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 4	Option 2 is most appropriate. When identifying sites for employment, the selection of particular uses for a site should be led by the evidence on need for employment land and looking at reasonable options for identification of land for employment development. We consider that there needs to be a mindset shift away from a focus on the traditional 'B-uses' (accepting the change in the land-use class for former B1 Business uses). Acknowledgement should also be given to the value of employment from life sciences, education uses, community uses and smallscale start up businesses. The input of the Oxford and Oxfordshire LEP and business community will be relevant here. As supported by paragraph 81 of the NPPF, the emerging Local Plan should set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to Local Industrial Strategies and other local policies for economic development and regeneration. This needs to be integrated with the emerging content of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 6	The answer to this must be led by the evidence on need for housing, both market and affordable housing. The latest position as published is the Oxfordshire Councils Growth Needs Assessment (OGNA). Levels of affordable housing have to be tested through viability appraisal so as to avoid an adverse impact on housing delivery in the context of housing an placemaking within the vision and objectives for the plan. As a general approach, affordable housing need is infrequently met even in authority areas where the overall housing requirements are met in some of the accounting years. This suggests that models of delivery of affordable housing must extend beyond S106 provision as part of marketled housing development. 'Exception to Policy' development rarely features fully in local plans and yet the NPPF (section 5) requires planning policies to identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. This includes provision of a range of affordable housing types and tenures and small sites. A range of affordable housing levels is appropriate across the District and this needs to be set within development viability appraisal work and whether the Council intends to continue with S106 only without introducing the Community Infrastructure Levy.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 7	The answer has to be evidence-led and there will not be a one-size fits-all solution. The NPPF seeks a range of housing types which includes tenures. The definition under Annex 2: Glossary and relevant policy advice and guidance from Government is relevant here. This seeks by and large to expand the range of tenures defined as affordable including discount market sales and started homes. These must feature within policy or guidance within the District. As it is so difficult to plan for delivery over such a plan period it might be more appropriate not to define a tenure split in policy but refer to evidence guiding discussions on sites set within preparation of supplementary planning guidance on affordable housing
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 8	Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements exceeding the minimum standards required by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area, and justify setting appropriate policies in their Local Plans. Unlike need for affordable housing, we see this issue as being Oxfordshire-wide and not one that should be decided upon, possibly differently, by each local authority in the County. The partner authorities should consider the impact of applying NDSS or above as part of the Local Plan viability assessment. In considering the costs relating to optional Building Regulation requirements or the NDSS, authorities may wish to take account of the evidence in the most recent Impact Assessment issued alongside the Housing Standards Review. This is not a matter for inclusion in Development Plans and should not be included in this Local Plan. The imposition of minimum separation distances is too prescriptive and does not take account of local site circumstances such as topography and boundary features. Ensuring good design can be done in different ways, for example through compliance with the principles of the National Model Design Code and any local design code or SPD that is in place.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 9	No need for a policy relating to Modern Methods of Construction. It would be more appropriate to let the market resolve this, in the context of meeting other sustainability requirements and legislation.

LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 11	Relevant policies included in the Local Plan should be sufficiently flexibility to ensure that they remain relevant. Blenheim, Merton and St Johns have previously submitted responses to the Oxfordshire Plan. It is argued that this Plan should include the option for land currently designated as Green Belt to be released from that policy. This would allow for the development and other needs of the county to be met in a sustainable way. In Cherwell and South Oxfordshire changes to the Green Belt to allow for the expansion of the urban area of Oxford have been shown to be a sustainable option and one endorsed by both Local Plan inspectors. Land within ownership is promoted for an employment led strategic mixed use development on land at Loop Farm north of the A40, west of the A34 and south west of the A44 at Wolvercote. This site extends to approximately 23 hectares. It forms part of the wider Oxford Green Belt. The site offers the potential for an employment led strategic mixed use allocation, similar in scale to the nearby Oxford North (formerly known as Northern Gateway). This could include approximately 50,000-70,000sqm of employment floorspace; 300-400 dwellings; and leisure, which could be delivered in 6-10 years' time. This scale of development could also help fund and deliver the Loop Farm Link Road. This would link the A34 and A44 and provide a more direct route from the A40 west of Oxford to the A34. This would avoid the need for such traffic to route via the Wolvercote Roundabout. The junction of the A34, A40 and A44 is a strategic location which would encourage economic development. It is also a sustainable location close to facilities in Oxford with frequent bus services to the city centre. The potential mix of uses could allow employment on the eastern part of the site to help provide noise mitigation as a result of the proximity of the A34. It could also allow leisure uses on the western edge of the site close to the Oxford Canal. The proposal is consistent with four of the five spatial options in the draft Oxfordshire Plan
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 12	This is a County matter and should be addressed in the Oxfordshire Plan. Welcome the aspiration in that Plan for biodiversity gain. We also note that there is a proposed benchmark of 20% BNG for Oxfordshire, which we have requested is the subject of further analysis (to confirm an achievable and potentially phased target) and that more details are given.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 15	The designation of Local Green Spaces should be a matter for Neighbourhood Plans. Policies should follow the NPPF (Section 12 Achieving Well Designed Places) and avoid ambiguity between National Model Design Code and local codes and guidance. Policies can set standards which can be illustrated/explained through supplementary planning guidance at the County level. We support the principle of the 20-minute neighbourhood. Further consideration of this should be given to see if this can be delivered through the Local Plan. Support the connectivity and transport approach outlined in the Local Plan, including moving towards a net zero transport network and a decarbonised transport system. With regard to land at Loop Farm, Wolvercote. Scale of development could also help fund and deliver the Loop Farm Link Road. This would link the A34 and A44 and provide a more direct route from the A40 west of Oxford to the A34. This would avoid the need for such traffic to route via the Wolvercote Roundabout. The junction of the A34, A40 and A44 is a strategic location which would encourage economic development. It is also a sustainable location close to facilities in Oxford with frequent bus services to the city centre. The potential mix of uses could allow employment on the eastern part of the site to help provide noise mitigation as a result of the proximity of the A34. It could allow leisure uses on the western edge of the site close to the Oxford Canal.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 16	This is a County matter and should be addressed in the Oxfordshire Plan.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 17	Costed and consulted upon infrastructure delivery plan is necessary but only where it takes a lead from the work put in for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. This must be crossboundary and look to deliver on the set of core objectives to deliver the plan vision.
LPR-B-481	Savills for Blenheim, Merton & St John's	Option 26	Are there any local Green Belt matters we need to consider?, Blenheim, Merton and St Johns are promoting land in the Green Belt at Loop Farm on Woodstock Road, Wolvercote which has the potential for an employment led strategic mixed use allocation, similar in scale to the nearby Oxford North (formerly known as Northern Gateway). This could include approximately 50,000-70,000sqm of employment floorspace and also 300-400 dwellings and leisure. In addition, the removal of the Loop Farm site from the Green Belt and its development for employment and housing at the scale proposed would also help fund and deliver the Loop Farm Link Road. This would link the A34 and A44 and provide a more direct route from the A40 west of Oxford to the A34. This would avoid the need for such traffic to route via the Wolvercote Roundabout
LPR-B-482	Judith Thonrton	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. The extent and planned growth detailed in this Plan Review is a serious cause for concern. The site is outside of the previously agreed Residential Settlement Boundary which was agreed in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, going against policy AD1. There is an abundance of wildlife in this area thanks to the open fields, trees and hedgerows. These include everything from frogs, toads and newts to hedgehogs, bats, hares, deers, foxes, badgers, field mice, buzzards, kestrels and kites. This entire eco system would be destroyed for ever. How can this comply with any Environmental Objective? The footpath walking routes through this beautiful green countryside are an absolute lifeline for residents. Again this natural and free activity will be irreplaceably impacted by developing and changing this natural environment. This field has a seemingly endless amount of fossils. I believe this field was once a quarry and is perhaps why there is so much, but this archaeological area must be checked. Where will all the water run off go if these fields are covered in concrete? Surely flooding will suddenly become an issue and risk to us all. I understand more affordable housing needs to be created, but I am really not sure this is a suitable location. There has to be more suitable locations which provide more local facilities and employment opportunities. They would be dependent on having use of a car to get anywhere which in turn would increase traffic on strained roads. The increase in noise and air pollution. Only a very few landowners and developers will gain any benefit - that being money - to the utter detriment of a historical and beautiful village that is Adderbury.
LPR-B-483	Mary Adams	Adderbury	Object. We have already undergone a huge change. It is gridlocked in rush hour, what a shame to further enlarge this very attractive location. Surely it would be better to establish new areas. There is no surgery schools are overloaded and traffic fumes are unpleasant



LPR-B-484	James Sadler	Hanwell	<p>Object. Hanwell has existed as a village and community since Norman Times. If further housing is built to the North West of Banbury then Hanwell runs the risk of being absorbed into the environs of Banbury. In doing so becoming just a satellite village and losing its true identity as an element of Oxfordshire’s much admired and valued rural life. There is a risk of the existing Community being lost. This is much against the considered wishes of Hanwell’s residents. Contradicts and is counter to what exists in the Current local plan 2011-2031; Policy C15.</p> <p>This may be evidenced by the development which has taken place around Bodicote, south of Banbury, which has been swallowed up by the developers. Policy C15 is weak in that it fails to designate the open countryside between Hanwell and Banbury as being something akin to Green Belt, or, at least, an extension of the Hanwell Village conservation area. Hence it gives no signal to housing developers that it’s not up land which it is up for grabs for development. If such building were to be allowed this would have the undesirable consequence of seeing housing on countryside that forms a calculated and important “strategic” gap between Banbury, the town, and Hanwell, the village. Large developments will mean Hanwell will no longer be a rural village in Oxfordshire. On a further historical note regarding Hanwell, St. Peter’s 12th Century Parish Church which lies in the Hanwell Conservation area may be viewed from the existing open countryside south of the Village. These views have been preserved for centuries but there is no reference, or policy, for this to continue. The existing Local Plan does have a Policy (C34) to protect the views of St. Mary’s 18th Century Parish Church in Bambury.</p>
LPR-B-485	Penny Sprigg	LPR-A-107	<p>Object. The proposed development would double the number of houses in this small village. The area proposed is next to an Ironstone Downland AONB and proposed development would surely impact not only on this, but on the rural characteristics of the village and its surrounds. The Cherwell LP states its intention to limit ‘growth in our rural areas’ and to value and conserve ‘the integrity and richness of the county’s historic character’. Car usage in the area would increase commensurately - public transport links are intermittent - meaning that commuter traffic would add to pollution at a time when the focus must be on reducing private car use. The exit at the north end of Pound Lane onto the main road is potentially dangerous due to a dip in the road to the west. The alternative routes for entering/exiting the village would be either to use the crossroads within Sibford Gower to take traffic past the Primary school or to head South down a winding route through a farm which is already a ‘rat run’ during commuting hours. Brownfield sites exist in Banbury which should surely be used for imaginative development to improve derelict areas and to enhance the town’s image. Amenities already exist there. The impact of the additional pressures on the surgery and Primary School from a development on the proposed scale must be considered, alongside the inadequacy of current roads, cycleways and footpaths. Protecting the natural environment is a vital aspect of any proposed development. The Cherwell LP itself states: Key Objective 15 is to ‘protect, conserve and enhance natural capital assets such as soils, woodlands, hedges and ponds in order to capture and store carbon’.</p>
LPR-B-486	Mandy Ryhmes	LPR-A-156	<p>Strongly object. Developments across these areas of green space would not only double the current size of the village but negatively impact on the village. There are too few facilities in the village to serve any more housing. The local primary school has already undergone expansion just to accommodate the already bulging village population; There is no health centre in the village so yet more residents would put even more strain on the surrounding practices. Levels of crime would increase locally with an increased population. The impact on the local wildlife which enjoys the land where the proposals are for would be obviously catastrophic. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The large-scale developments proposed would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-486	Mandy Ryhmes	LPR-A-178	<p>Strongly object. Developments across these areas of green space would not only double the current size of the village but negatively impact on the village. There are too few facilities in the village to serve any more housing. The local primary school has already undergone expansion just to accommodate the already bulging village population; There is no health centre in the village so yet more residents would put even more strain on the surrounding practices. Levels of crime would increase locally with an increased population. The impact on the local wildlife which enjoys the land where the proposals are for would be obviously catastrophic. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The large-scale developments proposed would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-487	Milton Parish Meeting	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Town centres are changing and more homes should replace what were offices/shops as centres become more amenable places to live.
LPR-B-487	Milton Parish Meeting	Option 30	The stated objective of the Council and government is to enhance the environment. Cycling and walking are to be preferred to driving and traffic is to be focussed on sustainable corridors. Schools, shops and entertainment (social infrastructure) should be planned to take account of these objectives. Development is to be concentrated in larger settlements and be Oxford, Banbury and Bicester led. Rural communities are to be supported and protected with no development in open countryside. Existing business and tourist locations are to be strengthened (ie not scattered).
LPR-B-487	Milton Parish Meeting	Milton	Rural areas of Cherwell have taken 2641 houses since 2011 whereas Banbury has taken 3612 (with 1536 more unbuilt but with planning). Adderbury and Bloxham are rural communities. Their growth in the last 10 years looks set to turn them into small towns but with few facilities, requiring travel by road to reach most of those facilities in Banbury. The road system was not designed for the large amount of traffic now using it and residents complain of noise and light pollution growing in Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury, with consistent calls for reduced traffic and reduced speed. Villages operate as a single community, towns do not being a congregation of different communities which often compete. Cherwell must decide with the communities of both villages, whether Adderbury and Bloxham are to become towns and eventually part of Banbury, or whether they are to retain, at the last, their identity as villages. Roads to the north and east of Banbury are better capable of handling the increased traffic from Banbury's growth than the south and west and accordingly believe any growth in Banbury should be to Banbury's east and north. Development in the rural areas should be restricted to local needs only. Neighbourhood Plans should control the growth of rural and village development and should not be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate. The sites put forward in the parishes of Adderbury, Milton and Bloxham, do not meet any of the Council's objectives. Development in Adderbury and Bloxham should be small scale so that these communities retain their identity as 'villages in the countryside' and do not become part of and wholly reliant on the facilities of Banbury. Any development in Milton Parish should be very small scale respecting the conservation village and its environs. The proposed development of the old caravan park and its adjoining field should be the subject of a separate consultation with Milton villagers as it falls within the parish boundary but outside the village, in open countryside. Varied views on whether additional services and connections should be provided but all agree that: road traffic should not worsen; urban road painting, signage and lighting should not be sited in or around villages and the countryside; overall landscape and character of the area should be protected and certain special individual features in the landscapes given special protection; tranquillity and reduction of light pollution should be a factor in decisionmaking; settlements should be prevented from coalescence; commercial and economic growth should be limited to specified urban areas; and, improvement of the environment should be a major factor.
LPR-B-487	Robert Blackburn	Option 30	Village environments are valuable and should be conserved, if they are destroyed or altered by modern developments then they are destroyed or altered for ever. People enjoy the village fabric, the close association of historic buildings, public and private spaces, which together generate the unique sense of 'place', the essence of the village. Villages are not small towns. The village limits should be established, and interior should be preserved, not butchered in the interests of the car driver, especially if the origins of the traffic is from a development on the village edge. Attaching modern development to the periphery of any village should be avoided because a mediaeval urban fabric can not be comfortably wedded to modern buildings and layout. Too much new development will overwhelm the original ancient core. There is a place for modern development in its own right, but that place should not be to glue it onto the edge of an old and valued village. All developments generate road traffic, but hooking up new housing developments to the ancient network of roads and lanes should be avoided. Those networks have enough to cope with as it is. There may be some opportunities within a village for minor development, but too much infilling of this type could alter the character of the place. There will be a limit to the amount of development a place can take and that limit should be established for all rural settlements and written into planning policy.

LPR-B-489	Charles Martin	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. These sites are disproportionate to the existing settlements of Adderbury and Twyford and will place pressure on existing facilities and utilities including the road systems, internet provisions, storm drainage, water and sewer systems which are already failing to keep up with the needs of the village. The development of these sites will also cause a loss of amenity for many of the village who use these areas for walking, recreation and connecting with nature, thus impacting the physical and mental health of the village. Traffic at peak times around the school is already badly compromised with drivers cutting through the back roads, often with excess speed. It is logical that the extra housing will only increase this problem and the traffic pressures and constitutes a significant threat to the safety and wellbeing of the children within the village. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-489 Page 1744	Charles Martin	LPR-A-178	<p>Strongly object. These sites are disproportionate to the existing settlements of Adderbury and Twyford and will place pressure on existing facilities and utilities including the road systems, internet provisions, storm drainage, water and sewer systems which are already failing to keep up with the needs of the village. The development of these sites will also cause a loss of amenity for many of the village who use these areas for walking, recreation and connecting with nature, thus impacting the physical and mental health of the village. Traffic at peak times around the school is already badly compromised with drivers cutting through the back roads, often with excess speed. It is logical that the extra housing will only increase this problem and the traffic pressures and constitutes a significant threat to the safety and wellbeing of the children within the village. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Development would be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-489	Charles Martin	LPR-A-156	<p>Strongly object. These sites are disproportionate to the existing settlements of Adderbury and Twyford and will place pressure on existing facilities and utilities including the road systems, internet provisions, storm drainage, water and sewer systems which are already failing to keep up with the needs of the village. The development of these sites will also cause a loss of amenity for many of the village who use these areas for walking, recreation and connecting with nature, thus impacting the physical and mental health of the village. Traffic at peak times around the school is already badly compromised with drivers cutting through the back roads, often with excess speed. It is logical that the extra housing will only increase this problem and the traffic pressures and constitutes a significant threat to the safety and wellbeing of the children within the village. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The largescale developments proposed would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-489	Charles Martin	LPR-A-081	Strongly object. These sites are disproportionate to the existing settlements of Adderbury and Twyford and will place pressure on existing facilities and utilities including the road systems, internet provisions, storm drainage, water and sewer systems which are already failing to keep up with the needs of the village. The development of these sites will also cause a loss of amenity for many of the village who use these areas for walking, recreation and connecting with nature, thus impacting the physical and mental health of the village. Traffic at peak times around the school is already badly compromised with drivers cutting through the back roads, often with excess speed. It is logical that the extra housing will only increase this problem and the traffic pressures and constitutes a significant threat to the safety and wellbeing of the children within the village. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-490	Lesley Wragg	Option 30	The options offered are not satisfactory choices. An additional criterion required is that The development of rural areas would give great weight to the existing character, size of the village and well being of exiting residents. Rural areas have already contributed to the development of Banbury e.g. Bodicote, Hanwell etc. Development of brownfield sites better enable higher density, affordable housing, reduced cars, vibrant urban centres. Development in villages needs to be proportionate and organic. Infill may be appropriate. Significantly increase the housing stock in North Newington parish all proposed sites are developed
LPR-B-490	Lesley Wragg	Option 31	Use a combination of the above but with the caveat that consultation is meaningful. So far the consultation on this plan as a grossly inadequate timescale and discriminatory against people without computers.
LPR-B-490	Lesley Wragg	Option 32	Before discussing the weight to give to services, I stress the importance of considering villages infrastructure; roads, pavements, power, water sewage, drainage, electricity and broadband. Services must be tested for resilience before development is considered. North Newington has narrow roads, parked cars, heavily used, pavement not continuous, water pressure low in parts of village, electricity supply not always secure, storm drains not coping with heavy rain. Bus service withdrawn, walking or cycling not viable options as hazardous. Access to M40 and train station gets more difficult with the extra traffic from expansion westward of Banbury An additional criterion for a rural settlement hierarchy is needed – “The nature and character of the village should not be significantly affected by the development, especially where it abuts a conservation area.” Before any site is agreed for development a proper testing of the resilience of the infrastructure should take place.
LPR-B-490	Lesley Wragg	LPR-A-135	Support. Providing the scale and type of development proposed is suitable we would see this area as appropriate infill as it sits within the village footprint. A more suitable development in the village yielding a 10 % increase in housing stock in the village from 2015 to 2040
LPR-B-490	Lesley Wragg	LPR-A-004	Object. Not suitable as a backland development that would increase of village footprint. Development would introduce a new road. Would reduce privacy of current residents. Current residents properties devalued. The parcel (land north of Broughton Road) comes within the Parish boundary so should be considered as part of the housing increase for North Newington although it does not directly impact on the character of the village. It will increase the traffic on the Broughton Road and storm water will run off the development and worsen the flooding that often occurs on the Broughton Road.
LPR-B-491	Patrick Whyte	Milton	Object. I live in Milton and have been shocked by the volume and speed of traffic on what should be a quiet country road between Bloxham and Adderbury. Any new development will add to that. I am not against new housing but it needs to be in the right place and existing infrastructure needs to be upgraded. Oxford County Council has talked about making 20mph the new 30mph but in Milton traffic speeds through at at least 40mph and often faster. This needs to be addressed before new houses are built in the area. There is no bus service.
LPR-B-492	David Cawdery	Milton	Object. Milton is a rural conservation village that is being threatened by continuous encroachment from both Adderbury and Bloxham and the general urbanisation that follows. All aspects of traffic, noise, light pollution and reduction of rural tranquillity should be avoided. Any development in Milton Parish should be very small scale (minor infill) respecting the conservation village of Milton and its environs
LPR-B-493	Christine Robbins	LPR-A-091	Object. This area is used for dog walking and is a lovely open space. I thought it is a public right of way. Please do not build on this open ground. Look at all the empty building, office building and warehouses around Banbury area?
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at south east Bicester	Land at south east Bicester is promoted for housing / community use. Update to HELAA422. A vision document, Countryside as master developer brochure, technical review of the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment and Path Finder Report - Marking out the route to net zero have been supplied.

LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 1	It is important that the emerging Cherwell District Local Plan provides clear commitments and ambitions which align with those emerging as part of the Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework and Oxfordshire Plan 2050. This will ensure a consistent approach is taken to growth, sustainability and reducing climate change, recognising the wider strategic role and function that Cherwell and specifically Bicester plays in this region. It is important that the policies within the emerging Local Plan recognise and support this important function, one that provides a meaningful opportunity to balance jobs with homes and reduce the need to travel. A key part of any vision is ensuring it is deliverable. The emerging Plan should be supported by a robust evidence base that includes whole plan viability assessment, one that demonstrates the policies and targets are deliverable within the plan period. The viability assessment should take account of other requirements set by higher tier policy documents (i.e. Oxford-Cambridge Spatial Framework and Oxfordshire Plan), as well as district and site-specific requirements.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 2	Countryside supports the general ambitions of the Vision for Cherwell and the Draft Objectives.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 3	Employment land and residential developments should be co-located in order to provide benefits to local residents, the local economy and the wider investment into the area. We would suggest the sustainability of the location should be a key factor. Developing previously developed land in isolated locations, or at levels disproportionate to the role and function of a settlement for example would run contrary to the modal shift and climate change objectives of the plan. supports a proportionate focus of employment land at the urban centre of Bicester. Bicester is a key growth location and transport interchange for the District, and indeed for the region, therefore, in order to support additional housing, employment opportunities should also be encouraged and delivered.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 4	Polices relating to employment site allocations should include sufficient flexibility in order to allow the sites to adapt to and respond to wider economic circumstances, where evidence dictates a need for varying employment uses and where the provision of mixed use would not prejudice wider strategic objectives of the site and the employment area.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 6	acknowledged that there is a considerable need for affordable housing across the district, which is a key component in attracting and maintaining an economically active local population in support of Options 3 and 4, as well as meeting the government's wider objectives to address access to affordable homes for all. If an increase in the percentage of affordable housing is to be pursued, or indeed to the tenure mix requested on individual sites (Option 7), this should be underpinned by a whole plan viability assessment. This will ensure such requirements are both justified and deliverable, and importantly would not undermine the delivery of the other objectives of the plan.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 8	supports a policy requirement for all new dwellings, both market tenure and affordable tenure, to achieve minimum space standards outlined in the NDSS. It is important to ensure new housing provides sufficient space for living and increasingly now, for home-working. The requirement to meet the NDSS will help facilitate this. It is also considered that there should not be a prejudice between the level of internal space between market and affordable housing, as such the NDSS requirement should be for all housing tenures.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 9	supports the ambition to provide housing for a range of users and this will be a key focus when providing the detailed design of the Site. important to ensure that any policy related to accessibility standards and the provision of accessible units considers viability implications. A requirement for a significant proportion of dwellings to meet accessibility standards may impact the viability of a scheme due to the additional cost these adjustments accrue. Therefore, any policy should ensure it is informed by plan wide viability assessment at the outset, thereby ensuring it is justified and deliverable over the envisaged plan period
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - Housing Policies	It is also considered that Modern Methods of Construction(MMC) is an important and growing approach towards housing which will provide significant benefits related to housing delivery. Therefore, the emerging Local Plan should support and encourage this approach. Rep provides a list of the benefits of MMC. Countryside believe timber panel is the future of high quality, sustainable homes and will play a key role in achieving swift and sustainable housing delivery.

LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 10	supports the emphasis placed on responding positively and proactively to climate change in the emerging Cherwell Local Plan Review. This aligns closely with Countryside’s own ambitions for their business operations and future development sites. Countryside therefore strongly supports the strategic objectives of the emerging Plan but note that the policy options include the possibility of introducing local sustainability standards above Building Regulations and superficially the Government’s proposed Future Homes Standard (FHS). The FHS is an ambitious improvement in Building Regulations which will see new homes reduce their carbon emissions by c.75% compared to those built to the current regulations. Given the volume of new homes required within Oxfordshire and Cherwell there is a risk that the introduction of standards higher than Building Regulations (and specifically those proposed within the Oxfordshire Plan) will restrict the delivery of new homes particularly given that the supply chain is currently not able to deliver these standards at volume. These challenges will also be particularly acute for smaller housebuilders which may further restrict delivery and diversity within the market. it is important that the sustainability policies do not restrict the delivery of much needed new private and affordable housing across the District. the emerging Plan should also include policies to ensure that the spatial distribution of new housing and employment sites contribute to a reduction in carbon emissions. Policies that ensure new development is focused in sustainable locations such as Bicester by access to sustainable modes of transportation and/or key services and facilities that can be accessed via walking and cycling. To ensure consistency across the County the Cherwell Local Plan should be in line with the standards agreed in the Oxfordshire Plan. This ensures that the development requirements for sites are equal and that certain Local Plan areas are not unfairly preferred for development locations where there are differing (or less restrictive) requirements for sustainable construction measures. strongly believes that the sustainability policies of both the Oxfordshire and Cherwell Plans should not set standards above those established by Government for the following reasons; The FHS will see all new homes from 2025 built with an all- electric energy strategy thereby ensuring the carbon footprint of these dwellings reduces each year in line with decarbonisation of the national grid. All new homes from 2025 will require high standards of fabric insulation and renewable energy technologies such as heat pumps and solar PV which are a key requirement of both national and local policy. The FHS places significant technical and commercial challenges upon housebuilders and any standards higher than this risk under delivery of housing and reductions in the number of smaller housebuilders.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 11	supports the deployment of renewable energy across Oxfordshire and Cherwell and believes that the plan should identify suitable locations for the deployment of strategic scale renewable energy generating technologies. there should be a robust site selection exercise to identify suitable locations for renewable energy and that consideration should be given (where viable and of a correct scale) to collocating new development with such infrastructure to reduce costs of upgrading local electricity infrastructure to accommodate all-electric development and a much greater demand for electricity.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	firmly believes that one of the most effective ways of reducing carbon emissions is to locate new development in a manner that promotes more sustainable modes of transportation other than the private car. Ensuring a more sustainable approach to the distribution of development can have a hugely beneficial impact in terms of reducing carbon emissions given that approximately 33% of GHG emissions arise from the transportation sector. therefore recommend that within the housing policies there is a specific reference to the promotion of a sustainable pattern of development.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 13	supports the approach for proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment, however, the policy will need to clarify the form and scope of the natural capital assessment. This is to ensure a consistent approach across all sites. The requirement for natural capital assessments will also need to be in line with the Oxfordshire Plan requirements to ensure consistency across the Arc. We request any future policy defines ‘environmental net gain’ and confirms whether this differs from biodiversity net gain. This is important to understand in order to avoid a repetitive policy requirement.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	support the ambition to provide high quality green and blue infrastructure across the District. A policy on this should clearly define what infrastructure this encompasses and should ensure this is factored into the whole plan viability assessment of proposed allocations at the outset. Any policy requiring the protection of landscape areas / features should clearly define what criteria a landscape feature must have in order for it to be classed as important for protection. This will avoid less important landscape features being necessarily protected where they could be put to better and more efficient use, and / or enhanced through replacement planting that has wider biodiversity gain benefits
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 14	A combination of these three approaches would ensure that all forms and locations of development benefit from these facilities.supports the ambition to provide LAP/LEAP/NEAPs on large development sites. a policy relating to children’s play space should confirm how the required extent of the provision is calculated, for example, based on the population density of the site and needs in the local area.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 15	It is considered that the optimal approach towards outdoor sports provision is a combination of providing facilities within urban areas, at the edge of settlements and supporting the enhancement of existing sporting provision through financial contributions where it is not possible or desirable to include facilities onsite. This will ensure all forms and locations of developments will benefit from and contribute towards outdoor sports facilities. The Policy Option refers to the option to secure and establish sports hubs “at our main settlements”. If the Council were to proceed with this approach it is important this is transparent, planned and deliverable. This should be factored into urban capacity assessments at the outset, with specific requirements defined. This will ensure identified needs are deliverable within the plan period. For example, formal playing pitch needs may be more difficult to deliver within the urban area (particularly where there is a competing need to make best use of urban land for housing and other uses), than perhaps on the edge via planned strategic development sites.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	supports the concept of a 20-minute neighbourhood as it provides accessible facilities and shops as part of the liveable neighbourhood, within a convenient 20-minute walking distance. This concept builds upon the changing approach to transport planning and climate change.

LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - Transport & Connectivity	supports this approach and are of the view that sustainable transport measures are a key factor to be considered within future development proposals themselves and in the selection of sites for allocation. supports the Council's recognition that proposed transport and connectivity approach may not be possible everywhere and notes that in these areas there will be a focus on means of transport and location of development which cause the least impact on the transport network and minimise carbon emissions, which could be through 20minute neighbourhoods or other locational choices, as well as enhancing public and community transit options.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 16	The ambition of Option 16 is supported and aligns with Countryside's company strategy to ensure all properties within new residential developments of over 30 dwellings are connected to open reach fibre.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - Transport Policies	The initial list of topics covered under the heading of development control policies are consistent with the wider transport strategy that will underpin the Local Plan. To this end, Countryside supports the topics but will reserve comments until further details are worked up. Without prejudice to the preparation of specific policies and supporting SPDs, it will be key to ensure that the policies that are adopted do not undermine the integrity/commerciality of proposed developments. With specific reference to parking standards and any associated design guides, it will be important that any updated standards and/or guidance build in sufficient flexibility to meet current demands whilst allowing future adaptation as travel patterns change. considers that there would be real merit in the Local Plan including a policy that would support/encourage the use of car clubs across the district.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - Infrastructure Delivery	advocates the preparation of a new Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) on the basis that the infrastructure required to support new developments should take into account the expected changes to the way we travel, which have been accelerated by the COVID-19 Pandemic. Countryside believes that the IDP should be drafted in line with the Transport Hierarchy and should be developed having regard to the key destinations that will serve a development. This should consider linkages between areas that will be a focus of activity
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Banbury	Appendix 1 shows the locations of all the sites submitted for Banbury, however the map is based on parish boundaries and does not identify those sites submitted as potential urban extension opportunities for these settlements. In the interests of consistency and transparency, we suggest these maps are updated to be settlement maps, as opposed to Parish maps. LPR-A-208 is not shown on the map at Appendix 1. map in Appendix 1 should be updated to include the call for sites submissions which are at the edge of the settlements in question. As currently shown the map of sites is not fully representative of the land submitted as available at the town
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Bicester	Appendix 1 shows the locations of all the sites submitted for Bicester, however the map is based on parish boundaries and does not identify those sites submitted as potential urban extension opportunities for these settlements. In the interests of consistency and transparency, we suggest these maps are updated to be settlement maps, as opposed to Parish maps. LPR-A-208 is not shown on the map at Appendix 1. map in Appendix 1 should be updated to include the call for sites submissions which are at the edge of the settlements in question. As currently shown the map of sites is not fully representative of the land submitted as available at the town, which would support the expansion of Bicester, and could therefore prejudice the assessment and delivery of sustainable options.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 22	It is important that the emerging Cherwell District Local Plan provides clear commitments and ambitions which align with those emerging as part of the Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework and Oxfordshire Plan to 2050. It is important that the policies within the emerging Local Plan recognise and support this important function, one that provides a meaningful opportunity to balance jobs with homes and reduce the need to travel. The phased improvements and extensions to the rail line toward Oxford and Milton Keynes are a key component of this, and further supports the justification for additional growth around Bicester. support both the need for and benefits of modest integrated expansion(s) to Bicester. They contend this can be achieved in a manner that respects the identity of Bicester, and its surrounding settlements. Importantly Countryside consider such growth is capable of enhancing the sustainability of the town, along with its role and function in the wider region. These are important considerations in answering this question, as the town performs a strategic role and function that has much wider potential benefits to the district and region. Focusing strategic growth at Bicester has many sustainability advantages over a dispersed growth strategy that draws its employment base from Bicester. Reducing the need to travel being just one of them. Whilst we do not oppose growth to smaller towns and villages, this should be commensurate with the sustainability of the settlement and the objective of reducing the need to travel amongst many other factors.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Option 23	There are multiple advantages of directing development to lesser constrained options south east of Bicester, including the proximity of the site to Symmetry Park, Wretchwick Green, and central Bicester beyond, and the potential for enhanced pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the town and wider area.
LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Question - Reducing Car dependency in Bicester	response refers to the benefits of the LPR-A-208 site development.

LPR-B-494	Turley for Countryside Properties Ltd	Sustainability Appraisal	Option 2 (high growth) should be the preferred option given the findings of the SA for the following reasons: - The SA appears to reject Option 2 on the grounds of greater environmental impacts however a review of the SA scoring in Table 3.2 would indicate the following: Air and Environmental Quality: Both options score the same uncertain impact with respect to air quality with the SA acknowledging that higher growth could unlock highways infrastructure investment which could have a positive impact upon air quality. Biodiversity: The SA identifies that Option 1 (lower growth) is likely to result in a lower biodiversity impacts but equally acknowledges that higher growth and the development of strategic sites could result in the creation of high quality green infrastructure that improves biodiversity. Historic Environment: The SA identifies that Option 1 (lower growth) is likely to result in lower impacts upon the historic environment. Countryside believe however that this appraisal is an extremely high level conclusion to take without the use of site specific evidence for heritage impacts and firmly believe that any mitigation can be taken on a site by site basis to reduce or negate any heritage impact. In summary, Countryside believe that the SA has failed to conclusively demonstrate that the environmental benefits of Option1 (lower growth) are significantly better than the socioeconomic benefits of Option 2, particularly at this high level stage of assessment. Countryside believe that in order for this policy option to be determined and assessed correctly, this assessment should be repeated at Draft Plan stage but with reference to site specific data to determine the exact nature of any environmental impacts. This is particularly important to Bicester given that the SA recognises the potential benefit that higher growth could bring to the town through the provision of strategic highways mitigation and green infrastructure.
LPR-B-495	Caroline Firth	Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury	Object. The increase in housing on both the Adderbury and the Bloxham ends of "Milton Road" is vast. Increased traffic going at vast speeds along the Milton Road- with the 3 turnings into our village becoming more and more dangerous as cars come along over the speed limit. The roads into Banbury are congested, with traffic jams on numerous occasions- and vast numbers of houses south and west of the town in both directions. <u>There is no more capacity for more housing on the south of Banbury</u>
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	Milcombe	The level of development indicated would be totally out of proportion to the current size of Milcombe consisting of approximately 350 dwellings, this includes 92 that have either been built or are under construction in the last 20 years, if the level of development indicated above was to proceed Milcombe would cease to be an independent village and become merely a dormitory of Bloxham / Banbury. Small organic developments are to be welcomed with a mix of private and affordable properties that reflect the housing needs of local people who may want
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	Parish Profile - Milcombe	It would be helpful for all parish profiles to include on their map, areas of land which already have planning permission but have not yet been built and those included in the current Local Plan. This would then allow a more accurate analysis of developments in the village and also in surrounding parishes, especially highlighting coalescence. It would have been helpful for the demographic information to show the current number of households in Milcombe to compare to what is being proposed on these pieces of land. The housing completions and commitment figures does not include Oak Farm Phase 2. The census information is very out of date. Will the parish profile be updated accordingly with the recent census results? It would be useful to indicate on the map, where flood zones 2 & 3 are located as this would help inform whether the proposed sites are suitable for development. Pleasing that the ridge and furrow has been identified as an area which should be protected from development and the importance of the Dovecote and green open space around it. Employment sites are referenced, however, there are many small businesses operating in the village and this information has not been included. Any new large scale development should include provision for a primary school, secondary school, doctors surgery, dental surgery and other infrastructure especially roads. Protection of bats and swifts should be considered. Flood zones taken into account. Section 106 funds to mitigate the impact of developments in the village. Boost income for existing businesses eg. Horse and Groom Public House and village shop. Local authorities should adopt the roads, footpaths, street lighting and open spaces on new developments. Management companies are a good idea in theory, however in practice, it is a very complicated system for residents to negotiate and understand and therefore, they do not get the service that are paying for, via their annual management fees. Would any of these developments impact on the footpath network around the village? Would any of these developments impact on the views of the Church? New developments should have adequate green space. Electric charging points at all new properties. Energy efficient heating at all new properties, residential and business. Adequate off-road parking provided. Preserve the rural character of Milcombe.
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	Option 2	The document as a whole is vague and doesn't get down to specific aims and objectives.
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	Option 2	KO 1 - This should read: Allocate sufficient suitable land to meet etc. etc. KO 10 to 19 - Nothing about reviewing current planning applications to include such things as increased insulation standards, the provision of electric vehicle charge points, the use of heat pumps and the requirement to integrate solar panels into the design. KO 20 to 31 - Nothing about Waste Management, for example the separation of Surface Water and Sewerage to stop raw sewerage discharges in to rivers etc.
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	LPR-A-119	Object. Development is not suitable in this location. However, development would strengthen Milcombe as a viable community. Detrimental impact on infrastructure especially traffic. The site is not avoiding development in key green areas and not in proportion to other recent developments. The parcel <u>south Manor Farm is prone to flooding. The site is not development of brownfield land</u>
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	LPR-A-137	Object. Development is not suitable in this location. However, development would strengthen Milcombe as a viable community. Detrimental impact on infrastructure especially traffic. Development would narrow the gap between parishes. The site is not avoiding development in key green areas and not <u>in proportion to other recent developments. The site is not development of brownfield land</u>
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	LPR-A-158	Object. Development is not suitable in this location. However, development would strengthen Milcombe as a viable community. Detrimental impact on infrastructure especially traffic. Development would narrow the gap between parishes. The site is not avoiding development in key green areas and not <u>in proportion to other recent developments. The site is not development of brownfield land</u>



LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	LPR-A-206	Development is potentially suitable in this location. However, development would strengthen Milcombe as a viable community. Detrimental impact on infrastructure especially traffic. The site is not avoiding development in key green areas and not in proportion to other recent developments. The site is not development of brownfield land.
LPR-B-496	Milcombe Parish Council	LPR-A-231	Object. Development is not suitable in this location. However, development would strengthen Milcombe as a viable community. Detrimental impact on infrastructure especially traffic. Development would narrow the gap between parishes. The site is prone to flooding. The site is not avoiding development in key green areas and not in proportion to other recent developments. The site is not development of brownfield land.
LPR-B-497	M J & P A Warren	Sibford Gower	Object. The scale of such development is totally inappropriate in such a small community. We fully support the Sibford Gower Parish Council response.
LPR-B-498	Daniel Fortune	Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury	While living in Milton I have already seen additional housing being built locally which has meant increased traffic and noise pollution, not to mention a loss of green space. Their growth in the last 10 years looks set to turn them into small towns with few facilities. The local roads were not designed for the large amount of traffic now using them. Residents already complain of noise and light pollution growing in Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury, with consistent calls for reduced traffic and reduced speed. Development in the rural areas where roads already struggle with the amount of traffic should be restricted to local requirements only. Neighbourhood Plans should govern the growth of rural and village development and should not be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate. The sites do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor are they consistent with any of the previous consultation results. Any development permitted in Milton Parish should be very small-scale respecting the conservation village and its environs. The proposed development of the old caravan park and its adjoining field should be the subject of a separate consultation with Milton villagers as it falls within the parish boundary (though outside the village), in open countryside. Urban signage and lighting should not be sited in or around villages and the countryside but should be restricted to towns. Overall landscape and character of the area should be protected and certain special individual features in the landscapes given special protection in addition. Tranquillity and reduction of light pollution should be a factor in decision-making on development of any kind. Individual settlements should be prevented against coalescence and local design features should be more strongly enforced. Commercial and economic growth should be limited to specified urban areas. Improvement of the environment should be a major factor wherever previously developed land or greenfields are considered for development.
Page 1750	DR Graham & Mrs Jennifer Speake	Bloxham and Adderbury	Strongly object. Adderbury and Bloxham are rural communities. Their growth in the last 10 years looks set to turn them into small towns with few facilities. The local roads were not designed for the large amount of traffic now using them. Residents already complain of noise and light pollution growing in Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury, with consistent calls for reduced traffic and reduced speed. Development in the rural areas where roads already struggle with the amount of traffic should be restricted to local requirements only. Neighbourhood Plans should govern the growth of rural and village development and should not be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate. The sites do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor are they consistent with any of the previous consultation results. Any development permitted in Milton Parish should be very small-scale respecting the conservation village and its environs. The proposed development of the old caravan park and its adjoining field should be the subject of a separate consultation with Milton villagers as it falls within the parish boundary (though outside the village), in open countryside. Urban signage and lighting should not be sited in or around villages and the countryside but should be restricted to towns. Overall landscape and character of the area should be protected and certain special individual features in the landscapes given special protection in addition. Tranquillity and reduction of light pollution should be a factor in decisionmaking on development of any kind. Individual settlements should be prevented against coalescence and local design features should be more strongly enforced. Commercial and economic growth should be limited to specified urban areas. Improvement of the environment should be a major factor wherever previously developed land or greenfields are considered for development.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 1	The proposed development of Islip is grossly disproportionate & takes no account of the effect it will have on a historic settlement & its residents or the fact that it will destroy valuable agricultural land. The effect on the ecology of the village & its rural surroundings has been largely ignored. The facts that this small community is embedded in the Green Belt, surrounded by flood zones & has a large conservation area have been glossed over. In the light of COP26 & current thinking on environmental matters, the plan to devastate a rural area is devastating.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 2	KO1: housing & employment needs should not trump environmental & agricultural imperatives. KO4: irrelevant in this case. KO5: important but not upheld by your plan. KO6: important but destroyed by your plan. KO9: important but ignored by your plan. KO25: very ignored but will be devastated by plan. Is the most important objective but appears incompatible with your plans.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 3	Option 1 and 2.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 4	Option 3 - not on agricultural land, which is essential for the future.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 5	Option 2. Provide for sufficient parking to allow people to use town centres for their needs, rather than pushing them away. Hostility to cars has led to significant destruction of town centres. Better parking and encouragement of independent retailers would help retail
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 6	Option 1.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 7	Option 2.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 9	Housing policies: Environmental building, heating, etc. and discouraging speculators, buy-to-lets & 2nd home owners – perhaps by increased levies/taxes, etc.

LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 10	Retrofitting existing stock should always take precedence over building new houses.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 11	Option 2. Follow recommendations arising from COP26 & subsequent debates in relation to climate change policies. Protect the green belt.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 12	Option 1. Our experience with destructive force of the development of the railway here, with hundreds of trees & shrubs removed throughout our village & surrounding fields – & never replaced – we have no faith in the willingness or ability of CDC & developers to protect biodiversity
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 13	Option 2.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 15	Protect the historic environment. 20-minute neighbourhood already exists in Islip – would be partially destroyed by extensive development
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 16	Option 1 and 2.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 17	Current methodology doesn't take into account the importance of agriculture – an essential part of our infrastructure. Include a policy on agriculture.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 25	Closure of useful shops – no reason to visit the town if all businesses become defunct. No policy to control redevelopment of larger dwellings.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 26	Option 1.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 27	Option 1. Killing off the centre of Kidlington by making it difficult for visitors from surrounding villages would reduce traffic- & encourage online shoppers & growth of supermarkets outside.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 28	No need for either option if the green belt is protected.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 30	Rural areas are part of the heritage of our country, & that they have a part to play in the future of the country. Agricultural land isn't just for looking at – it needs protecting.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 31	Option 1.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 32	No to both options.
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 33	Talk to rural communities & the people who work the land to find out what they need, rather than imposing 'criteria-based policies'?
LPR-B-500	Johanna Stephenson	Option 34	Option 1. More support required for neighbourhood planning.
LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	Option 20	support the proposed focus on 20 minute neighbourhoods, where people's daily needs are within a 20 minute walk or cycle ride.
LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Section 5.12 (Connectivity and Transport) focuses on connectivity between Oxfordshire and other locations, and between the major towns within Oxfordshire. More emphasis should be placed in this section of the plan on connectivity between smaller settlements within the County and the District. If development and infrastructure continues to be focused on urban areas, the gap between sustainable travel options in urban areas and in rural areas will continue to widen, and residents of rural areas will be ever more isolated. This Plan should embrace the opportunity to create a step change by improving connectivity in rural areas, which will benefit existing residents, and enable new developments to be delivered more sustainably in rural areas.
LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	Option 17	consider that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be updated by catchment and how accessible places are, to maximise the opportunities for connections to be made between places, to recognise existing patterns of infrastructure use and to influence future patterns of use.

LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	Option 30	<p>recognise that there has been development of housing in rural areas since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2015, and that much of that has been speculative development, which has not always been supported by the delivery of infrastructure and services to support those developments.</p> <p>However, this is not a reason to limit further development in rural areas to only meeting local needs. Indeed, it is a good reason to plan proactively for development in rural areas, to ensure that further development is properly supported by the infrastructure required and to stimulate and enhance the local economy. This is particularly the case in well serviced villages such as Bloxham, which offer a wide range of shops, services, and community facilities as well as good accessibility to Banbury, where there are opportunities to further improve the infrastructure and services. Rural housing should not just be limited to meeting local housing need. It should be recognised that properly planned rural housing, with the infrastructure to support it, provides homes in places where people want to live, where they can have a high quality of life and access to local services and facilities, and contributes to the continued vitality and viability of rural areas by introducing new residents who support the local schools, shops, community facilities, and public transport provision. As such, rural housing should be used to meet District wide housing need. Limiting new development to meeting local housing needs exacerbates the gap between urban and rural areas and the sustainable transport and facilities to which they have access.</p>
LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	Option 31	<p>strongly recommend that the Council works with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified, district wide, housing needs. Recent years have shown that in the absence of a strong, planned approach in rural areas, Neighbourhood Plans allocate little if any land for housing, and speculative applications can be made. If CDC works with communities to identify and allocate specific sites, these can be properly planned for, with associated infrastructure, and the process gives local communities some ownership of the process.</p>
LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	Option 32	<p>consider that appropriate weight should be given to each of a whole range of services, and that the weighting used in the assessment should be agreed and set out in a transparent process, and then all rural settlements should be assessed consistently against these criteria. Note that Bloxham has an extensive range of shops and services including three village stores, a post office, a petrol station, a GP surgery, a dentist, a pharmacy, a primary school, a secondary school and a private school, churches, public houses, a fish and chips shop, a nursery, a care home, a village hall, play areas, a barber shop a beauty salon and a physiotherapist. The village is served by an hourly bus service to Banbury and Chipping Norton. Such an extensive range of facilities provides a highly sustainable location for development and should be recognised as such in a rural settlement hierarchy. Re the definition settlement boundaries; settlement boundaries should only be defined once any draft allocations for this Plan have been proposed. They should not be used to limit development now, at a time when high housing numbers are being planned for, but should be incorporated into the discussion around the allocation of sites. Settlement boundaries are not necessarily in place simply to prevent further development. A criteria based policy would enable appropriate development to take place adjacent to settlement boundaries if this results in sustainable development in appropriate locations.</p>
LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	LPR-A-052	<p>promotes the development of the site for residential development of approx.100 homes suitable for a mix of homes with generous gardens and areas of open space. The site lies within a 5 minute cycle ride of these facilities in Bloxham. The 20 minute neighbourhood concept also lies to Land at Tadmarton Road and its proximity to Banbury, now that the shared use path connecting Bloxham and Banbury has been completed, which provides a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists to travel between the two settlements. The site covers an area of 8.5ha, but of this, only 6.4 ha is considered to be developable, as this is the area which lies adjacent to the village, on the relatively flat land at the foot of Hobb Hill, but not extending up the hill. It is proposed that there is extensive landscaping and green space within the site, as well as the provision of a car park to serve Bloxham Primary School. Landowners are currently in discussions with a neighbouring landowner to potentially include a strip of land to the west of the site, which would enable the scheme to deliver both a safe, vehicular access to the site from Tadmarton Lane, and to provide a car park within the site, for use by the village primary school, so that parents can safely pick up and drop off their children. This would help to relieve the congestion experienced in the mornings and afternoons associated with school drop offs and pick ups. Based on an assumed 1,350 households in Bloxham, the proposed development would represent a 7.4 % increase in the housing stock of Bloxham, so would provide a modest addition to the housing stock in the village. site lies close to the village and would not encroach beyond this boundary. Existing development extends further north and eastwards from our site along Banbury Road, so development of this site would not close the gap between Bloxham and Banbury. There are no formal landscape designations on the land, and any informal designation such as a valued landscape would be taken account of through the extensive landscaping of the site and the improved access to Hobb Hill offered by the landowners. Bloxham is a highly sustainable location for new development because it offers a wide range of facilities to cater for daily needs, for all ages and types of households. Further, it is served by a regular bus service which runs seven days per week, and a cycle/footpath which links the village with Banbury. One mile to the north of Bloxham lies Vantage Business Park, which offers a range of employment opportunities, including a printing company, building supplies and a publishing company. In Banbury there are employment opportunities a hospital, a wide range of shops, banks, a library, indoor sports facilities, opticians, and the full range of retail opportunities if required. support the provision of footpaths and retention and enhancement of hedgerows. Proposals for development include enhancement and widening of the existing public footpath up Hobb Hill to provide designated local green space up and at the top of the hill, adjacent to the reservoir at the top of Hobb Hill, for the enjoyment of the views for the public. The proposals also include the potential delivery of a new pedestrian and cycle way between Courtington Lane and the site. support the Neighbourhood Plan proposal not to exceed a housing density of 30 dph. However, applying Huff House standards to all developments would be very expensive to deliver, would increase house prices accordingly, and would therefore exclude some people from the housing market. However, electric vehicle charging points could be provided, and residents would be able to safely walk or cycle to the village.</p>

LPR-B-501	Sworders for Mr Bertrand Facon	Sustainability Appraisal	strongly encourage the LPA to adopt Option 2, the higher growth option. Additional development in Bloxham would not necessarily result in a proportionally greater increase in traffic than additional development in urban areas through the urban Air Quality Management Areas identified. The provision of an hourly bus service to Banbury and the recent delivery of the cycle and footway connecting Bloxham and Banbury, as well as the extensive provision of local shops and services in Bloxham, would all help to minimise additional traffic. Residents in the proposed development site will have no need to use motor vehicles to go anywhere in Bloxham. The SA notes that dispersed, smaller scale housing scheme could be delivered at the expense of a focus on strategic growth locations, and would provide a missed opportunity to support strategic biodiversity enhancements. This does not have to be the case. The biodiversity enhancements which could be provided at land at Tadmarton Road would be extensive, would benefit existing and new residents, and would connect into an existing green infrastructure network surrounding the site. support the assertion in the Sustainability Appraisal that well targeted growth within the rural area can assist with maintaining local services and facilities such as a primary school, thereby minimising the need to travel to nearby villages. This is particularly the case for our clients' site, which lies within walking distance of both primary and secondary schools, as well as shops, services and employment opportunities. The SA notes in relation to Communities that 'assuming well located growth, there is support for exploring options that would see increased growth in the rural area relative to the existing strategy however, there are uncertainties.' This approach is supported – the IDP needs to identify where infrastructure is required to support appropriate growth in rural areas. This may include improving bus services or providing better footways linking new developments to existing villages. The SA notes that it will be important that the district wide portfolio of housing sites identified by the Local Plan Review includes a good proportion of smaller sites. Smaller sites can be delivered quickly and will contribute to a five year housing land supply. It is too simplistic to dismiss a rural housing strategy on the basis of likely highway impacts. The strategy should recognise that some rural areas, such as Bloxham, are well served by public transport, and are likely to generate far fewer highways trips than other settlements with fewer facilities.
LPR-B-502	Sworders for Mr J Dent	Option 20	support the proposed focus on 20 minute neighbourhoods, where people's daily needs are within a 20 minute walk or cycle ride.
LPR-B-502	Sworders for Mr J Dent	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Section 5.12 (Connectivity and Transport) focuses on connectivity between Oxfordshire and other locations, and between the major towns within Oxfordshire. More emphasis should be placed in this section of the plan on connectivity between smaller settlements within the County and the District. If development and infrastructure continues to be focused on urban areas, the gap between sustainable travel options in urban areas and in rural areas will continue to widen, and residents of rural areas will be ever more isolated. This Plan should embrace the opportunity to create a step change by improving connectivity in rural areas, which will benefit existing residents, and enable new developments to be delivered more sustainably in rural areas. Deddington already benefits from a good bus service (S4 service) between the village and Banbury and Oxford, but the frequency of the service could be increased, to improve the public transport link.
LPR-B-502	Sworders for Mr J Dent	Option 17	consider that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be updated by catchment and how accessible places are, to maximise the opportunities for connections to be made between places, to recognise existing patterns of infrastructure use and to influence future patterns of use.
LPR-B-502	Sworders for Mr J Dent	Option 30	recognise that there has been development of housing in rural areas since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2015, and that much of that has been speculative development, which has not always been supported by the delivery of infrastructure and services to support those developments. However, this is not a reason to limit further development in rural areas to only meeting local needs. Indeed, it is a good reason to plan proactively for development in rural areas, to ensure that further development is properly supported by the infrastructure required and to stimulate and enhance the local economy. This is particularly the case in well serviced villages such as Bloxham, which offer a wide range of shops, services, and community facilities as well as good accessibility to Banbury, where there are opportunities to further improve the infrastructure and services. Rural housing should not just be limited to meeting local housing need. It should be recognised that properly planned rural housing, with the infrastructure to support it, provides homes in places where people want to live, where they can have a high quality of life and access to local services and facilities, and contributes to the continued vitality and viability of rural areas by introducing new residents who support the local schools, shops, community facilities, and public transport provision. As such, rural housing should be used to meet District wide housing need. Limiting new development to meeting local housing needs exacerbates the gap between urban and rural areas and the sustainable transport and facilities to which they have access.
LPR-B-502	Sworders for Mr J Dent	Option 31	strongly recommend that the Council works with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified, district wide, housing needs. Recent years have shown that in the absence of a strong, plan led approach in rural areas, Neighbourhood Plans allocate little if any land for housing, and villages are then vulnerable to speculative applications. If CDC works with communities to identify and allocate specific sites, these can be properly planned for, with associated infrastructure, and the process gives local communities some ownership of the process. The Deddington Neighbourhood Plan was withdrawn in November 2019 following the publication of the Examiners' report into the Plan, but there is an opportunity for the District Council to work with the Parish as they prepare a new version of the Plan.

LPR-B-502	Sworders for Mr J Dent	Option 32	consider that appropriate weight should be given to each of a whole range of services, and that the weighting used in the assessment should be agreed and set out in a transparent process, and then all rural settlements should be assessed consistently against these criteria. Note that Deddington has a range of shops and services including a village store, a post office, a GP surgery, a dentist, a pharmacy, a primary school, churches, public houses, and a number of restaurants. It also has a nursery, a care home, a community centre, play areas, and recreational facilities. The village is served by an hourly bus service to Banbury and Oxford. Such an extensive range of facilities provides a highly sustainable location for development and should be recognised as such in a rural settlement hierarchy. Option 32 also asks whether the Council should define settlement boundaries, beyond which development would not normally be permitted. Firstly, settlement boundaries should only be defined once any draft allocations for this Plan have been proposed. They should not be used to limit development now, at a time when high housing numbers are being planned for, but should be incorporated into the discussion around the allocation of sites. Secondly, settlement boundaries are not necessarily in place simply to prevent further development. A criteria based policy would enable appropriate development to take place adjacent to settlement boundaries if this results in sustainable development in appropriate locations.
LPR-B-502	Sworders for Mr J Dent	LPR-A-074	Villages such as Deddington offer a wide range of shops, services, and education, all within a 20 minute walk or cycle ride of residential development sites such as Land East of the A4260. The site lies within a 5 minute cycle ride of these facilities in Deddington
LPR-B-503	Jackie Hawtin and Bernard Harris	Adderbury	Recent development has increased housing in the village by circa 20% in a short amount of time. The village has already had to deal with the pressures of the extra houses without any increase in amenities or infrastructure so to consider any further development on any large scale would be seriously detrimental to village life. The rural feel of the village has already been compromised with recent development and the expansion on the scales proposed will significantly impact the village. The character and community of the village will be lost and is not something that can ever be recovered once gone. The size of the proposed development is not in keeping with a village environment. Indeed much of the proposed development contravenes the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village. This will result in Adderbury becoming morphed into the village of Bodicote and/or Bloxham. The size of the proposed developments is not proportionate to the existing size of the village. Developments of such size should be restricted to towns not small villages. The village would be more than doubled by some of the proposed developments. The proposed developments would no longer allow views of the village church. The infrastructure in the village is not sufficient at present let alone if further development took place. Congestion on the main road running through Adderbury (A4260) is already severe. Further increase in traffic would result in gridlock at certain times of the day. The amount of traffic is already dangerous, with the proximity of the school. The pollution of traffic from this stretch of road is worrying with many children using the roads to walk to school. The road is also the main route for ambulances travelling into the JR hospital from Banbury, it would be chaos with further traffic and emergency services trying to access the hospital in Oxford. The village has a network of fields, footpaths and ecological and wildlife habitats which have already been disturbed by recent developments and will be further impacted by the proposed developments. There will be a detrimental increase in pollution from traffic, noise and light.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Local Green Spaces	Land to the north of Cropredy and south of Cropredy Marina, Cropredy is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied. As a resident of Kyettes Corner, Cropredy, I overlook site LPR-A-155. 6 of my 11 windows have views of this site. I am opposed to this site being considered for development because development here would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a negative impact on the natural environment.</li> <li>• Destroy the biodiversity of the area.</li> <li>• Negatively effect the ecological resilience of this rural area.</li> <li>• Negatively effect the rural economy by destroying farmland.</li> <li>• Provide a flood risk, as development on this site would mean the area would no longer be able to act as a sponge.</li> <li>• Destroy a natural winter spring.</li> <li>• Delay this areas ability to recover after the impact of the marina build which saw the spoil of the basins spread across the entire field, causing damage to the soil structure.</li> <li>• Permanently effect the views and therefore mental wellbeing of 34 households which overlook this site.</li> <li>• Permanently effect the tranquillity of the area.</li> <li>• Expanding the village in this direction goes beyond our settlement boundaries. In order to make a development in this area carbon neutral we would need to off balance the destruction of this piece of land with creation of a green space elsewhere. This field should be seen as part of our natural capital and supplying an ecosystem service and therefore protected. Instead I would suggest this land is put forward to be a green space. Perhaps a community forest.</li> </ul>
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. I believe unused buildings in town centres should be compulsorily purchased and turned into residential apartments, sympathetically renovated to protect heritage but also to create housing for young people, with excellent transport links. Not only would this support the town centre economy but also invigorate the town centres as communities.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 8	Other - I don't know the answer to this question
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Separation Distances	Yes.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility

LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Housing Policies	<p>Yes - In order to fulfil the goals outlined in the policy, all new housing will have to be sustainable. I believe self build projects would give residents of Cherwell the opportunity to learn new skills in sustainable house building and be able to use these skills elsewhere. This would create innovation, knowledge based employment and support the needs of local business and communities. Housing styles should be modern and fully support modern living styles, with access to good transport links to both places of work and between rural and urban areas. When deciding what 'good' design is, Cherwell should seriously consider what modern families, especially young families, need and want. To date, modern housing developers use mock Victorian styles to create versions of the very houses, young people throughout the country are paying to convert and renovate. We should not keep building in these faux traditional styles, but embrace sustainable building techniques, but also reflect the lifestyle choices people are making. The term "in keeping" has been used, to allow mediocre design, unsustainable building practices, and uninnovative architecture across Oxfordshire in the past.</p> <p>This plan should seek to be innovative and allow design to reflect that. Implementing really good and innovative modern design could create knowledge based employment and enrich the environment, culture and heritage. Looking at how communities work, and focusing on selfbuild initiatives would not only create employment opportunities for the future but also enhance peoples <u>mental wellbeing</u></p>
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Before building new developments, we should be looking at the circular economy and look at revitalising existing buildings or grey areas. Developers should be encouraged to sympathetically restore and enhance and restore old buildings in the centre of town. Successful developments like the sympathetic restoration of 16 Market Place Banbury should be promoted as a fantastic opportunity for the economy as well as a way of preserving our heritage. The plan should be looking at upcycling existing buildings and creating more domestic residences in our town centres, through compulsory purchasing of large empty units that are being used as land banks – e.g. 1 Malthouse Walk Banbury, and other buildings along Bridge Street Banbury. Residential apartments in town centres have <u>advantages of excellent public transport links, but also a way of injecting the local towns economies</u>
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation and Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for <u>renewable energy generation</u>
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	<p>Rural Planning I believe we do need to limit development in rural areas to meet local needs and protect the environment. While Villages need to grow, and builders need jobs, housing developments shouldn't just benefit huge companies. Current huge developments take advantage of building on mass, but Cherwell should consider local builders being able to make a difference in their communities on a small scale. Instead of giving permission for huge developments by large companies, why not provide opportunity for self build initiatives, with innovative and sustainable solutions. This would enrich the local community, teach people new skills and put money back into the rural economy. In order to fulfil the goals outlined in the policy, all new housing will have to be sustainable. I believe self build projects would give residents of Cherwell the opportunity to learn new skills in sustainable house building and be able to use these skills elsewhere. This would create innovation, knowledge based employment and support the needs of local business and communities. Housing styles should be modern and fully support modern living styles, with access to good transport links to both places of work and between rural and urban areas. Good Design When deciding what 'good' design is, Cherwell should seriously consider what modern families, especially young families, need and want. Light and space, and outside areas are important to young families. To date, modern housing developers use mock Victorian styles to create versions of the very houses, young people throughout the country are paying to convert and renovate. We should not keep building in these faux traditional styles, but embrace sustainable building techniques, but also reflect the lifestyle choices people are making. The term "in keeping" has been used, to allow mediocre design, unsustainable building practices, and uninnovative architecture across Oxfordshire in the past. This plan should seek to be innovative and allow design to reflect that. Implementing really good and innovative modern design could create knowledge based employment and enrich the environment, culture and heritage. Looking at how communities work, and focusing on selfbuild initiatives would not only create employment opportunities for the future but also enhance peoples mental wellbeing. Planning in Banbury Before building new developments, we should be looking at the circular economy and look at revitalising existing buildings or grey areas.</p> <p>Developers should be encouraged to sympathetically restore and enhance and restore old buildings in the centre of town. Successful developments like the sympathetic restoration of 16 Market Place Banbury should be promoted as a fantastic opportunity for the economy as well as a way of preserving our heritage. The plan should be looking at upcycling existing buildings and creating more domestic residences in our town centres, through compulsory purchasing of large empty units that are being used as land banks – e.g. 1 Malthouse Walk Banbury, and other buildings along Bridge Stree Banbury. Residential apartments in town centres have advantages of excellent public transport links, but also a way of injecting the local towns economies.</p>
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 12	Other - Don't build on areas of biodiverse, or agricultural land, and then try and offset the damage by creating green spaces elsewhere - it's just <u>counter productive.</u>
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of <u>the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain</u>
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	The land at LPR-A-155 should be seen as part of our natural capital and supplying an ecosystem service and therefore protected. Instead I would suggest this land is put forward to be a green space. Perhaps a community forest.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 14	Other - I'm not sure how to respond to this question

LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	When deciding what 'good' design is, Cherwell should seriously consider what modern families, especially young families, need and want. Popular TV shows document the conversion of Victorian style town houses, with huge modern glass structures. Light and space, and outside areas are important to young families. To date, modern housing developers use mock Victorian styles to create versions of the very houses, young people throughout the country are paying to convert and renovate. We should not keep building in these faux traditional styles, but embrace sustainable building techniques, but also reflect the lifestyle choices people are making. The term "in keeping" has been used, to allow mediocre design, unsustainable building practices, and uninnovative architecture across Oxfordshire in the past. This plan should seek to be innovative and allow design to reflect that. Implementing really good and innovative modern design could create knowledge based employment and enrich the environment, culture and heritage. Looking at how communities work, and focusing on selfbuild initiatives would not only create employment opportunities for the future but also enhance people's mental wellbeing.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Transport & Connectivity	yes agree with the approach. I am encouraged by the plans desire to reduce private car ownership and improve transport links. I am worried that smaller villages may suffer. Yes approach should be different for rural areas.i agree with 71. measures to drive less- Cheaper, greener public transport.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Adoption services are Oxford Centric. Physiotherapy services are Oxford Centric. As a resident of Cropredy, needing access to both of the above, I need to take time off work, and pay to travel to use the above services. A trip to an appointment in Oxford requires half a day off work
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 19	other - inside the town - there is a lot of unused building in the town itself currently being land banked by people outside of the county. Look at the buildings in Bridge Street. New site suggestion - Unused buildings in Banbury Town Centre like 1 Malthouse Walk Banbury
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Important Views of Banbury	yes. St Mary's is a beautiful historic and a tourist attraction
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	would love to see a wild swimming area created in Spiceball Park. This would be a wonderful tourist attraction, excellent for wellbeing and create a real buzz in Banbury.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	A bus service from my village which allowed me to get to work for 9am and home again at the end of a working day. A bus service that allowed me to go into town for a meal in the evening. A bus service that allowed my daughter to get to her school
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. believe we do need to limit development in rural areas to meet local needs and protect the environment. While Villages need to grow, and builders need jobs, housing developments shouldn't just benefit huge companies. Current huge developments take advantage of building on mass, but Cherwell should consider local builders being able to make a difference in their communities on a small scale. Instead of giving permission for huge developments by large companies, why not provide opportunity for self build initiatives, with innovative and sustainable solutions. This would enrich the local community, teach people new skills and put money back into the rural economy. In order to fulfil the goals outlined in the policy, all new housing will have to be sustainable. I believe self build projects would give residents of Cherwell the opportunity to learn new skills in sustainable house building and be able to use these skills elsewhere. This would create innovation, knowledge based employment and support the needs of local business and communities. Housing styles should be modern and fully support modern living styles, with access to good transport links to both places of work and between rural and urban areas.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 31	use a combination of the above
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 32	No- no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres. By adding weight to places that already have the infrastructure you just reduce the ability of the really small places to grow and turn medium sized villages into small towns..
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Question - Settlement	I'm not sure. In some cases yes.
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 33	use a combination of the above
LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district

LPR-B-504	Jo Samways	LPR-A-155	As a resident of Kyetts corner, I overlook this site. 6 of my 11 windows have views of this site. I am opposed to this site being considered for development because development here would: • Have a negative impact on the natural environment. • Destroy the biodiversity of the area. • Negatively effect the ecological resilience of this rural area. • Negatively effect the rural economy by destroying farmland. • Provide a flood risk, as development on this site would mean the area would no longer be able to act as a sponge. • Destroy a natural winter spring. • Delay this areas ability to recover after the impact of the marina build which saw the spoil of the basins spread across the entire field, causing damage to the soil structure. • Permanently effect the views and therefore mental wellbeing of 34 households which overlook this site. • Permanently effect the tranquillity of the area. • Expanding the village in this direction goes beyond our settlement boundaries. In order to make a development in this area carbon neutral we would need to off balance the destruction of this piece of land with creation of a green space elsewhere. This field should be seen as part of our natural capital and supplying an ecosystem service and therefore protected. Instead I would suggest this land is put forward to be a green space. Perhaps a community forest.
LPR-B-505	Julie Gray	LPR-A-091	object to this land being included in the Local plan , it will have an adverse affect on The Red House (The late Captain Molyneux House) as well as residents backing onto this land, The Trees obviously planted for this purpose and to Block view of village for Landowners new dwelling
LPR-B-506	Clifford Osenton	LPR-A-091	Objects. lack of access on Austin road & Church street for extra development. The present building line on the approach to Bodicote Brook is acceptable, but any more building will degrade the enjoyment of this area of the countryside. Increase in traffic will have a negative impact on the area
LPR-B-507	Dennis Price	Sustainability Appraisal	I find that as climate change will become so over bearing that the consultation does not adequately address this. There is far too much proposed development and the reduction of much needed Greenfield sites for nature and ourselves to enjoy. Any housing should be to passive house standards and built of sustainable and low carbon materials basically wood.
LPR-B-507	Dennis Price	Sustainability Appraisal	Too much development for any chance of being sustainable. Greefield will be vital in a fight to cope with climate change the must not be built on. any new houses to be bilt of non carbon materials ie not concrete ot steel, Wood is the material of choice and building to passive house standards
LPR-B-510	Bloombridge LLP	Sustainability Appraisal	principal interest concerns Kidlington. In light of our representations on the options (and in particular paragraphs 6.4.1 to 6.4.10 of the consultation paper), we find the terms of reference and findings of Cherwell’s Sustainability Appraisal (“SA”) to be surprising. We would go as far as saying, with respect, that the terms of reference are wrong – generally, and in relation to Kidlington. The findings have not considered a Green Belt review or housing needs in Kidlington as ‘reasonable alternative’ policy options because, according to the AECOM SA, the consultation on the Local Plan defers these considerations to the Oxfordshire Plan – this means that the whole SA (and next steps) is skewed. Put another way, the SA has applied “no decision” (yet) on a Green Belt review and housing growth in Kidlington as a negative when defining and choosing between options. This is plainly a false assumption – ie it is without foundation or evidence, and it lacks pragmatism. This must be addressed. the SA needs to consider (as an input/option) the potential for development in the Green Belt, and long term defendable Green Belt boundaries, not least because this is one of the functions of a local plan review (NPPF21, paragraphs 140 - 142). we note that Section 2.11 of the SA refers to difficult choices around employment allocations but does not mention a Green Belt review, which is already part of the consultation paper and surely inevitable given Oxford Technology Park is under construction (but still waiting for the Green Belt designation to be lifted). We also find the evidence in support of more social housing at paragraph 2.15.2 over simplified and unconvincing. This is best dealt with at the application level, depending on local circumstances – for example, there is no point providing social housing in a rural area or Kidlington if the resident being accommodated works in Banbury. it is not the function of the SA to propose policy solutions at this stage in the planmaking process. Specifically on Kidlington, it is difficult to see what authority the authors of the SA have in choosing alternative options for assessment, notably options which exclude a reconsideration of the Green Belt, which was reviewed, partially, as recently as last year; including a set of ‘exceptional circumstances’ listed at paragraph 5.17 of the Cherwell Partial Review, adopted in 2020. These ‘exceptional circumstances’ are still highly relevant. In short, a Green Belt review ought to be a fundamental term of reference for the plan and SA. . It is an opportunity for positive planning where ‘reasonable alternatives’ such as our site at The Moors have already been assessed and considered favourably by Cherwell alongside a substantial evidence base. To disregard this opportunity and evidence in the AECOM SA, at such an early stage in the process, is not reasonable – for example because it makes the findings and next steps of the SA partial and somewhat meaningless. Either a Green Belt review should have been SA’ d, or the findings heavily limited in their scope to ensure all reasonable options remain open for consideration.it seems truly remarkable that an SA by LUC could support the release of Green Belt land in Begbroke and Yarnton to accommodate more than 4,000 houses in 2020, yet the potential of this area, notably Kidlington itself (ie Cherwell’s ‘third settlement’), could then just be set aside by AECOM’s SA less than a year later – ie with no growth plan. It is hard to see how this assumption in the SA is fair, reasonable or proportionate, and we feel it must be addressed to avoid skewing the consideration of the whole local plan. the SA shows strong support for employment and economic growth in Kidlington, yet appears to have no regard to the planning, sustainability and accessibility advantages of locating houses next to the resultant jobs. To conclude on the SA, we strongly recommend that it is reviewed and re-issued, specifically in relation to the approach to growth around Kidlington.



LPR-B-511	The Green Party	Sustainability Appraisal	As seems to be the usual case with these documents the SA starts with the premise that growth is a given and we need to plans for more of it. Whilst 'organic' growth is certainly something we should be accommodating, we should not be deliberately encouraging growth in an area like Cherwell which has low unemployment and has already seen its fair share of growth. If the government's proposals on 'levelling up' mean anything it should be that areas in other parts of the country to should be given the investment and opportunities that have already been afforded to Cherwell and Oxfordshire as a whole. In terms of my specific area - Kidlington and the surrounding villages - I'm pleased to see that issues such as flood risk have been identified and acknowledged. However it's likely that by the time the local plan is adopted these problems will have been massively exacerbated by the new proposed developments on and in areas that already regularly flood. That would seem to signpost a real problems with the assessment in that these areas are due to be changed out of all recognition compared to when these appraisals have been carried out. This is likely to have a major impact on all the key areas in the document, not least air quality, flooding, landscape and soils, biodiversity, and the quality of life of local communities living in what are currently small rural villages. In this context it would seem foolish to base the 2040 local plan on any of this current data as the area is going to be so heavily transformed over the next 20 years. I really don't know how this can be addressed. Perhaps a revised SA should be compiled closer to the time of the full plan being proposed/adopted. I would also suggest that a greater level of local consultation be included. It seems clear to me that the current report is largely speculative and rooted in data that is going to be out of date very soon.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 1	The vision is broadly supported. However, the Vision fails to address or include any reference to any spatial aspect of how the growth of the District will be delivered; ie, is it the part of the Vision for the future of Cherwell that growth will be focussed upon the existing Urban Areas, or be subject to a rural dispersion? Will the Vision look to distribute housing along sustainable transport corridors, or maybe focus on existing centres of employment etc. The Vision needs to include an aspect of spatial outcome, if it is to be successful in delivering the growth which Cherwell is required to meet.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 2	KO 23 makes reference to focusing development in Cherwell's sustainable locations, but does not seek to define, or explain, how that 'sustainability' is being assessed or determined. The KO should include some clearer direction against which compliance with this objective could be assessed. More generally, the objectives make no reference to the need to secure and make provision for sufficient housing for sustainable growth or seek to ensure any link between the location of employment provision and ensuring a sufficient quantity of new residential development to support that growth. KO10 deals with the move to net zero carbon development. The reference to decentralised energy is considered unhelpful. The energy market is responding to the challenges established in achieving net zero, and whilst decentralised energy may be a part of that solution, that may be no more so than more traditional centralised sources of low carbon power delivery. The Objective should remain non-specific as to the mechanism by which low carbon energy should be supplied, rather just securing that it is low carbon
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 6	The percentage of affordable housing required on major development sites should be based upon evidence collected by the Council in respect of affordability across the District. It would not be appropriate to arbitrarily define percentages, nor would it be appropriate to simply carry forward the percentages contained within the adopted Local Plan without having first tested to see whether they are still appropriate, and/or viable.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 7	any policy requirements for the tenure mix of affordable housing should be based upon the latest available evidence in respect of housing need.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 8	Whilst Barwood do not necessarily object to the utilisation of the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS), footnote 49 to paragraph 130 f) of the NPPF confirms that: "Policies may also make use of the nationally described space standard, <b>where the need for an internal space standard can be justified.</b> " [emphasis added]. The utilisation of the NDSS within Cherwell District should accordingly be based upon demonstrable evidence of need, which should form part of the Local Plan Review evidence base. Moreover, even if NDSS are to be applied, any policy should allow for flexibility within individual sites, for exceptions to be made where specific and sound design justification, dictates
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 9	The imposition of accessibility standards through planning policy is unnecessary as they are already considered within Building Regulations.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 10	Given the Government's pending introduction of the Future Homes standard, the need for any Local Plan review to set standards of sustainable construction is questioned. If there is an intent to set standards above those required by Government then this should not occur without a fully evidence viability assessment to confirm that the additional costs of so doing, would not render development unsustainable.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 12	How the provision of BNG should be delivered should not be dictated as a 'one size fits all' solution but should recognise that meeting BNG will be bespoke to each individual site, and the ecology of that site. Solutions to the provision of BNG may require a combination of the types of measures set out above to ensure that adequate compensatory provision is made.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 14	The supporting text appears unclear. At 5.8.6 reference is made to recent developments having a 'large number of small areas for play' and this creating a 'maintenance burden'. However, at 5.8.7 the text goes on to state that the approach being advocated is one that seeks 'play friendly environments incorporating opportunities throughout developments...'. That seems to be a strategy which would exacerbate the alleged concern regarding 'maintenance burden'. Provision of children's play through new development has been successfully integrated in many developments, through traditional use of LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs, maintenance contributions being secured where they are transferred to LPA control or being secured by on site Management Companies. If there is considered to be a requirement to move away from traditional methods of securing adequate play provision, then this needs to be supported by a suitably evidenced justification

LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 18	Rep supported by a site plan and context plan for proposed development off Bloxham Road. Barwood have previously proposed the development of land at Bloxham Road, Banbury through their response to the Stage 1 Consultation and the call for sites. Those submissions remain valid and are not repeated here. What is significant about the site being promoted, which lies to the South of Banbury and hence is the direction of growth supported, is that it forms an extension to the recently constructed Redrow Development, from which Access can be gained and infra-structure shared. This provides a sustainable form of development, in maximising new robust infra-structure with surplus capacity as opposed to wholly new provision.
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Option 19	With regard to the options proposed for growth at Banbury, then if Banbury is identified as a location for growth, then Banbury is where the growth should occur. Decanting that growth to an alternative existing settlement or a new settlement which does not support Banbury, would be inappropriate. It would not be meeting the need, where the need was identified, and would likely therefore lead to unsustainable patterns of growth. Barwood support use of peripheral green field sites at Banbury, where such sites are well related to the existing urban area, have good access to public transport, can utilise existing infra-structure which has spare capacity, and which do not cause landscape or coalescence issues. To this end, Barwood promote their land interest at Bloxham Road, Banbury, as a site capable of meeting the sustainable growth aspirations of the emerging plan, in an appropriate location well served and well connected to existing employment, services and <u>social infrastructure</u> .
LPR-B-512	Pegasus Group for Barwood	Banbury	Barwood, note and support the recognition at para 6.2.6 of the Consultation document that Banbury has shown itself to be the stronger of the main towns in terms of the market delivery of residential development, with 'more of the allocated sites delivering in accordance with the planned trajectory'. The identification at 6.2.7 of the need to commission work related to Banbury's future employment needs, must also be balanced by an understanding of the implications of further employment growth at Banbury, to the additional demand on the local Housing Market Area, with a commensurate growth in residential development to support the planned economic growth of the Town.
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 1	The Paper sets out a vision for Cherwell District, which is broadly supported by the Representors. However, the Vision fails to address or include any reference to any spatial aspect of how the growth of the District will be delivered; ie, is it the part of the Vision for the future of Cherwell that growth will be focussed upon the existing Urban Areas, or be subject to a rural dispersion? Will the Vision look to distribute housing along sustainable transport corridors, or maybe focus on existing centres of employment etc, will that involve a further review of Green Belt? The Vision needs to include an <u>aspect of spatial outcome, if it is to be successful in delivering the growth which Cherwell is required to meet</u>
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 2	KO 23 makes reference to focusing development in Cherwell's sustainable locations, but does not seek to define, or explain, how that 'sustainability' is being assessed or determined. The KO should include some clearer direction against which compliance with this objective could be assessed. More generally, the objectives make no reference to the need to secure and make provision for sufficient housing for sustainable growth or seek to ensure any link between the location of employment provision and ensuring a sufficient quantity of new residential development to support that growth. KO10 deals with the move to net zero carbon development. The reference to decentralised energy is considered unhelpful. The energy market is responding to the challenges established in achieving net zero, and whilst decentralised energy may be a part of that solution, that may be no more so than more traditional centralised sources of low carbon power delivery. The Objective should remain <u>non-specific as to the mechanism by which low carbon energy should be supplied, rather just securing that it is low carbon</u>
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 6	The percentage of affordable housing required on major development sites should be based upon evidence collected by the Council in respect of affordability across the District. It would not be appropriate to arbitrarily define percentages, nor would it be appropriate to simply carry forward the percentages contained within the adopted Local Plan without having first tested to see whether they are still appropriate, and/or viable.
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 7	any policy requirements for the tenure mix of affordable housing should be based upon the latest available evidence in respect of housing need.
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 8	Whilst Barwood do not necessarily object to the utilisation of the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS), footnote 49 to paragraph 130 f) of the NPPF confirms that: "Policies may also make use of the nationally described space standard, <b>where the need for an internal space standard can be justified.</b> " [emphasis added]. The utilisation of the NDSS within Cherwell District should accordingly be based upon demonstrable evidence of need, which should form part of the Local Plan Review evidence base. Moreover, even if NDSS are to be applied, any policy should allow for flexibility within <u>individual sites, for exceptions to be made where specific and sound design justification, dictates</u>
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 9	The imposition of accessibility standards through planning policy is unnecessary as they are already considered within Building Regulations.
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 10	Given the Government's pending introduction of the Future Homes standard, the need for any Local Plan review to set standards of sustainable construction is questioned. If there is an intent to set standards above those required by Government then this should not occur without a fully evidence viability assessment to confirm that the additional costs of so doing, would not render development unsustainable.
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 12	How the provision of BNG should be delivered should not be dictated as a 'one size fits all' solution but should recognise that meeting BNG will be bespoke to each individual site, and the ecology of that site. Solutions to the provision of BNG may require a combination of the types of measures set out above to ensure that adequate compensatory provision is made.

LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Option 14	The supporting text appears unclear. At 5.8.6 reference is made to recent developments having a 'large number of small areas for play' and this creating a 'maintenance burden'. However, at 5.8.7 the text goes on to state that the approach being advocated is one that seeks 'play friendly environments incorporating opportunities throughout developments...'. That seems to be a strategy which would exacerbate the alleged concern regarding 'maintenance burden'. Provision of children's play through new development has been successfully integrated in many developments, through traditional use of LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs, maintenance contributions being secured where they are transferred to LPA control or being secured by on site Management Companies and secured through S106. If there is considered to be a requirement to move away from traditional methods of securing adequate play provision, then this needs to be supported by a suitably evidenced justification.
LPR-B-513	Pegasus Group for Baarwood & Hill	Kidlington	Reference is made to LPR-A-237 by Kidlington Parish Council and their representation which was seeking a linear park of connected routes of paths and open spaces around Kidlington. They were not, as CDC suggest at Appendix 2 promoting the land on the outskirts of Kidlington for Local Green Space (LGS). The areas of open space identified in the Parish Council's Linear Park plan covers most of the land allocated as PR7a. Clearly, having just identified the exceptional circumstances, to remove the site from Green Belt and having allocated the site for residential development, it would be perverse to now identify the site as LGS, which is a quasi-Green Belt policy allocation. From the Representors perspective the Linear Park proposal, as far as it relates to land within their control, is an aspiration they are willing to assist in the delivery of. The large area of open space indicated on the Parish Council's Plan would need to be delivered further south on the site (within the area still within the Green Belt) to reflect the Partial Review allocation as to where built form on the site will be. However, the open space, and the footpath links providing wider offsite connectivity, are both provisions which the sites promoters are willing to work toward providing as part of their forthcoming planning application on the site. If the zone proposed by the Parish for Open Space were to be transposed literally into this area, it would prevent the adopted Partial Review policy from being able to deliver the required level of housing, as it would sit squarely over much of the area shaded pink, which the plan confirms is for residential development. That land was released from Green Belt, because the Council demonstrated that there were 'exceptional circumstances' of sufficient weight to justify its allocation. Those needs and the exceptional circumstances generally, have not changed since the Plan's adoption in September 2020. It remains vital therefore, that the allocated site remains capable of development in the terms set out by adopted Policy PR7a and is not fettered by the imposition of an Public Open Space designation which is not necessary or part of the adopted Plan strategy. This is not to say PR7a is coming forward without Public Open Space, the Policy makes provision for a strategic contribution of 11ha of formal playing pitches, and wider community and green infra-structure. This land remains subject to Green Belt designation, and is integral to both the adopted policy, and the emerging Development Brief for the site. As noted, the Representors are very willing to work with the Kidlington Parish Council to enable the delivery of that part of the 'Linear Park', in an appropriate manner, as it relates to the land within their control.
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Drayton	The population figure is clearly inaccurate especially as it is claimed no development has taken place. All village details MUST refer to the old established village and not include of the new developments either built or planned as they will probably be moved into Banbury before the new Local Plan review is agreed. The old village has less than a 100 dwellings and a population of just over 200. The Parish Council believes the map should show the conservation area boundary as this clearly shows the areas that need to be protected from development to protect the village heritage. THE VILLAGE STRONGLY EXPECT THE GAP BETWEEN BABURY DEVELOPMENTS AND THE VILLAGE WILL BE PROTECTED BY SPECIFIC POLICIES WITHIN THE NEW PLAN. There is now a strong boundary between the new developments adjacent to Bretch Hill and those to the west of the Warwick road. This boundary is also the conservation area boundary.
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	LPR-A-152	Object as they would extend Banbury further away from the shopping and employment areas in an unsustainably way.they would also be outside the the Banbury bowl and be very obtrusive in the open countryside. They would also bring housing very close to Hanwell to the detriment of the village, the village conservation are and light pollution would affect the observatory. Hanwell has always been promised that the village would be protected from being joined up to the town
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	LPR-A-214	Object as they would extend Banbury further away from the shopping and employment areas in an unsustainably way.they would also be outside the the Banbury bowl and be very obtrusive in the open countryside. They would also bring housing very close to Hanwell to the detriment of the village, the village conservation are and light pollution would affect the observatory. Hanwell has always been promised that the village would be protected from being joined up to the town
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Option 2	Page 16 para 3.5.5 the PC supports Nos 1 & 2. Supports KO5, KO23, and KO25. Page 36, para 5.4.4 - supports the standard method.
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Option 3	Supports numbers 1, 3 and 4
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Option 18	supports Nos 2 & 3 the more sustainable areas for growth
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Option 19	supports No 2 especially the separation between villages and Banbury.
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Option 30	supports No 1 limit rural development to local needs
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Option 31	supports No 1 work with communities to meet local need.

LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Question - Settlement	supports the definition of village boundaries
LPR-B-514	Drayton Parish Council	Option 34	supports No 2 especially the valued landscape areas that protect villages from urban growth. These need additional protection policies
LPR-B-515	Rosalind French	Adderbury	Concerns regarding the proposed housing. The village has seen a lot of expansion in the last 10 years and does not have the amenity to support current development or proposed. Further development would risk Adderbury being swallowed into the town of Banbury and losing its rural charm as well as the much needed green areas around Banbury. The primary school in Adderbury has struggled to cope with the recent expansion. The village shop and many residents have to take to their cars and travel to the neighbouring villages of Deddington and Bloxham to their Coops or into the town of Banbury. There will be massive environmental impacts, which surely should be at the forefront of our minds at the moment, as well as ecological implications. Adderbury has historically been prone to flooding with many of the solutions not fully resolving the issue. The development would destroy the character of the village and make the traffic and flooding problems much more severe. Traffic is already an issue within Adderbury with little being done about the congestion on the Aynho Road (outside the Primary School) and the village High Street can only allow traffic in one direction at a time. Communication about these proposals have been very sparse.
LPR-B-516	Vanessa Spooner	LPR-A-107	Concerns re: Access & Movement resulting from an increase in the number of residence on this Lane. Pound Lane is a small lane, not fit for significant vehicle movement that struggles to sustain the current vehicle movements, let alone an increase. Serious cause for concern as this road is not fit for purpose for current use, let alone more. The village is a dark sky village and we already have a significant development taking place in our attached village Sibford Ferris already contributing to light pollution, traffic movements and reducing the countryside across the Sibfords and Burdrop. The size of this plot of land in question gives me great concern, it appears large enough to potentially double the number of residences within Sibford Gower. Not opposed to appropriate sized developments that are in keeping with the countryside area, but the size of this plot of land gives me huge concern.
LPR-B-517	Edward Spooner	LPR-A-107	concerned that there has been no public consultation on this matter and that such a development would detrimentally impact on the scale of the village. The development would be damaging Oxfordshire's valuable countryside, productive agricultural land, sensitive habitat and an area of natural beauty. Development of this scale would be suited closer to Banbury on brownfield sites. The Oxfordshire vision emphasises progress towards a carbon negative future 'leaving the natural environment in a better state than we found it'. In addition Key objective 15 is to protect conserve and enhance natural assets woods and hedges. Against such development given the sites' clear weaknesses from both a sustainability and access perspective
LPR-B-518	Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-518	Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.

LPR-B-518	Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-518	Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-518	Adderbury Residents Association	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-519	Stephen Leonard	LPR-A-152	Opposes proposals. Destruction of greenfield land which is not sustainable. Views from the conservation area which the 2007 council appraisal pledged to protect will be desecrated. Increase in local infrastructure. Few facilities in the north of the town and public transport is woefully inadequate. Development will increase volumes of traffic on local roads and increase problems through Hanwell where the Main Street is already an issue. Previous local plan set Dukes Meadow Drive as the defensible northern edge. This has already been breached and further piecemeal development of this area would permanently destroy the village of Hanwell. The Council should think about devising permanent protection of the local arable landscape and way of life.
LPR-B-519	Stephen Leonard	LPR-A-214	Opposes proposals. Destruction of greenfield land which is not sustainable. Views from the conservation area which the 2007 council appraisal pledged to protect will be desecrated. Increase in local infrastructure. Few facilities in the north of the town and public transport is woefully inadequate. Development will increase volumes of traffic on local roads and increase problems through Hanwell where the Main Street is already an issue. Previous local plan set Dukes Meadow Drive as the defensible northern edge. This has already been breached and further piecemeal development of this area would permanently destroy the village of Hanwell. The Council should think about devising permanent protection of the local arable landscape and way of life.
LPR-B-519	Stephen Leonard	LPR-A-205	Opposes proposals. Destruction of greenfield land which is not sustainable. Views from the conservation area which the 2007 council appraisal pledged to protect will be desecrated. Increase in local infrastructure. Few facilities in the north of the town and public transport is woefully inadequate. Development will increase volumes of traffic on local roads and increase problems through Hanwell where the Main Street is already an issue. Previous local plan set Dukes Meadow Drive as the defensible northern edge. This has already been breached and further piecemeal development of this area would permanently destroy the village of Hanwell. The Council should think about devising permanent protection of the local arable landscape and way of life.
LPR-B-520	Jonathan Fenster and Joanne Evans	LPR-A-034	Raises concerns. Previously there has been a clear delineation between the town of Banbury, including its industry and commercial infrastructure on one side of the M40 junction and the appealing rural nature of the land adjacent to the A361. The warehouse which has already been built is an eyesore and a proliferation of this type of building would, in our view, be extremely detrimental to the surrounding landscape and to the wider environment.

LPR-B-521	Greg Lowe	Milton	Comments provided in relation to the impacts of new homes built either side of Milton- resulting in more lighting, footpaths, traffic calming measures. New homes should ensure the rural character of the areas is maintained and doesn't result in hedgerow removal for paths, lighting could be placed at lower levels. The sites put forward in the parishes of Milton do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor any of the previous consultation results. Any development in Milton Parish should be very small scale respecting the conservation village and its environs. The proposed development of the old caravan park and its adjoining field should be the subject of a separate consultation with Milton villagers as it falls within the parish boundary but outside the village, in open countryside
LPR-B-521	Greg Lowe	Adderbury	Adderbury and Bloxham are rural communities. Their growth in the last 10 years looks set to turn them into small towns but with few appropriate facilities, requiring travel by road to reach most of those facilities in Banbury. Most new facilities and amenities are from the town centre and to the north – communities south of Banbury cause congestion at pinchpoints for miles already. The road system was not designed for the large amount of traffic now using it and many residents complain of noise and light pollution growing in Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury, with consistent calls for reduced traffic and reduced speed. The sites put forward in the parishes of Adderbury do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor any of the previous consultation results. Development in Adderbury should be small scale so that these communities retain their identity as 'villages in the countryside' and do not become part of and wholly reliant on the facilities of Banbury
LPR-B-521	Greg Lowe	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Neighbourhood Plans, updated regularly to accord with regional planning demands and defined settlement boundaries, should control the growth of rural and village development and should not be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate operating under national government guidance
LPR-B-521	Greg Lowe	Option 30	Development in the rural areas should be restricted to local needs only
LPR-B-521	Greg Lowe	Option 19	The roads to the north and east of Banbury are better capable of handling the increased traffic from Banbury's growth than the south and west- any growth in Banbury should be to Banbury's east and north.
LPR-B-521	Greg Lowe	Bloxham	The sites put forward in the parishes of Bloxham do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor any of the previous consultation results. Development in Bloxham should be small scale so that these communities retain their identity as 'villages in the countryside' and do not become part of and wholly reliant on the facilities of Banbury
LPR-B-521	Greg Lowe	Option 30	road traffic should not be allowed to grow further. Urban signage and lighting should not be sited in or around villages and the countryside but that these should be restricted to towns. The overall landscape and character of the area should be protected and certain special individual features in the landscapes given special protection in addition. Tranquillity and reduction of light pollution should be a factor in decision-making on development of any kind. Settlements should be prevented from coalescence and local design features more strongly enforced. Commercial and economic growth should be limited to specified urban areas. Improvement of the environment should be a major factor wherever previously developed land or green fields are considered for development (not mitigation of damage)

LPR-B-522	Framptons for Tritax Symmetry Ltd	Option 22	<p>Tritax Symmetry (TSL) who have successfully brought forward Symmetry Park, Bicester as part of the Bicester 12 allocation. TSL has secured substantial inward investment within the logistics sector into Bicester. The PPG emphasises that the logistics industry plays a 'critical role in enabling an efficient, sustainable and effective supply of goods for consumers and businesses', and of particular significance to the Local Plan, 'distinct locational requirements that need to be considered in formulating planning policies (separately from those relating to general industrial land)'. The logistics sector is also critical to the social objective of sustainable development. The logistics sector is vital to a successful economy, underpinning and supporting all other sectors. Research has shown that there is a direct correlation between new housing and logistics space, with every home generating demand for an additional 69sqft of logistics space. COVID19 has supercharged demand. In the retail sector, online sales grew from 20% of all sales in February 2020 to 28% by the end of the year with a peak of 32% in Q4 2020. Each 1 million sqft of logistics space provides a range of construction and operational benefits including 1400 jobs in the construction sector and 2400 direct and indirect in warehouse and delivery sectors, £98m GVA boosting economic output and growing productivity for construction, £110m GVA generate for operation, £25m direct wages to construction employees and £37m to logistics employees, £5m construction and £9m fiscal benefits from NI and PAYE. Logistics operations provide a wide range of jobs for a variety of skills with flexible working hours to suit people's lifestyles. The logistics sector is a leader in terms of environmental improvements and sustainability. Rather than commit to distant climate change/emissions targets, it is proactively making change now, embedding net zero carbon in construction practices, BREEAM improvements, energy efficiency and renewable energy technology. The commissioning of a Cherwell Employment Land and Needs Assessment is welcomed, in principle to supplement the evidence base that may be identified in the Spatial Plan. It is essential that, as set out in the PPG, evidence of market demand is assessed through discussion with TSL, the logistics development arm of FTSE 250 company Tritax Big Box REIT plc. The strategy and site allocations in the Local Plan must respond to the distinct locational requirements for the logistics sector, particularly in the context of the scale of land releases to meet occupier demand, and the accessibility of sites to the strategic highway network for both the receipt of goods by HGVs and the onward delivery of goods to customers. These locational requirements equally apply to the receipt and delivery of goods for retail customers and to businesses including manufacturers to support 'just in time' deliveries to continuous production lines. It is considered that the Local Plan needs to distinguish between the scale of logistics operations which can be appropriately located on the edge of the existing built-up area of Bicester, and the need to accommodate national / regional scale logistics facilities which are not well suited to an edge of urban area location. This scale of logistics operation needs to be located on sites that are well connected to the strategic highway network. These locations necessarily will be 'free standing' from the urban edge of Bicester. The scale of provision is such that sites can become well connected by public transport and potentially by cycling. The allocation of land for the logistics sector should recognise that the locational requirements will not be fully met by enlargement of Bicester. New allocations in the open countryside on sites well connected to the strategic highway network are necessary in order to respond to clear market signals and meet these needs.</p>
LPR-B-522	Framptons for Tritax Symmetry Ltd	Option 23	<p>consider that accommodating the needs of the national and regional scale logistics requires sites to be allocated to the west of the town, where they are well connected to the motorway network at Junction 9 M40 and Junction 10 M40. Meeting the needs for the logistics sector, other than the national / regional scale logistics, can appropriately be accommodated on land to the east of Bicester adjoining Symmetry Park. This area of land is situated between Symmetry Park and a large brownfield site. The extension of Symmetry Park, Bicester is considered to represent a logical provision to meet future employment needs. TSL has, through the call-for-sites, identified the opportunities to accommodate future needs of the logistics sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) To the east of Symmetry Park</li> <li>(ii) Land at J9 M40</li> <li>(iii) Land at J10 M40</li> </ul> <p>The policy provision for the strategic scale sites at Junction 9 and Junction 10 could reasonably include a criterion which safeguards these sites for national and regional scale logistics developments. The policy presumption would be that smaller scale logistics development will be located on land adjoining the existing urban edge of Bicester including land to the east of Symmetry Park Bicester. We would be happy to discuss details of the above sites/locations at a meeting, or would be able to send plans on request.</p>
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Call for Sites Promotion - Land east of Oxford Road, North Oxford	<p>Land east of Oxford Road, North Oxford is promoted for housing. Representation is supported by a document which provides details of site constraints, strategic connectivity, development proposals, benefits, compliance with policy options in the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050.</p>
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 1	<p>Christ Church generally supports the proposed Vision. However, it should reference, be consistent with and have regard to the Oxfordshire 2050 Vision which is the strategic overarching Vision for the Local Plan.</p> <p>Other suggested changes are: - Pre-amble – Whilst COVID 19 has been a key issue over the past 18 months or so, it is questionable if it will remain so over the plan period. As such we suggest this is changed to simply "...provide opportunities for a healthier, more prosperous, resilient and sustainable future for all our communities."- Item 4 – it is suggested that this element should be re-written as below, to better emphasise the need to meet housing numbers: "To meet our needs a wide choice of market and affordable housing is provided. These homes should be energy efficient and well designed." - Item 12 – clarity should be given as to what is meant by "...re-shaped and adapted..." in relation to Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. - Item 13 – this specifically refers to Heyford Park only and then refers to "other areas of planned growth..." We suggest that there is reference to the sites set out in the Partial Review Local Plan on the edge of Oxford in this context.</p>

LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 2	Whilst the objectives are generally supported by Christ Church, we consider that there are too many. 31 Key Objectives seems excessive and will lead to an unfocused plan. There is a degree of overlap in the objectives that could be streamlined. We would suggest limiting the objectives to a handful for each heading to better focus the plan. We also question KO18 and 19 that refer to historic buildings contributing to Climate Change mitigation. Most historic buildings are highly inefficient and so we fail to see the relevance of these objectives. It would be better to refer to improving the energy efficiency of historic building. The most important objectives from our view point are: KO10, KO11, KO13, KO16, KO23, KO26, KO28, KO29, KO30 and KO31.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 3	Christ Church supports a focus for the main employment land being in the most appropriate and sustainable locations. Generally, this will mean a focus at the main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, but also at significant key transport interchanges (both bus and rail) such as around Oxford Parkway Station and Park & Ride. However, it is important to consider all of the above options to provide a range of opportunities to maximise the economic benefits across the whole District and support both small scale and larger scale businesses. The NPPF seeks use of brownfield land before greenfield land but that assumes there is sufficient brownfield land in the right locations to utilise
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 4	This must respond to the demand following detailed assessment. Taking account of the Oxfordshire Industrial Strategy and the associated Delivery Plan, prepared by the LEP, there is a strong ambition to drive up the provision of R&D space and to increase employment skills to better respond to local demand and provide people with longer and more flexible careers. In particular, Oxfordshire lacks flexible laboratory and innovation space as well as Grade A office space, which are critical to attracting foreign direct investment and secure international business headquarters in the region. We therefore suggest a mix of the above driven by an assessment of need.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Supporting	The Local Plan must set out a clear Vision and objectives which positively and proactively support sustainable economic growth. This must have regard to the wider strategic employment policies set out in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and the requirements in the NPPF
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 5	Christ Church supports the need to provide flexibility in the Local Plan to enable town centres to thrive. This will require reuse of existing buildings as well as redevelopment where necessary.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 6	The need to meet the requirement for affordable housing is a key objective of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. A number of options was discussed in the recent 2050 Plan consultation. These points need to be resolved prior to fixing an approach in the Local Plan. In addition, assuming a percentage is required to be set out in the Local Plan it must be evidence based and requires an assessment of viability to be undertaken.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 7	The NPPF seeks a range of housing types to be provided. In addition, there are new affordable tenures such as First Homes that will have an impact on the percentage mix. The answer should be based on the local housing need and take account of the final policy approach in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 8	The Council should provide evidence as to why it would be necessary to set out a Local Plan policy to control this over and above the standard requirements in the Building Regulations. We are aware that Oxford City has such a policy. If required this should be a strategic policy that is best set out in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and applied uniformly throughout the County.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Separation Distances	No. The Plan should concentrate on appropriate policies to control good design in accordance with the National Design Guide and leave the assessment of separation distances to individual applications as they will be site specific and depend on individual circumstances
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 9	Christ Church supports continuing to rely on the Building Regulations as the best means to provide accessible dwellings. The level of provision must be dependent on need. Over providing can have an impact on viability and can lead to inefficient use of land if the units are not required
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Housing Policies	There is no need for a policy relating to Modern Methods of Construction which should be up to individual developers to decide. To control this would go above and beyond the requirements of Planning policy. Policies should refer to quality of design and environmental criteria and leave how to achieve the aims to individuals to decide how best to meet them
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 10	The policies to control this should be set at the county level through the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. In addition, the Government will be setting out clear guidance on the Future Homes Standard that will take account of evidence regarding ability to deliver etc. Given the above, option 1 is likely to be the most appropriate way forward and to avoid duplicating policy controls.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 11	There is no need for a policy on this specific matter. Other policies in the Plan and the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 will shape where such proposals are acceptable or not.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Christ Church fully supports the need to tackle climate change through the planning system. However, we suggest that the policies being proposed in the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050 should be relied on and should not be duplicated in the Local Plan. Any policies should be subject to appropriate technology and viability testing so as not to impact delivery.



LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Green Belt	We have commented on the need for a Green Belt review through submissions on the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. The 2050 Plan is the right document to review the Green Belt. The Local Plan should follow the approach set out in the NPPF for general Green Belt policies. However, should the 2050 Plan not define precise areas of land for development then it may be necessary for the Local Plan to review the precise Green Belt boundary. Releasing sites on the edge of Oxford, within the Green Belt has previously been shown (in both the Partial Review Local Plan and South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan) to be highly sustainable. Further releases should be considered on their merits if this results in the most sustainable development options. The NPPF refers to the need to consider enhancement of Green Belt areas where release takes place. The Local Plan should consider options for such enhancement eg improving accessibility and enhancing character of land.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 12	This matter is covered in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 at a strategic scale especially in terms of the minimum percentage net gain. Any further policy in the Local Plan must have regard to the strategic policy and avoid duplication. If included within the Local Plan then a hierarchical approach should be set out to provide onsite if possible first, then within the local area, then within Oxfordshire and <u>before considering projects elsewhere.</u>
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 13	The controls already in place through the EIA Regulations, the NPPF and Local Plan policies dealing with biodiversity, trees and water already lead to development being built in the locations of least environmental impact. The mapping undertaken by the University of Oxford is a very useful tool and one that will form part of the above assessments. However, we do not see a need for major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment. This would duplicate existing measures
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	many of the topics mentioned in this question are proposed to be covered at the strategic level through the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Where they are not then it would be essential to include a policy in the Local Plan.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 14	The current Cherwell policy approach to play provision lacks flexibility and does not always result in the intended benefits. As such Christ Church would support option 3) above, which will result in a bespoke solution for each site. This has the benefit of taking account of local circumstances rather than simply applying a rigid formula.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 15	The approach will vary depending on the location and identified needs in each particular area. There is little point in having a rigid approach that requires a fixed response when money might be better directed to existing hubs or facilities that will provide greater benefits. It is therefore essential that an updated sports needs assessment is prepared and underpins the Local Plan.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	This can be best supported by avoiding ambiguity between National Model Design Code, Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and local codes/guidance, thus providing developers with certainty.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Christ Church is generally supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principles. Care is needed as to how this would be incorporated in to policies as this approach does not fit neatly into all situations, especially in rural areas or where access to jobs and services requires a longer commute.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Christ Church generally supports the transport hierarchy set out. This is a key component if we are to reach net zero developments. Spatial planning has a clear role in supporting a decarbonised transport system and meeting the hierarchy. As shown in the Partial Review Local Plan sites on the edge of Oxford, especially those adjacent to Oxford Parkway Station and Park & Ride have the highest opportunity for travel to be undertaken by sustainable modes. Developments in more remote rural areas will be inherently less sustainable for these reasons. Policy needs to encourage the <u>best possible solutions for the whole District whilst spatially distributing growth to maximise sustainable modes of transport</u>
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 16	This should be covered within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. In any event, the market demands good digital connections and as such there is little need for a policy approach in the Local Plan.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Transport Policies	This should be a county wide matter and should be left to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and other county wide policy documents such as the Local Transport Plan.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 17	It is essential to have an updated and accurately costed IDP document. However, the document must be county wide as most infrastructure projects are cross District in scale/impact. As such the work of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 in this regard must be taken in to account
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 26	Appropriate locations for employment should be considered based on demand and need as well as proximity to transport hubs/sustainable modes of travel and housing. Only then should consideration whether to undertake changes to the Green Belt should be made. For example land to the south east of the Oxford Parkway Station and Park & Ride is a highly sustainable location for employment growth, easily accessible from Bicester, Oxford and Kidlington by rail, bus, pedestrian and cycle.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 27	Maintaining and protecting Kidlington village centre, especially the retail uses is key to enhancing the local community. Additional housing developments in and around Kidlington should have good accessibility to the centre to help bolster the viability of the uses
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	To locate new development in close proximity to sustainable transport hubs which make opportunities for sustainable means of travel easy to choose.

LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 28	Creating a network of green corridors, foot and cycle paths should be explored. This should include how best to improve connectivity to key open spaces through new developments
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community	Through the development of the sites identified in the Partial Review Local Plan Kidlington and the surrounding area will benefit from a large increase in publically accessible open spaces, sports and recreation spaces/facilities. These should be assessed comprehensively to make best use of the facilities and in planning any future growth. (See response to Option 15).
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 30	Christ Church owns land at Milcombe. It is essential that growth in the villages is supported. This should cover not just local need but a sufficient level of growth to help sustain local services and facilities and ideally enhance them
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 31	Christ Church supports a parish level figure but to then work with the local community to decide how that would be delivered via Neighbourhood Planning. It is however, recognised that to produce such a plan requires a lot of hard work and resource which not all communities will want or be able to support. The approach set out in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan in relation to Henley, Wallingford and Thame is a good model to follow. The Local Plan set a housing target for each settlement and a timescale (12 months) for those areas to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. If a plan was not produced then the Council would accept planning applications from developers to deliver the housing numbers. This promotes local involvement but where that is not forthcoming or possible then it also gives certainty over delivery.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 32	A settlement hierarchy must consider both the availability of local services and facilities but also connectivity to such services and facilities elsewhere. The assessment must also factor in the effect of growth on such a settlement in setting the hierarchy. For example, a village may not be well connected or have good services and facilities but a planned bus link or employment development close by would result in that settlement being more sustainable. Previous studies have not factored in these benefits.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 33	A combination of the options set out above would provide the most flexibility to enable the rural economy to develop as and when opportunities arise.
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Settlement	Whilst settlement boundaries are useful for defining and applying policies they are rigid and inflexible and do not allow for circumstances that may arise during the plan period. In our experience there are more benefits in not having settlements boundaries
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Option 34	Maintaining the current approach to protection of the historic and natural environment should be followed. This is in line with the NPPF. Any policies should be aligned with the approach and policies that may be set out in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050
LPR-B-523	Savills for Christ Church Oxford	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Christ Church supports a parish level figure but to then work with the local community to decide how that would be delivered via Neighbourhood Planning. It is however, recognised that to produce such a plan requires a lot of hard work and resource which not all communities will want or be able to support. The approach set out in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan in relation to Henley, Wallingford and Thame is a good model to follow. The Local Plan set a housing target for each settlement and a timescale (12 months) for those areas to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. If a plan was not produced then the Council would accept planning applications from developers to deliver the housing numbers. This promotes local involvement but where that is not forthcoming or possible then it also gives certainty over delivery.
LPR-B-524	Victoria Conway	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. The proposals for additional housing in Adderbury is completely disproportionate to the size of the village and would alter the character of this beautiful ironstone village and would contravene the neighbourhood plan.
LPR-B-524	Victoria Conway	Adderbury	The proposals for additional housing in Adderbury is completely disproportionate to the size of the village and would alter the character of this beautiful ironstone village and would contravene the neighbourhood plan
LPR-B-524	Victoria Conway	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-524	Victoria Conway	Question - Settlement	Yes, otherwise settlements would merge together and lose their individuality. Bloxham has already merged into Banbury but still had some green space separating it from Adderbury, although this is threatened by proposed development
LPR-B-524	Victoria Conway	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-524	Victoria Conway	LPR-A-178	The size of this proposed development is out of proportion with the size of the village and would significantly alter the character of the area. The increase in traffic would lead to regular congestion on the Aynho Road and increased air pollution. The village has very few amenities for residents so there would be many more cars on the road travelling for work, shopping and leisure. The countryside views and walks that local people enjoy would be destroyed, along with much wildlife and biodiversity. The sewage facilities would be under greater strain, threatening the conservation area which includes Adderbury Lakes Nature Reserve, which has already had issues with poor water quality in recent years
LPR-B-525	Elizabeth Holbech	LPR-A-175	extremely against the building of 400 new houses with access to the main Daventry Road, even if new houses were built for the next 50 years we would still not have enough and it would cover the beautiful green countryside
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 1	Supports policy which minimises the amount and environmental value of land taken for development and ensures that where development occurs it is sensitively located, sustainable, appropriate to need, and the land take proportionate. Broadly supports the Vision. An additional objective should be to retain and support active local democracy, with the Plan reflecting the needs and wishes of local people. LP vision is overshadowed by the potential implementation of the OxCam Arc which may override LP aspirations (eg for Bicester to retain its market town character). 4.7.5. This should specifically reference accessible green space (not just open space) 4.7.11. This should specifically reference Cherwell's vital contribution to Oxfordshire's Nature Recovery Network

LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 2	Supports many of the objectives. KO 23: This should be underpinned by a spatial strategy based on the following hierarchy (starting from the most protected), working outwards in defence of our countryside: The citadel (Green Belt and AONB, protecting Oxford & its surrounding villages and the County's Areas of Natural Beauty respectively, SSIs and other environmental sites, and the new Nature Recovery Areas); The countryside, the inner defences (inner defence line is the open countryside, and the areas around smaller villages and settlements. The countryside should be protected for its own sake, particularly where land is highly graded, and any development which would be harmful to it must be fully and satisfactorily justified. New settlement in the countryside should be resisted because of the inevitable harm); The areas around larger villages and smaller towns (Development to meet strictly local needs, to support local infrastructure, or provide necessary housing, identified through Neighbourhood Plans); Sites already released in previous Plans (Where sites include land over and above the requirement to meet the current allocation of development, that land should be used for further development if the need arises. Where a masterplan for the original allocation has not as yet been permitted it should be revisited); Brownfield (Previously developed) sites outside the City and larger towns; and, Sites within larger towns. KO 2 - an aim to attract investment by a diversity of employment providers into Cherwell to preclude the need for residents to travel out of the area for work KO 6 - Tourism is an ever-increasing contributor to the economy of Cherwell - preservation of environment and landscapes should be at the heart of all planning decisions affecting rural areas or the cachet of 'Gateway to the Cotswolds' will ring hollow. KO10- encourage CDC to be ambitious (as the climate emergency dictates) and seek to ensure that all new developments demonstrate a net negative carbon footprint. All transport interventions should demonstrate steps to minimise private car mileage. KO14- the protection of existing green and blue infrastructure is of paramount importance. KO15 The aim should be not just to capture and store carbon but also to protect the local ecology KO16- We agree with the aspirations of KO16 but the plan does not give any concrete suggestions to how to achieve less dependency on the car. KOs 13-15 and 25: As a general comment there is not much evidence of these aspirations in recent planning decisions.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 3	In relation to the question as framed here, it's most likely to be a combination, barring perhaps 4 and, depending on definitions, 2. The larger villages are only larger because of decades of development but we accept that there may be occasions where development is appropriate in larger villages particularly if it enables them to be more sustainable. The plan should define transport interchanges. Does this mean at, for example, rail/motorway intersections or does it include class B8 developments adjacent to motorway junctions? The Banbury 15 development is a particular example of where such a B8 development in the latter circumstances will have a highly detrimental impact on the local environment and communities. We are of the view that both of the proposals for large-scale distribution centres in the vicinity of Ardley with Fewcott should be resisted as an unwelcome intrusion into open countryside, entailing loss of farmland, damaging long-distance views, and bringing large numbers of HGVs into rural neighbourhoods.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 4	Option 3. Avoid an over provision of B8. The current apparent 'obsession' with B8 development (aka mega warehousing) is surely incompatible with the overarching aim of a developing a 'knowledge spine'.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 5	Option 2. Developments should utilise town centre and rural brownfield sites before even considering any applications for additional encroachment into green space. Expanding Bicester Town Centre southwards to cover the Oxford Rd sports field was to be considered in the abandoned LP2. We consider that this green space should be left to provide a green buffer between the St Edburg's church/Bicester town cemetery and Bicester Village shopping complex. Building a modern shopping centre here will drain the old town centre of vitality. Continued support for more small chain / independent outlets. These generally support a greater variety of shopping outlets which could allow essential ecofriendly advances such as 'refill shops' to reduce use of plastic, and craft outlets which provide locally made goods. Encouragement of local farmer and business involvement in town centre events, such as markets. This will help to support the rural economy and connect urban dwellers to local food production (reducing climate impacts) and the countryside.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 6	Support Option 1. Given the crisis in the unaffordability of houses, the percentage of affordable houses on developments of 10 and more units should be increased. This is especially important in villages where outwards migration of young people occurs due to lack of affordable housing thus changing the characteristics of these settlements.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 7	Disagree with Government policy that affordable housing is sold on the open market after some years resulting in the depletion of affordable housing stock, and consider that social housing for rent should be prioritised above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 8	Support Option 1. Separation distances can be decided on a case by case basis. In general, higher housing density should be supported because of its benefits in terms of reducing the amount of landtake, providing more affordable housing that is cheaper to buy and run, and helping reduce climate impacts through lower energy requirements and better support for public transport and other services

LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 9	<p>Agree with Option 1 as the need for this will increase with potential longterm health problems due to the coronavirus pandemic and with the demographic trend to an older population. Accessibility standards should be tailored to the local infrastructure capacity. No recommendation on specific sites for travelling communities but Cherwell should have a list of appropriately designated sites. Speculative applications in or on the edge of villages should be avoided. Sites should be situated such that the number of pitches for travellers should not be disproportionate to the density of the local population and all decisions should take account of the local context. There should be a de minimis settlement population below which it is deemed that designation of sites is not appropriate. The consultation document states that the decision on housing targets will be set by the Oxfordshire Plan 2050, but then goes on to state that 'It is likely to be above the standard methodology set by government'. This is an unacceptable pre-judging of the OP2050. CPRE has substantial reservations about how the 'adjusted' standard methodology figure, as presented in the recent OP2050 consultation, has been calculated and has joined many others in calling for a peer review of the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment which sets out unreliable evidence to justify this. Using figures directly generated by the Government's standard methodology is the most likely to be achievable within the county's environmental constraints and therefore is the only option that CPRE would consider even vaguely appropriate. We certainly cannot hope to meet the alternative options presented in the Plan (euphemistically titled 'business as usual' and 'transformational') without significant harm to our environment and rural character. Given the large overspill of housing numbers from the Growth Deal lying behind the previous suite of Local Plans our calculation of the standard method would lead to minimal actual housing requirement from 2020 to 2040. CDC should support the Standard Methodology approach and focus instead on delivering its commitments on climate change, biodiversity and successful place-making.</p> <p>Housing density policy should be set within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 (OP2050) as this is best established at a county-wide level, to avoid developers 'playing the field'. If OP2050 should choose to delegate density policy to District Plans, it is essential that the Cherwell LP should include a strong and robust policy on this issue. As a generality Oxfordshire's present housing stock has used land inefficiently with an average understood to be 34 houses per hectare or less. The housing stock needs to be rebalanced with a higher proportion of high density housing, to provide housing that is cheaper to buy and run and to accommodate smaller family units. CPRE's policy is that all new housing in the forthcoming plans should be 70/100 units per hectare, unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise, and that all new housing should be "climateready" for example to be able to accommodate heat pumps. The existing housing stock would remain but this would rebalance it with around a 20% injection of high density housing, giving more opportunities to upsize as well as downsize. These would be two and three storey units, not "tower blocks". The benefits would be houses which would be less expensive to buy and to maintain. This would be genuinely affordable housing (not 20% less unaffordable as "affordable" housing is presently). It would make costeffective social housing. Being smaller and "climate-ready" it would be better insulated and more fuel efficient. High density housing means compact communities with easy to walk shops and more viable public transport and probably a more social environment too. Land is a scarce resource and this will help use it more efficiently, requiring less land take for any given number of houses.</p>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 10	<p>Support option 3. Any new build should meet strict sustainable standards and the CDC Local Plan rightly has meeting climate change as a theme. Given the very challenging net zero carbon target by 2030 which has been set by CDC, Option 3 seems appropriate provided the appropriateness of the design to complement the local architecture and environment is confirmed. Paragraph B.181, 4th bullet on page 85 of the current LP has never been implemented. The policy needs to be reinforced in the LPR so that the Bicester 'ecotown' standards are adopted for all new builds. Buildings must be resilient to the effects of climate change, severe weather events and the latest technology and zero carbon construction methods and use must be incorporated into Council policy The current LP promises that the recommended BREEAM standard 'Very Good' would be reviewed over the plan period. Although the standard 'Very Good' sounds acceptable, it is in fact only the average level and the LPR needs to increase this to the 'Exceptional' standard. The LPR needs to ensure that the checking of this BREEAM standard will be by independent inspectors from the Building Research Council not district council officers. Decentralised energy systems. Policy ESD4 of the current LP should be amended to include heat pumps as well as the Government statement that use of gas for domestic purposes will end around 2025. This means that developments approved today should not have a domestic gas supply. Every historic building should be assessed on its own unique merits and retrofitting may not always be possible. The priority is to reduce to the extent possible the heat loss and increase energy efficiency across all housing stock and employment buildings. Cherwell Council has demonstrated the successful retrofitting of the historic Garth building (Bicester Town Council offices) without apparent damage.</p>

LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 11	<p>Proper choice and management of the location of renewable energy sites is essential to minimise environmental impact. Both 1 and 2 should apply. CPRE agree that there should be a coherent plan for where renewable energy projects should be sited. The lack of policy has led to a random scattering of an increasing number of solar farms on greenfield sites. CPRE policy is for solar panels to be installed on roofs of buildings where possible rather than large solar farms. The LP should provide a mechanism for local decision making about renewable energy projects. Community energy projects should be promoted. Residents tend to accept projects more if they feel part of it. Renewable energy projects should prioritise the use of previously developed land. Where greenfield sites are proposed, projects must: benefit the rural economy; be supported and/or owned by local communities; bring net benefits to wildlife; avoid/minimise loss of productive agricultural land; and, avoid/minimise impact on landscape, tranquillity and cultural heritage. The full lifetime carbon costs of any project, including associated transport and infrastructure, should be assessed, noting that 'renewable' does not necessarily equal 'low carbon'. The current LP asks for a feasibility assessment for on site renewable energy provision and this provides developers with a get out of only having to complete an assessment saying that renewable energy provision is not feasible. This loophole should be closed. Battery storage should be installed along with solar panels to allow the occupier to use the energy generated during daylight hours for use after dark. Without battery storage the excess electricity is exported to the grid and does not benefit the householder. We would recommend careful consideration on a policy for the installation of solar panels. These should be based on industrial developments or new housing. A minimum requirement of solar panels could be set aside for new housing developments. We reiterate our opposition to using farmland in and around villages for solar farms particularly where they are going to power urban settlements. The CDC Plan should map out what the renewable energy requirement is for the district and what is required from the plan to meet this. A separate policy should cover 'Vehicle to Grid' charging and recharging of mobility scooters, e-bicycles, e-motorcycles and other electric mobility devices. There is a need for these to be able to be recharged safely at home or off street. Strong policy on water use is required, including reduction of demand in new development through greywater harvesting. At an absolute minimum, CDC should be seeking to follow the highest possible standards in terms of Fittings (as set out in Table 2.2 Part G of Building Regulations) but we would encourage and support the Council to pursue an approach that exceeds current Building Regulations and is more in line with the emerging Future Homes Standards. Government policy states that Green Belt is a permanent designation and that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Since the Part 1 Review was only adopted around a year ago, we can see no justification for any further allocations at this point. Although billed as a potential 'smallscale' release of Green Belt land to meet employment needs, the removal of yet more Green Belt land at Kidlington would be significant on top of the substantial inroads already made in the Cherwell LP Part 1 Review and this should be rejected. The large-scale employment sites being developed at Oxford North, Salt Cross and elsewhere, should be more than adequate to meet need.</p>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 12	<p>If biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures cannot be achieved on site then the default position should be refusal of development applications. Offsite compensation simply encourages developers to suggest they cannot manage this. Given COP26 and the emphasis on the environmental agenda, there should be no compromise here. Developers should show that they have used the rules of hierarchy and using mitigation off site should be a last resort. Any claims that they cannot meet requirements must be robustly challenged. There is a need to strengthen the wording of policies 10,11 and 13 to prevent developers finding loopholes. In Option 1 'close to the site' should be defined- anywhere in CDC or within a prescribed distance of the development site? Prioritising in CTAs alone may result in harmful loss of threatened species where equivalent habitat loss is not able to be created in the CTA. As with the Oxfordshire Plan there should be an option to consider a 20% BNG. CDC should insist all calculations use the latest methodology (ies) as stipulated by DEFRA. All applicants should make their calculations publicly available and CDC should assure itself that it <u>has the necessary resource to challenge BNG assumptions.</u></p>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 13	<p>Support Option 2. All proposals should include the assessment of the local environment. Consistency of assessment by CDC is essential. Nature's value depends on who is making the assessment eg 'scrub' is a valuable habitat for wildlife and is thus valued by ecologists but it is not valued by developers. The Core and Recovery Zones of Nature Recovery Networks should be designated at the same level as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty ie no development unless truly exceptional circumstance were shown with clear evidence that no other location is possible. CPRE suggest 5 further Policies for inclusion. 1) Increase BNG requirement for every development to be 20% above baseline. 2) Expand Conservation Target Areas and strengthen the Conservation Target Area policy ESD 11 to give better protection. 3) A Tree Cover policy is needed. Current tree cover in Cherwell is 9% and should be increased to 30%. CDC must collaborate with OxTrees to find suitable areas for tree planting/regeneration 4) CDC should not 'double designate' land for both nature conservation and development in the LP. The biodiversity of several LWS and CTAs has declined because development needs were prioritised over nature conservation. Examples are Gavray Drive (Policy Bicester 13), Wretchwick Green (Policy Bicester 12), and RAF Bicester airfield (Policy Bicester 8). CDC are at fault here because the LWS designation of Bicester airfield is not even mentioned in the Bicester Motion inset on page 82 of the draft LPR. 5) Increase the number of employment hours for CDC ecologists to provide a satisfactory service. Experience has shown that two mornings per week is insufficient to effectively scrutinize 3,500- 4,000 planning applications per year, make site visits, check the developer's baseline biodiversity data, subsequent Biodiversity Net Gain calculations and mitigation measures and then check whether the mitigation measures are effective.</p>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 14	<p>Any significant development must contain accessible green space provision for children.</p>

LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 15	<p>Support Option 1. If proposers wish to undertake developments of a significant size, they should be required to make provision for sports facilities appropriate to the scale of the development. CPRE encourages this type of designation as per NPPF 101-103 and recommends that the submitted LGSs are designated where they adhere to the NPPF criteria. Concerned that many communities remain unaware of this opportunity and would urge CDC to do more to promote the importance of this potential designation. Yes, it should be sacrosanct that significant historic sites are protected completely. Any areas of historic interest must be surveyed before any agreement by councils is made to develop them. The Local Plan needs to better explain what it means by protection. Does protection mean developments that are directly adjacent to those elements of the historic environment that the plan is aiming to protect? Conservation areas must be strongly protected as well as their borders and land at their curtilage peripheries. Support action to address this as part of building healthy &amp; sustainable communities.</p> <p>Recommendations included: strong benefits in designing at higher densities than is the norm; local authorities need to use proactive design codes – design parameters established for each site – and design review processes for all major housing schemes; end the current disconnect between highways design and planning aspirations when it comes to new housing areas; and, schemes that don't meet minimum requirements should be refused on design grounds and this should be supported, without question, by the government regardless of progress towards meeting housing targets in the area. Agrees with 20-minute neighbourhood concept. This is a concept most likely to work well within suburban areas, particularly if they are being developed around the urban hubs of the district. Whilst a harder proposition in rural areas, where the availability of services, amenities and infrastructure is much more varied, there seems to us no reason why the same overall principles should not apply, albeit at a different scale eg developing the village hall as a space for all ages and using farm shops to increase local food provision. Indeed, the features of a 20 minute neighbourhood appear to be the essential ingredients of ensuring a vibrant village community. Villages are often surrounded by countryside, farmland may still not deliver the accessible green space that is required so adequate provision remains a consideration. Reducing the need to travel needs to be viewed in terms of both urban and rural areas. Developments such as expansion of Chesterton Sports facility and Great Wolf are examples of developments that do not help in this regard. These developments with their large car parks do not encourage people to drive less. The Local Plan needs to be more ambitious in this regard if CDC's aim of net zero by 2030 is to mean anything. It is not only about reducing the need for travel but also improving accessibility to sustainable and reliable public transport at a reasonable cost. Both of the proposals for large-scale distribution centres in the vicinity of Ardley with Fewcott should be resisted as an unwelcome intrusion into open countryside, entailing loss of farmland, damaging long- distance views, and bringing large numbers of HGVs into rural neighbourhoods. In particular, we should beware of rail freight distribution centres which have the rail part separated from the road part and are on railways that don't carry freight.</p>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 16	<p>Support option 3. The range of transport policies may be fine but no consideration appears to have been taken regarding future capacity requirements given proposed housing and employment development. The majority of employment development in the 2011-30 Plan is of a distribution/logistics nature. This, along with the very significant housing developments, inevitably increases the needs for transport requirements. Whilst rail connectivity in Cherwell overall is good, road transport facilities are already under considerable strain and, with further development will only get worse. Nowhere in the draft Plan is this issue addressed. All three M40 junctions in Cherwell are already operating at well over capacity. Junction 11 – Issues here will be exacerbated following the inclusion of five new possible sites adjacent to the junction in addition to the current developments at Banbury 15 on the junction. Additionally, this junction is the access to the M40 for the whole of a now hugely expanded Banbury population. There is no mention of an additional motorway junction or a relief road to carry traffic from the south side of the town. Junction 10 – Outline proposals for new warehousing and a road/rail freight depot here will only exacerbate the issues associated with an already badly designed junction. Junction 9 – The continued development of Bicester and increased A34 traffic will require this junction to be totally remodelled. In addition to motorway related issues the Plan must take account of the general road transport flow matters in addition obviously to addressing climate change related matters. Whilst most road transport matters are the responsibility of Oxfordshire County Council and Highways England, this Local Plan cannot ignore them. Public transport, particularly in the rural areas, would be better utilised if it were more frequent and made better provision for early morning and late evening availability. The type of transport will be dictated by the unique circumstances of each location.</p>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 17	Support option 1 - this is essential.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 18	Support Option 2. Banbury is increasingly becoming a hub for tourism to the Cotswolds and also the Chilterns making much of its cachet of 'Gateway to the Cotswolds'. Increased sprawling development in any direction from the town would dilute its attraction to such trade to the detriment of the commercial health of the local economy as a whole as well as to the quality of life in and around Banbury. We therefore support option 2.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 19	<p>It is invidious to specify as optimal for development one particular direction from Banbury. Green field construction around Banbury is to be avoided at all costs with development of brownfield areas optimised before any further encroachment on green field sites. There are no apparent details in the document of projected housing requirements for 2040 vs those for 2030 for Banbury and Bicester? Likewise there is no mention of improved road capacity- all access from the area to the M40 has to go through Banbury. The document contains no mention of a relief road or new junction. The capacity of the M40 J11 is already critically threatened. Any consideration of proposals for commercial development have to go hand in with consideration of road capacity. Commercial manufacturing investment would be an overwhelmingly better option in terms of traffic capacity in the area than further distributive capacity and would bring better paid and higher grade jobs to the area. Likewise there is no mention of medical treatment or educational capacity to cope within the consideration of Banbury developments. There is already a major problem coping with the primary medical and educational needs of the current population of the area. Support protection of views of St Mary's Church and the policy should be strengthened. These historic sites below should be protected: North Bar; Horsefair; South Bar; Banbury Cross; Lady on a Horse statue; and, Banbury Town Hall.</p>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 20	Support Option 2 provided it is properly administered by CDC.

LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 21	Option 1 but again with the caution against agreeing any development until the future transport and medical infrastructure for Banbury has been fully considered. Option 2 would be a second choice but with a slant towards residential over commercial provided excellent connectivity for bus and active travel with the station is prioritised. Better, more frequent transport links between local villages and Banbury.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 22	Support option 2 as preference and then option 3. CPRE notes that significant levels of growth from the current LP2031 are yet to be delivered. In 2021, halfway through the life of the plan, only 2,879 houses of the 10,129 planned for have been delivered (=28%). Outward expansion of Bicester to engulf its local villages and make it a massive conurbation is not acceptable. The town would then lose its identity as a market town and destroy the characteristics of the neighbouring villages. The previous LP1 had a 'green buffer' policy to protect areas between Bicester and the villages. This was deleted by the planning inspector as he thought the planning rules would give the villages sufficient protection. However, if all the sites submitted for consideration in the LPR are accepted then Caversfield, Launton, Ambrosden and Wendlebury will merge with Bicester and ecologically valuable land will be destroyed and the local landscapes ruined and village identity lost. The Upper Ray Conservation Target area lies to the east of Bicester and must be kept free of development because it is of high nature conservation importance. It is protected by Policies ESD10 and 11.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 23	It is invidious to specify as optimal for development one particular direction from Bicester. Green field construction around Bicester is to be avoided at all costs with development brown field areas optimised before any further encroachment on green field sites. There are no apparent details in the document of projected housing requirements for 2040 vs those for 2030 for Banbury and Bicester? Likewise there is no mention of improved road capacity. Commercial manufacturing investment would be an overwhelmingly better option in terms of traffic capacity in the area than further distributive capacity and would bring better paid and higher grade jobs to the area. Likewise there is no mention of medical treatment or educational capacity to cope within the consideration of Bicester developments. There is already a major problem coping with the primary medical and educational needs of the current population of the area.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 24	CPRE would generally support conversion to residential where businesses are no longer viable. However, the numerous small properties in Sheep St and Market Square developed from 1670 onwards for commercial uses on the ground floor with accommodation above. Most properties are listed and have small rooms which are unsuitable for conversion to habitable units which comply with modern standards. There is therefore a risk that such conversions will result in homes which do not meet standards for light and space.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 25	Bicester lacks cultural facilities such as an art gallery, theatre or concert hall. A growing town of 30,000-60,000 people should provide these. Specific sites for a new build cultural centre such as the two sites (LPR-A-240) promoted by Cllr Dan Sames might be suitable. Space could be provided on NW Bicester east site LPR-A-177 for an eco-friendly cultural centre. Other sites could be the old Magistrates court (LPR-A-110) and Bicester Village Station Rd site (LPR-A-122). Areas to protect include North St, Sheep St, Market Square, Market Hill, Causeway, Church St, King's End, The Garth, London Rd as far out as the town railway station, Piggy Lane and the old St Edburg's school. Bicester's Historic Conservation Areas and Bicester Airfield Conservation Area and Local Wildlife Site must be protected. The tranquil area around St Edburg's Church and the town cemetery must also be protected. The shortfall in natural green space in Bicester has markedly increased since it was assessed in 2011. The biodiversity of the open spaces is reduced by overgrowth with aggressive perennials such as brambles and ivy. Litter problems and neglect occur in Launton Fields Park, Duxbury Close, land by Bicester Community College, and Jarvis Lane. Support Council policy on promoting and enhancing green infrastructure. Gavray Drive LWS is a unique site for Bicester and CPRE support the designation of this land as a Local Nature Reserve as well as a Local Green Space. A new Town Park at Pingle Field is much needed and the preservation of the adjacent green space by the Oxford Road is important because Bicester is expanding further south and there is a lack of green space in this area. There should be no further development at Bicester Airfield LWS. A requirement for Bicester to have its own Green Belt should go along with the Garden Town designation and provide green infrastructure. The reinstatement/renovation of the Bicester Fields Park Tree Trail would enhance biodiversity and make the footpath between the Town station and Langford Village an improved amenity as well. Robust green infrastructure prevents flooding and this should be highlighted in policies. The amenity and biodiversity value of the Bure stream and other water courses in Bicester should be enhanced. The work on the Bure stream in Manorsfield Road has been successful in this regard and similar transformations would bring benefit. Pollution levels in the water (nitrate and phosphates) should be monitored. The contribution to green infrastructure made by existing formal parks and amenity spaces should be increased by planting to increase biodiversity and reduction of mowing frequency to allow wildflowers to bloom and set seed. An innovative project in Todmorden aims to increase biodiversity as well as local food production by rejuvenating neglected spaces and small corners in that town. There are many small pockets of land in Bicester that could be enhanced and cared for in this way bringing community and environmental benefits. Existing allotment sites should be protected and new sites found so more residents can grow their own food locally. Perhaps some of the smaller sites put forward for LP2 could be used for allotments to increase the town's green infrastructure. Cherwell Council could also pioneer a 'Garden Share Scheme'. Construction of Launton Grange care home, the electricity sub-station and Windrush Close housing have reduced the area of the 'linear park' intended for the south of Skimmingdish Lane. The proposal for a linear park round Bicester should be a policy in the LPR. Development of small sites within the town, other than 'brownfield sites' should not be allowed if the quality and area of Bicester's green infrastructure is to be increased. If housing supply is short, then the density of housing should be increased in strategic sites. CPRE support all the sites in Bicester that are put forward for LGS designation and consider that all fulfil the criteria as per the NPPF. Better and more frequent public transport between villages and town.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 26	Strongly objects to option 1.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 27	Support Option 1. Better public transport in locality to reduce car dependency.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 28	Support Options 1 and 2; both should be carried out. Strongly support option 1 but it is essential to protect and enhance existing green spaces and POWs. With the extent of development planned for Kidlington with loss of much Green Belt land, there must be sufficient funds to carry out both 1 and 2. Supports the designation of the Church Street Conservation Area and Bury Moor Fields as Local Green Spaces.

LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 29	Support Option 2. Any further outward expansion of the strategic site will cause unacceptable harm to the surrounding villages and countryside. Both of the proposals for largescale distribution centres in the vicinity of Ardley with Fewcott are an unwelcome intrusion into open countryside, entailing loss of farmland, damaging longdistance views, and bringing large numbers of HGVs into rural neighbourhoods.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 30	Support Option 1. Development in rural areas should be restricted to local needs and be mindful of local infrastructure. There may be some scope for some development to be redirected to wider areas. For example to support new employment in villages and limit travel from outside of the village and the wider district. However this should be strictly controlled, criteria based and ensure that rural areas remain characterful and landscape is protected. The current policy wording for housing in villages must be changed. Any housing number allocated to villages should reflect permissions given, not housing delivered – otherwise developers can keep seeking new permissions without building out existing allocations. This minor text error in current policy has led to a number of <u>damaging speculative applications being granted.</u>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 31	Option 1. CDC should always work with communities and particularly on numbers for each parish and all developments should be based on genuine need. Cherwell has largely met its 2031 plan for villages already. The 2011-30 Plan included a target of 3,031 new houses in rural areas. Since then 2,641 house have been built (or planning permission has been granted for). Thus 87% of the target has been achieved in 50% of the time. It is therefore highly likely that the target figure for 2030 will be well exceeded. An approximate assessment of the housing proposals in Appendix 2 – Schedule C Sites in the Banbury and Bicester areas (ie excluding Kidlington, Heyford and any development related to Ox Cam Arc) suggests that a further 35,000 houses (assuming a conservative density of 40 houses per hectare) could be included in the Plan. This figure, when added to the urban housing numbers, would in only ten years considerably exceed the top end of even the most unrealistic housing needs forecasts. This excludes all the other considerations regarding development in rural areas that the Plan should take account of, ie for example excluding building outside existing rural settlement areas, building only on brownfield land, etc. In summary,very few if any of the proposals for housing development included in Appendix 2 are probably required.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 32	Combination of both 1 and 2 would be appropriate.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 33	Option 3 in terms of flexibility as appropriate. The question is, how you define meeting the needs of the rural economy? Is the development of a <u>warehouse on the edge of a village contributing to the rural economy or to the broader Cherwell economy</u>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	Option 34	We could answer yes to both options. We are not quite sure why these are separate choices. We should both conserve and ensure proper guidance is in place. Both 1 and 2 are needed given the extent of development that may be included in the LPR. CDC should explain the relevant rules regarding Neighbourhood Plans which we learnt from the recent overruling of the Adderbury NP by the inspectorate. Frequent interaction with Parish Councils and communities is essential. A robust Dark Skies policy would be a valuable and critical addition.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	LPR-A-071	Strongly object. This land is the portion of Gavray Meadows LWS that lies east of the ring road (A4421) and is included in the River Ray Conservation Target Area. It must be protected as specified in policies ESD10 and 11 in order to preserve its function as a green corridor of high wildlife and potential amenity value for migration of wildlife in and out of the urban areas of Bicester. It will be even more essential to preserve this function when Wretchwick Green estate (Bicester 12) is built out, thus reducing the green space east of the A4421. The plans for Wretchwick Green were modified to respect and enhance the wildlife corridor function of the land south of the railway. Submitted plans for Bicester 13, land north of Gavray Drive (21/03558/OUT), also keep the Gavray Meadows LWS <u>and that part of the Conservation Target Area free from development</u>
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	LPR-A-208	Object. It will block the important wildlife corridor from Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site through Wretchwick Green (Bicester 12) and on to the adjacent Blackthorn Hill LWS.
LPR-B-526	CPRE Oxfordshire	LPR-A-132	Object. Cherwell District Council must be made aware that these sites are designated respectively as a Local Wildlife Site 62C01 and an SSSI. The former was surveyed in 2018 and the Thames Valley Environmental record centre report below supplies all the evidence that this site is of high nature conservation importance and is protected under adopted Local Plan policies ESD10, 13 and 17. The adjacent Bicester Airfield Local Wildlife Site will soon be reduced in both biodiversity value and size when two new developments which have planning permission are constructed. A third development promoted by Bicester Motion on the airfield is currently being considered by the council. CPRE is not satisfied that the biodiversity net gain from the proposed mitigations for the extensive loss of biodiversity can be achieved on Bicester Airfield. We consider that the preservation of the wildlife sites is essential to maintain the biodiversity of the locality and also the wildlife corridor from Bicester Airfield LWS. Site lends itself to delivery of biodiversity enhancements in order for other developments in the District to be able to deliver ‘net gain’. The development of this site for recreation and leisure would lead to increased activity and impact negatively on the resident wildlife.



LPR-B-527	Roger Colbeck	Milton	<p>Object. Adderbury and Bloxham are rural communities. Their growth in the last 10 years looks set to turn them into small towns but with few facilities, requiring travel by road to reach most facilities in Banbury. The road system was not designed for the large amount of traffic now using it and residents complain of noise and light pollution growing in Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury. The roads to the north and east of Banbury are better capable of handling the increased traffic from Banbury's growth than the south and west- any growth should be to Banbury's east and north. Development in the rural areas should be restricted to local needs. Neighbourhood Plans should control the growth of rural and village development and should not be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate operating under national guidance. The sites put forward in the parishes of Adderbury, Milton and Bloxham, do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor any of the previous consultation results. Development in Adderbury and Bloxham should be small scale so that these communities retain their identity as 'villages in the countryside'. Any development in Milton Parish should be very small scale respecting the conservation village and its environs. The proposed development of the old caravan park and its adjoining field should be the subject of a separate consultation with Milton villagers as it falls within the parish boundary but outside the village. That road traffic should not be allowed to grow further, that urban signage and lighting should not be sited in or around villages and the countryside but that these should be restricted to towns, that the overall landscape and character of the area should be protected and certain special individual features in the landscapes given special protection in addition, that tranquillity and reduction of light pollution should be a factor in decisionmaking. Settlements should be prevented from coalescence and local design features more strongly enforced, commercial and economic growth should be limited to specified urban areas and that improvement of the environment should be a major factor wherever previously developed land or greenfields are considered for development. I am very worried about the continuing encroachment of large housing estates close to existing villages in the southern area of Banbury.</p>
LPR-B-528	Amanda Fossey	Milton	<p>Object. Adderbury and Bloxham are rural communities. Their growth in the last 10 years looks set to turn them into small towns but with few facilities, requiring travel by road to reach most facilities in Banbury. The road system was not designed for the large amount of traffic now using it and residents complain of noise and light pollution growing in Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury. The roads to the north and east of Banbury are better capable of handling the increased traffic from Banbury's growth than the south and west- any growth should be to Banbury's east and north. Development in the rural areas should be restricted to local needs. Neighbourhood Plans should control the growth of rural and village development and should not be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate operating under national guidance. The sites put forward in the parishes of Adderbury, Milton and Bloxham, do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor any of the previous consultation results. Development in Adderbury and Bloxham should be small scale so that these communities retain their identity as 'villages in the countryside'. Any development in Milton Parish should be very small scale respecting the conservation village and its environs. The proposed development of the old caravan park and its adjoining field should be the subject of a separate consultation with Milton villagers as it falls within the parish boundary but outside the village. That road traffic should not be allowed to grow further, that urban signage and lighting should not be sited in or around villages and the countryside but that these should be restricted to towns, that the overall landscape and character of the area should be protected and certain special individual features in the landscapes given special protection in addition, that tranquillity and reduction of light pollution should be a factor in decisionmaking. Settlements should be prevented from coalescence and local design features more strongly enforced, commercial and economic growth should be limited to specified urban areas and that improvement of the environment should be a major factor wherever previously developed land or greenfields are considered for development. I am very worried about the continuing encroachment of large housing estates close to existing villages in the southern area of Banbury. There is no bus connection at all for Milton or any public transport. There is no pathway for cyclists or horse riders.</p>
LPR-B-529	Alexander Severn	Milton	<p>Strongly object. The services can not cope. As an example - Do you know that at this very moment, there are two sets of "ad hoc" road works and thus, one way traffic, between this hamlet and Bloxham. Never a week goes by without this road having a blockage of some sort, generally due it being dug up to repair a fault or provide a service to a new development. Traffic on the road linking these communities has now reached dangerous levels, both in volume and speed. The chicane at the Adderbury end has only caused frustrated drivers to speed ever more so, as they proceed towards Bloxham. Enough damage to this rural community has been done already.</p>

LPR-B-530	Victoria Malcher	LPR-A-077	<p>Object. Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District’s housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. The existing 2015 Local Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031. Twelve potential sites could provide a minimum of 3,250 new houses (adopting CDC’s Site Capacity Sense Check methodology- Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution para B.102 &amp; Policy Policy BSC 2) have been proposed around Adderbury including a large 60 hectare site between Twyford and the M40, stretching from the Kings Sutton Road to the Aynho Road. This compares to a current population of approximately 2,811. These proposals contradict Cherwell District Council’s own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Development contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. “Measures will be taken to mitigate the impact of development within the District on climate change. Distributing growth to the most sustainable locations”. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. Increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Development would be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. The current supply of housing more than adequately provides for housing demand. Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury’s natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Development would be contrary to Policy ESD 10. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA and according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Increased traffic congestion as a result of over-development has substantially increased vehicle emissions and has degraded ambient air quality for residents. This is of particular concern when severely congested roads with stationary traffic are located adjacent to schools and private residences. This is most noticeable on the Oxford Road/Anyho Road traffic light junction. Further development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage.</p>
LPR-B-532	John and Judy Critchfield	LPR-A-077	<p>Object. Amount of development has altered the character of the village. There is a danger that further development on the scale apparently envisaged (in particular surrounding Twyford) would mean that there is little more than a single field separating an extended Adderbury with an extended Bodicote that is generally seen as being subsumed within Banbury. Development would fundamentally alter the character of the village. There is also a danger that the development of sites proposed at the end of the village would increase the coalescence between Adderbury and Milton. The village would not have the resources to sustain the scope of development envisaged. The additional traffic would arise from the development Negative impact from noise pollution both arising from new housing and suffered by inhabitants of new housing that would be closer to the M40. Who would be able to access housing developed. I understand that houses in Henge Close (a recent development on the Milton Road) are currently on the market for more than £500k. That cannot be a resource that would enable young families wishing to start a life in the village. We note that the site information proformas state that Adderbury has extensive transport by bus, stating that bus routes include accessibility to Banbury and Oxford. This rather implies a wider network than is actually the case. In fact there is an hourly service that goes to Oxford one way and Banbury the other. In practice neither the buses nor the cycle lanes are used to the extent that would significantly reduce the dependence on travel by car to the areas served and many local areas are not served at all. The main effect on transport of building additional houses (in Adderbury and elsewhere) is likely to be an increase in the volume of car traffic. Adderbury only has one shop which is no more than a convenience store. There is no Doctor or Dental surgery in the village and people currently attend Banbury, Deddington and Bloxham surgeries. We believe these are also working at full or near full capacity. There is one Post Office, which is open two half days a week. There is only one primary school in the village which has increased it’s size by half. We believe that the expanded school is nearly full and understand that the school is unable to expand further. The proformas state that the sites have good road frontage via an access to Croft Lane. It is hard to see how this could be the case even once any development (even if the minimum number of houses were to be built) was complete and it is particularly difficult to see how the resources and equipment necessary for construction could be delivered: Croft Lane is not wide enough to accommodate two vehicles passing; road narrows and has houses either side; junction of Croft Lane onto the main High Street has obscured visuals due to the hedging at the end house; and, Croft Lane passes over a pavement before joining the main road. This would create a potential site for accidents. In the application the site is deemed ‘flat’. We agree that the smaller field and that the top corner of the larger field is reasonably flat. However, this is not the case for much of the area within the larger field, which drops away to a 1:7 gradient before the point at which the proposed site ends. The field is prone to flooding and could increase flooding elsewhere. There is intrinsic value in the landscape of the Sor Brook valley, which is enjoyed by many. This is recognised in the Adderbury Local Plan. It would be lost and there would be a danger that development would impact on the bio-diversity of the area</p>

LPR-B-532	D Planning for Blue Cedar Homes	Option 19	<p>Local Plan needs to make provision for elderly persons accommodation within the emerging Local Plan. The future need for specialist accommodation for older people broken down by tenure and type may need to be assessed and can be obtained from a number of online tool kits provided by the sector. The assessment can set out the level of need for residential institutions (Use Class C2). Many older people may not want or need specialist accommodation or care and may wish to stay or move to general housing that is already suitable, such as bungalows, or homes which can be adapted to meet a change in their needs.” [Emphasis added]. There is a Government imperative for Local Planning Authorities to ensure that adequate provision is made for all types of housing need and in particular for the elderly. It is important that this Local Plan calculates the specific need for all types of elderly persons accommodation during the Plan period. This includes provision for care homes, nursing homes, retirement village and bespoke elderly persons accommodation for owner occupation which enables elderly residents to downsize within the area that they have lived and then free up their accommodation further. It is not sufficient for the Local Plan just to specify support for the provision of elderly persons accommodation, we also believe that the Local Plan should identify specific sites for such accommodation. These sites in the main should be standalone and not included within larger residential allocations. Blue Cedar Homes specifically develop their own residential sites for elderly persons which are not part of larger residential allocations. Many of their locations are within rural settlement and it is important that policies for rural settlements do not prohibit such development i.e. many existing policies only allow infill and such policies frustrate the ability to bring forward sympathetically designed schemes which meet an identified local need. Careful thought must be given to how such policies are drafted and we would suggest that the policies for rural settlements enable small scale retirement schemes to come forward either within or adjacent to settlement boundaries on suitable sites.</p>
LPR-B-533	Ben Malcher	LPR-A-077	<p>Object. Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District’s housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. The existing 2015 Local Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031. Twelve potential sites could provide a minimum of 3,250 new houses (adopting CDC’s Site Capacity Sense Check methodology- Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution para B.102 &amp; Policy Policy BSC 2) have been proposed around Adderbury including a large 60 hectare site between Twyford and the M40, stretching from the Kings Sutton Road to the Aynho Road. This compares to a current population of approximately 2,811. These proposals contradict Cherwell District Council’s own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Development contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. “Measures will be taken to mitigate the impact of development within the District on climate change. Distributing growth to the most sustainable locations”. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. Increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Development would be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. The current supply of housing more than adequately provides for housing demand. Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury’s natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Development would be contrary to Policy ESD 10. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA and according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Increased traffic congestion as a result of overdevelopment has substantially increased vehicle emissions and has degraded ambient air quality for residents. This is of particular concern when severely congested roads with stationary traffic are located adjacent to schools and private residences. This is most noticeable on the Oxford Road/Anyho Road traffic light junction. Further development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury. Proposals to increase residential development in Adderbury will place unnecessary and restrictive burdens upon the health, mental wellbeing and accessibility of the village.</p>
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Call for sites Promotion - Land east of South Newington Road, Bloxham	<p>Land east of South Newington Road, Bloxham is promoted for housing. A development concept masterplan has been supplied.</p>

LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 1	supports the vision of CDC to ensure that “there is a choice of energy efficient, well-designed market and affordable homes to meet our needs.” In that context, it notes that the Vision recognises Cherwell’s position within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and the “significant opportunities” that the Arc provides in relation to delivering a “healthier, more prosperous, resilient and sustainable” future and COVID-19 recovery. The implications that this has in terms of the quantum of development that CDC should plan for to 2040 is discussed in response to Option 30. Notwithstanding the position in relation to the quantum of development that CDC should seek to plan for, WDH welcome CDC’s Vision that the District’s rural communities will realise their full potential, not least by providing “new rural models of transport and service provision” to complement existing services in order to create a more sustainable and wellconnected rural network where communities can thrive and benefit from their connectedness to higher order urban areas. As discussed in WDH’s response to Option 30, that is a wholly appropriate vision for rural areas in the context of the challenges that they face, and thus it is imperative that the LPR positively plans to meet the needs of such areas. WDH’s response to Option 30 highlights how that should be achieved through focusing residential development to sustainable rural settlements, which the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, paragraph 79) highlights can “enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities” and “support local services.” The provision of housing in rural settlements should, therefore, be identified as a key aspect of CDC’s Vision, and that should clearly be aligned with the planned provision of infrastructure.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 2	WDH welcome CDC’s intention to fully meet its own housing needs (Key Objectives (KO) 1 and 2) and to achieve that by distributing development to Cherwell’s most sustainable locations. In that context, the merits of sustainable villages such as Bloxham are noted, and are discussed in WDH’s response to Option 30. Given the constraints relating to other main settlements (discussed in further detail in response to Options 18, 22, 29 and 30), the focusing of development to sustainable rural settlements would be a wholly appropriate approach to meeting CDC’s housing needs in accordance with NPPF paragraph 79. As such, CDCs intention to “support vibrant rural communities by seeking to protect and expand local services and facilities” (KO31) is welcomed, and the role that residential development can play in achieving that is noted.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 6	WDH recognise the importance of providing affordable housing to meet the evidenced housing needs of the District, and as such recognise the intention of any affordable housing policy. It is important, however, that the approach taken by CDC to meeting those housing needs is justified on the basis of appropriate evidence and that the affordable housing policy is deliverable over the plan period (as required by NPPF paragraphs 35b and 35c respectively). As such, the approach advocated by WDH is for CDC to commission a Housing and Economic Needs Assessment that considers the housing needs (including affordable housing needs) of the District, and recommends an affordable housing requirement for developments in the District. It is critical, however, that any suggested affordable housing requirement is taken into account in a Viability Assessment that seeks to ensure that “the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine the deliverability of the plan” (PPG Ref. 10-002-20190509), in order to ensure that the policy requirement is “deliverable” in accordance with NPPF paragraph 16b. If it is the case that the affordable housing requirement identified based wholly on the District’s needs alone would render development sites unviable and is therefore not deliverable, CDC should seek to cap that affordable housing requirement to an amount that would ensure the deliverability of development sites in the District. That may well be the case given the District’s acute affordability issues and lengthy affordable housing waiting list. In addition to that, CDC’s affordable housing policy should allow for flexibility in a site’s affordable housing delivery to take account of scheme viability and other sitespecific factors. In that event, WDH note that uplifting the level of CDC’s housing delivery above its base housing needs would increase the overall level of affordable housing need delivered in the plan period, and would begin to redress the affordability issues in the District that have been explicitly referred to in recent appeal decisions (such as Appeal Ref. 3228169). That approach to increasing development to facilitate affordable housing delivery is particularly relevant to rural areas given that CDC’s ‘Delivering our Options’ consultation document specifically references the particularly acute affordability issues in rural areas and the need for affordable rural housing. In that regard, it is also noted that CDC should seek to maximise both market and affordable housing delivery in such areas by directing growth to sustainable rural villages (see WDH’s response to Option 30).
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 7	As with the District’s overall affordable housing requirement (Option 6), CDC’s affordable housing tenure requirement should be informed by a Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment that considers the needs for each tenure type, as well as the Government’s requirements in relation to ‘First Homes’ / Discounted Market Sales. As with Option 7, the affordable housing tenure requirement should be taken into account in a Viability Assessment that seeks to ensure that “the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine the deliverability of the plan” and the policy requirement and plan as a whole is deliverable.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 8	WDH note the Government’s guidance in relation to the adoption of the nationally described space standards (NDSS), with a Written Ministerial Statement dated 25th March 2015 having confirmed that “the optional new national technical standards should only be required [...] if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered.” As such, for CDC to justify their adoption of such standards, up-to- date and appropriate evidence is required that demonstrates an actual need for dwellings that comply with the NDSS. Moreover, should that evidence justify the imposition of an NDSS requirement, that requirement should be considered in a comprehensive viability assessment that considers all of the plan’s requirements. That viability assessment should take into account that the density of their development will inevitably reduce as a result of NDSS dwellings being more spaceintensive. In addition to that, it is also suggested that CDC carefully considers the implications of the imposition of such standards on housing affordability (as a result of the additional cost of extra floorspace being passed onto buyers) and the potential impact on development delivery rates.

LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 9	Whilst WDH recognise the importance of providing accessible housing as part of meeting the District's housing needs, and the needs of specific groups, the NPPF clearly states that any policies should be justified based on up-to-date and proportionate evidence (NPPF paragraph 35b), such as a Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment that considers the need for accessible housing in the District. That assessment should take account of the distinct difference between a need for purpose-built accessible housing (i.e. care homes and supported housing) and accessible dwellings in 'estate-like' residential development, and clearly recommend requirements for M4(2) and M4(3) housing on that basis. Should that evidence identify that an accessible housing requirement is justified, it should be tested within a viability assessment that considers the cumulative cost of all policy requirements and ensures that the requirement does not render sites unviable and therefore undeliverable. Any policy in relation to housing accessibility should also provide sufficient flexibility to respond to site-specific factors that may influence the delivery of accessible housing, as well as viability.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 10	Whilst the intention of the policy option is recognised, CDC should not seek to require sustainability measures that go above and beyond the Government's adopted Building Regulations unless there is clear evidence to justify that approach. Rather, CDC should seek adherence to the latest Building Regulations both to ensure that the policy is in accordance with national policy and to ensure that it does not quickly become out-of-date. The approach of referring to the latest Government standards would reflect that the Government's clear objective in recent years, through the updating of its adopted Building Regulations and the emerging Future Homes Standards, is to create a standardised approach to energy efficiency and sustainable construction that is clear and is able to be implemented by developers as cost-effectively as possible. To seek to go above and beyond the Government's own requirements would, therefore, both be contrary to the Government's policy approach and would undermine the economies of scale for product manufacturers, suppliers and developers that the Government is seeking to achieve. As such, it is WDH's clear position that any policy relating to sustainable construction, and sustainable measures more widely, should seek adherence with the latest Building Regulations (or replacement standards). However, if CDC are minded to exceed those requirements, then they must justify that based on an up-to-date evidence of need, and should consider the uplifted requirement in a viability assessment of the plan's cumulative policy requirements.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	WDH note the benefits of promoting a 'fabric first approach' to increasing the energy efficiency of new houses and therefore managing climate change. Indeed, William Davis has adopted a holistic fabric first approach in their house type design as an alternative to renewable energy infrastructure, which seeks to reduce each dwelling's inherent energy demand. The approach also includes the installation of water saving appliances to aid water efficiency, highly efficient gas condensing boilers to reduce fuel costs, and gas savers and waste water heat recovery systems to reduce carbon emissions. This fabric first approach has a number of clear benefits, notably that it is built into the property for its whole life and achieves the aim of reducing CO2 emissions. In comparison to renewable technologies there is no maintenance required, and it avoids the concern as to whether the technologies are actually being used. Therefore, CDC's policy approach towards energy efficiency, sustainable construction and managing climate change should allow greater flexibility by including reference to the potential inclusion of other measures of mitigating climate change such as the above approach. In addition, and as set out in response to Option 10, CDC are reminded that any such policies should not seek to go beyond the standards set out in the most recent Building Regulations (or replacement standards) given the Government's clear objectives to create a standardised system in that regard.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Question - Green Belt	Paragraph 5.6.5 of CDC's 'Developing our Options' consultation document states that any new county-wide strategic matters relating to the Oxford Green Belt will be addressed by the Oxfordshire Plan. In that context, CDC are reminded that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified (NPPF paragraph 140), and that strategic policy-making authorities must first demonstrate that it has "examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development" prior to releasing Green Belt land. That includes maximising the potential of suitable, available and achievable non-Green Belt sites that are located in sustainable locations. In that context, WDH's response to Option 30 highlights the suitability of their site at Land East of South Newington Road, Bloxham; which should therefore be allocated ahead of any Green Belt release.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 12	Whilst it would appear most sensible to focus off-site biodiversity net gain compensatory measures to locations that would maximise their effectiveness (i.e. Conservation Target Areas / identified Nature Recovery Network locations), WDH does not have a specific preference or objection to any of the options of delivering an offsite biodiversity net gain (BNG) set out in Option 12. Indeed, WDH would be in favour of a policy that clearly sets out the specific range of mechanisms that the Council would consider appropriate for BNG compensation in a manner that is "clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals" (NPPF paragraph 16d). As part of that, the policy should clearly set out the required rate of offsite compensation (in terms of cost per unit), which must be justified based on up-to-date evidence and should be clearly set out in the policy.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 13	Whilst the intention of a natural capital audit is understood, such an assessment is not required by national policy or guidance, and indeed CDC have not yet provided evidence that justifies the need for the assessment. Moreover, it is not clear how the environmental aspect of the audit would vary from a biodiversity net gain assessment (also required by the plan), nor is it clear what the proposed methodology for the audit would be as yet. As such, it suggested that the plan does not require a natural capital assessment for those reasons. However, should CDC continue to pursue that approach, it is important that a standard methodology / calculator is developed to ensure consistency when assessing proposed developments (i.e. similar to the BNG calculator). That would ensure that the policy is clear and easily enforceable (NPPF paragraph 16d).
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 14	The policy should set out that any considerations in relation to children's play provision / contributions should first assess the existing children's play provision and needs of specific localities, and then should seek to determine how best respond to any identified need. The policy should provide flexibility to respond to those needs through the most suitable measure, whether that be through on-site play space provision or through a contribution to existing facilities. The policy should set out that decisions on the appropriate approach to be taken should be informed based on site specific circumstances and opportunities present to expand existing facilities nearby.

LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	It is noted that any design policy within the new local plan should not merely replicate the guidance of the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) or the Government's National Model Design Code, and should not include generic guidance. That also stands for any Supplementary Planning Documents or Supplementary Planning Guidance documents adopted by CDC after the adoption of the emerging plan, and indeed CDC should also take into account how any SPDs would relate to the Government's own design coding agenda. It is therefore suggested that it would be more appropriate for design guidance to be prepared at the local level where there is a need to do so, perhaps through CDC preparing areaspecific design SPDs. That would ensure that guidance is specific and relevant to the specific key design considerations of localities.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Whilst the principles of the '20-minute neighbourhood' are noted, the imposition of those principles for plan-making purposes could overlook the merits of focusing development within rural settlements. That is a key imperative of the NPPF, which outlines that development in rural areas can "enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities" and "support local services" (NPPF paragraph 79), and is clearly required in the District as a result of the depletion of services and facilities and increased housing affordability issues experienced in Cherwell's rural areas. The need for residential development in Cherwell's rural areas is discussed in more detail in WDH's response to Option 30. As such, it would be appropriate to allow some leeway to rural settlements when considering elements of the 20-minute neighbourhood model, which reflects that villages (such as Bloxham) can develop into a 20-minute neighbourhoods as a result of the infrastructure that new developments can support, and similarly that groups of villages can collectively become neighbourhoods in themselves when support is given to enhancing and maintaining the services and facilities within them.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Whilst the proposed transport and connectivity approach in principle, the plan as a whole (including any transport-based policies and the overall spatial strategy) should recognise that "opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas" which NPPF paragraph 105 states should be "taken into account in both planmaking and decisionmaking." The plan should reflect, therefore, that whilst sustainable transport solutions may not currently be as available in rural areas, the focusing of development in such locations can provide the investment required to provide or enhance sustainable transport opportunities, and improve the level of accessibility that Cherwell's significant rural population can benefit from
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 16	WDH do not have any specific preference relating to the options set out. However, should CDC pursue the option of requiring new development to provide digital connections and be futureproofed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs, CDC must take that the cost of that into account in a comprehensive Viability Assessment.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 17	In relation to the latter question, whilst it would be acceptable to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) on the basis of individual settlements, CDC should recognise that rural centres frequently work together to provide the day-to-day services and facilities required to support the population of their catchment, and thus groups of settlements often effectively act as a combined neighbourhood. The IDP's approach should reflect that, perhaps by setting settlement-specific requirements for the District's larger settlements and grouped requirements for the District's rural villages.
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 18	further strategic growth and development at Banbury should be limited to reflect its sensitive landscape setting and the need to maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages, as well as to ensure that CDC does not exacerbate the strain that has already been placed on the town's infrastructure as a result of the considerable development in Banbury in recent decades. Those are clear issues that have been recognised by CDC both in this Developing our Options consultation paper, and in previous stages of the LPR. The Developing our Options paper highlights that Banbury has been a key location for housing growth for many years, with 3,612 dwellings having been delivered since 2011, largely at strategic allocations on the edge of the town. That is set to continue throughout the plan period, with existing commitments as of 31st March 2021 totalling an additional 2,747 dwellings at Banbury. Similarly, there has been significant employmentbased development in Banbury in recent years as a result of the approach taken in recent local plans. That level of growth has clearly resulted in strain to the settlement in recent years, with the consultation document highlighting that "there are several challenges for Banbury including deficiencies in physical and social infrastructure, as well as issues with air quality and the impact of development on the surrounding rural landscape." That was reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that accompanies this consultation document, which found that there were a higher number of favourable outcomes for the lower-level growth option than the higher-level growth option. That SA highlighted that recent development has resulted in an "already congested road network" with associated "significant" air quality issues and that significant additional development in the town without substantial infrastructure provision may exacerbate those issues, and also contribute to climate change issues. Given that there is still a large amount of development to come forward in the near future, that alone gives sufficient justification to reduce the amount of residential development allocated in the town in the upcoming plan period. In addition to that, the SA highlights that Banbury has a sensitive historic environment, that further expansion of the town "risks encroachment on historic villages (mostly with designated conservation areas) and / or registered parks and gardens", and that Banbury is surrounded by an "inherently sustainable landscape"; which is also identified as a key constraint by CDC's consultation document. The SA finds in relation to that sensitive landscape context that "these factors lead to a concern with higher growth", which is a sensible conclusion given that substantial growth could only be accommodated by locating development at sites at the town's more visually prominent peripheral areas at the threshold to its sensitive rural surrounds. In the context of those constraints and given that, by the SA's own admission, there is not a "particular housing need associated with Banbury" it would clearly be a wholly inappropriate approach to accommodate significant housing growth in the town in the upcoming plan period. Indeed, pursuing that approach despite the above concerns would ultimately impact on housing delivery and the deliverability of the spatial strategy, thus undermining the plan itself. Rather, it would be more appropriate for CDC to disperse residential development more equally across the District by directing development to sustainable villages that are well-connected to the main service centres of Banbury and Bicester given the constraints to development in those locations.

LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 22	<p>Bicester “is one of the fastest growing areas in Oxfordshire” with the majority of development in recent years having “been focused on a small number of large, strategic sites.” Indeed, the Council’s adopted Local Plan identified some 10,000 dwellings to be delivered at Bicester to 2031, as well as 140ha of employment land; which is clearly a significant level of growth. CDC’s consultation document outlines that, whilst over 2,879 dwellings have been delivered since 2011 at Bicester’s strategic sites and permissions are in place for a further 4,039 dwellings, “several of the sites have been slower to deliver homes than anticipated and the total [number of houses] delivered is somewhat short of the projections set out in the 2015 Plan of 5,359.” That document finds that this is due to a number of reasons relating to the size, scale and complexity of the developments, delays in provision of key infrastructure required to support the development, and some sites obtaining full planning permission later than was originally anticipated. Clearly those constraints, particularly in relation to the delay in providing key infrastructure, must be dealt with before directing further residential growth to Bicester. Indeed, whilst CDC’s SA identifies that new development would facilitate the significant and strategic road infrastructure provision needed to facilitate the development itself and also realise transport and air quality-based improvements, it is important that CDC take a realistic view of the amount of development that could come forward in the plan period, and allocate land accordingly. In the context that previously allocated sites and their associated infrastructure have not come forward quickly and are currently experiencing issues, the amount of additional development that is likely to come forward is limited. CDC’s spatial strategy should reflect that by limiting the amount of development directed to Bicester. Furthermore, providing for a more modest amount of housing in the upcoming plan period would avoid potential issues in relation to market absorption of housing, and associated housing delivery rates. Indeed, the Letwin Review of Build Out Report (October 2018) highlights that there is a limit to the level of housing that the market will ‘absorb’ where that supply is a homogenous supply in a concentrated area; which would increasingly be the case should CDC continue to focus growth to the peripheries of Bicester (and similarly Banbury). The Letwin Review outlines that the limit to market absorption can dictate level of delivery from large sites in such areas, which would likely occur should CDC continue to direct growth to the settlement in the upcoming plan period. That, in addition to the clear constraints to development set out above, further calls into question the deliverability of any potential further development sites in Bicester. As such, CDC should limit the amount of additional development at Bicester to allow those issues to be resolved and existing commitments to finally come forward. Instead, and so as to meet the District’s housing needs and also tackle some of the key matters arising within the District, it would be more appropriate to disperse residential development across the District rather than depending on delivery from Banbury and Bicester as in recent years. CDC should achieve that balance by directing development to sustainable and wellconnected villages</p>
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 29	<p>WDH believe that the emerging Local Plan should not seek to focus any additional development to Heyford Park due to the limited capacity of the new settlement to accommodate additional significant growth both from a deliverability and suitability perspective. As such, CDC should limit development only to the element that is already planned for. Principally, WDH has concerns as to whether any further allocations adjacent to the settlement would be deliverable, given the degree of the original allocation that has not yet been delivered. CDC’s Developing our Options consultation paper sets out that the 2015 Local Plan allocated the RAF Heyford site as a location for a new settlement of c. 2,350 dwellings, of which 1,670 dwellings are remaining to be delivered in the plan period to 2040. Given the amount of supporting infrastructure that is required to service an entirely new settlement, it is not inconceivable that those final dwellings may only be delivered towards the latter years of the plan period. As such, the settlement could only accommodate a small element of housing after the completion of the initial development, particularly once any additional site(s) have prepared and submitted a planning application, received permission, negotiated a Section 106 Agreement, discharged all conditions, undertaken precommencement works including infrastructure provision, and delivered dwellings. In that light, there is no certainty that any additional development could come forward in this new settlement prior to 2040. In any event, it is considered that the settlement is unsuitable for further large-scale development, with CDC’s own consultation document highlighting that the settlement had “many constraints which include landscape, heritage as well as considering how sustainable the site is and whether or not accessibility in accordance with a more sustainable transport hierarchy can be achieved.” The settlement’s constrained nature is reflected in the SA assessment of the scenarios for growth in the settlement, which concludes that there is a significantly higher amount of negative impacts associated with a higher level of growth than the lower level of growth. The commentary supporting that highlights that the settlement is “relatively poorly connected” giving rise to concerns in relation to transport and climate change matters, that historic environment is a “primary constraint to further growth at Upper Heyford” by virtue of its “wideranging sensitivities”, and that there are “inherent landscape sensitivities that are a constraint to further growth at Upper Heyford” in addition to that. As such, there should only be very limited growth (if any at all) at RAF Upper Heyford given that the settlement is clearly unsuitable for large-scale development and that it is not certain that any further development beyond the extant allocations would be deliverable. It would be more appropriate for CDC to disperse residential development more equally across the District by directing development to sustainable villages that are wellconnected to the main service centres of Banbury and Bicester given the constraints to development in those locations.</p>

LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 30	<p>WDH support the latter option of “directing disproportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs”, which would be an entirely justified and appropriate approach given the District’s current supply of housing and the constrained nature of its larger urban areas (such as Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington, and Upper Heyford) to deliver further significant growth in addition to that recently delivered and currently committed. CDC’s emerging local plan will be required to identify sufficient land to meet the surplus housing requirement; which is likely to be significant. As set out in WDH’s response to Options 18, 22 and 29, the capacity of Cherwell’s larger settlements of Banbury, Bicester and RAF Upper Heyford to accommodate significant residential development in addition to the development that is already committed is limited. it would not be appropriate to continue to pursue the approach taken in recent local plans of allocating considerable land in Bicester, Banbury and at RAF Upper Heyford. That approach would fail to reflect the unsuitability of such locations, and in any case would not provide certainty that development would come forward as required. It is critical, therefore, that CDC moves away from that approach to development in the upcoming plan period. it would be more appropriate to pursue a more dispersed spatial strategy for growth in the upcoming plan period, reducing the focus on the constrained settlements of Bicester, Banbury and RAF Upper Heyford. CDC should achieve that by directing an increased level of residential growth to sustainable settlements that have a healthy range of services and facilities, and are wellconnected to those higher order settlements. That re-focused spatial strategy would provide more certainty that the required level of development will come forward through the plan period, by reducing CDC’s dependence on a small number of large allocations in the District’s two main urban areas that have previously experienced delays in their delivery (as above). Instead, the proposed dispersed spatial strategy would provide a wider portfolio of sites that would have much-needed variations in site size, developer (and as such house types), and target housing markets, That approach would be wholly in accordance with the NPPF. Increased rural development can play a key role in dealing with those acute socio-economic issues. much of the rural development in recent years has come forward via speculative, unplanned developments. Those are clearly issues that CDC could and should begin to address in the upcoming plan period (as opposed to deferring them to Neighbourhood Plans and such). Critically, that scale of development would also begin to redress the housing affordability issues that are prevalent in rural areas, and the associated socioeconomic matters discussed above. To distribute that increased level of development amongst rural villages in a sustainable manner, an audit of rural villages to ascertain their current and potential sustainability is required to inform a ‘rural settlement hierarchy’ (as suggested by CDC in Option 32). That audit should take into account a settlement’s housing needs, its suitability to accommodate development in terms of the services and facilities available in the settlement, what could be provided alongside further development, its accessibility to nearby higher order centres, and the availability of suitable, available and achievable sites in and around the settlement. Growth should be distributed accordingly on that basis.</p>
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Bloxham	<p>WDH note the merits of Bloxham as a sustainable location for growth given its readily available range of services and facilities, connectivity to surrounding urban areas, lack of planning constraints (such as Green Belt designation), and in the context of its role as the District’s second largest village after Kidlington (not included by CDC as an option for further growth due to planned development and Green Belt designation). Indeed, Bloxham benefits from a range of services and facilities within the settlement itself, including convenience stores, a petrol station, a post office, a doctor’s surgery, a pharmacy, a dentist, a primary school, a secondary school, and places of worship. It also benefits from a number of pubs, bars, restaurants, takeaways and cafes, as well as a good range of recreational / sports facilities including a Sports Centre with adjacent playing pitches, a separate multi-use games area and cricket pitch, a recreation ground with a play area, a pitch and putt golf course, and a network of public rights of way connecting the settlement to the wider countryside. In addition to that, the site is wellconnected to nearby settlements. The 488 bus service that travels through Bloxham via the A361 (South Newington Road / High Street / Bloxham Road) provides hourly services on weekdays and Saturdays to Chipping Norton, Hook Norton and Banbury. That provides access to the services, facilities and key employment opportunities within those settlements (particularly Banbury), and also provides an opportunity for multimodal journeys, with Banbury Bus and Train Stations providing access to the wider region. As such, Bloxham is clearly an inherently sustainable location for growth, and therefore is a suitable location to accommodate an increased amount of residential development; particularly given the constraints to development in nearby Banbury as set out above.</p>
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 31	<p>clear preference in response to Option 31 is for CDC to allocate specific sites in sustainable rural settlements to meet identified housing needs through the process of this ongoing local plan review, rather than to leave that to potential future Neighbourhood Plans. That is particularly critical in the context of the challenges that are being experienced in Cherwell District. As identified by CDC, the previous approach of not seeking to allocate specific sites in rural areas resulted in housing developments coming forward at unplanned sites through speculative planning applications, which has previously meant that “it has been more challenging [for CDC] to coordinate infrastructure improvements and supporting services.” That has resulted in strains to key infrastructure, services and facilities in rural areas, which are considered by CDC to be “relatively limited” and increasingly depleted in recent years. To avoid that scenario in the upcoming plan period, it is important that suitable sites are identified at the beginning of the plan period through the local plan review process, to ensure that any infrastructure required can be properly planned for and delivered where and when it is required to support development. Allowing for that to be deferred to neighbourhood plans does not provide that certainty, and leaves open a window of opportunity for further speculative applications on unplanned sites whilst those plans are being prepared. That is particularly the case given that not all neighbourhood areas have an intention or the resources required to bring forward neighbourhood plans. As such, it would be more suitable for CDC to bring forward sites based on its spatial strategy and site selection methodology, and indeed that approach would ensure that CDC could begin to remedy some of the key issues arising in rural areas by positively planning for their needs at an early stage of the plan period.</p>
LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Option 32	<p>CDC’s approach to directing growth to the most sustainable rural villages on the basis of a rural settlement hierarchy should be informed by an audit of rural settlements that takes into consideration the current availability of services and facilities, the potential for the delivery of new and enhanced services and facilities alongside development, and their accessibility to higher order settlements. That audit should also take account of the amount of suitable, available and achievable land within or adjacent to the settlement. As set out in WDH’s response to Option 30, Bloxham should be identified as a sustainable location for growth given the services and facilities from which the settlement offers, and given its accessibility to higher order service centres including Banbury.</p>



LPR-B-534	Define for William Davies Homes	Question - Settlement Boundaries	CDC should identify sufficient residential allocations in rural areas through the emerging local plan review, rather than deferring that to Neighbourhood Plans. Once those allocations have been identified, it would be sensible to define the settlement boundaries around the settlement and those allocations. To sit alongside that, it is assumed that the plan will include an 'open countryside' policy that will set out the types of development allowed outside of the settlement boundaries. It is important to note that such a policy should provide some flexibility for other types of development where there are material circumstances that justify the development, or if the public benefits outweigh any identified harm
LPR-B-535	Louise Aitken	LPR-A-077	Object. Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District's housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. The existing 2015 Local Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031. Twelve potential sites could provide a minimum of 3,250 new houses (adopting CDC's Site Capacity Sense Check methodology- Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution para B.102 & Policy Policy BSC 2) have been proposed around Adderbury including a large 60 hectare site between Twyford and the M40, stretching from the Kings Sutton Road to the Aynho Road. This compares to a current population of approximately 2,811. These proposals contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Development contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. "Measures will be taken to mitigate the impact of development within the District on climate change. Distributing growth to the most sustainable locations". Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. Increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Development would be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Development would be contrary to Policy ESD 10. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA and according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Increased traffic congestion as a result of over-development has substantially increased vehicle emissions and has degraded ambient air quality for residents. This is of particular concern when severely congested roads with stationary traffic are located adjacent to schools and private residences. Further development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury. Proposals to increase residential development in Adderbury will place unnecessary and restrictive burdens upon the health, mental wellbeing and accessibility of the village and place developer profit ahead of recreational, social and community needs and vastly increase social exclusion. This is of particular relevance given the lack of affordability of new developments in Adderbury.
LPR-B-536	Zoe Morgan	LPR-A-175	Strongly object. The village environment and inclusive community would be compromised if the village were to drastically change. Development at this scale would be detrimental to the village. If the site was developed then the promised bypass would not be possible. The development would not be sustainable with the lack of services and fragile infrastructure.
LPR-B-537	Kevin Willis	LPR-A-175	Object. Development would fundamental change to the character of a conservation village. It is out of scale to the size the village and not sustainable because need for services; school; sewerage etc. Designated land would be needed for any future bypass. Traffic will increase with huge new developments proposed to A361 M40 access.
LPR-B-538	Kenneth Wright	LPR-A-077	Object. There are limited facilities. Adderbury has already seen its fair share of new housing and does not need anymore. Croft Lane narrows very sharply with no room for a footpath.
LPR-B-539	Patricia Wright	LPR-A-077	Object. Development would destroy the unique nature of Addersbury. Crioft Lane is not a main road and unsuited to carry more traffic.
LPR-B-539	Patricia Wright	LPR-A-156	Object. Development would destroy the unique nature of Addersbury. Crioft Lane is not a main road and unsuited to carry more traffic.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 1	Welcome the 3 key themes identified but believe more consideration needs to be given to the needs of the near third of Cherwell's population that live outside the urban areas. In particular: more emphasis on dealing with the already intolerable levels of traffic which threaten "healthy place shaping" in many villages including Middleton Stoney; more emphasis on "good design" in new development, and a real focus on using existing land banks/infill before new greenfield sites are approved; support greater digital connectivity but would welcome more details of what is proposed; and, disappointed that the plan makes no provision for improving green spaces in rural areas such as upgrading bridleways and footpaths.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 1	Vision should explicitly recognize and agree to tackle the unsustainable burden of existing traffic flows through villages before new development is authorized. There should be explicit recognition of the need for people in rural areas to have easy access to green spaces too through a reinvigorated network of public footpaths.

LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 2	Support promoting net zero carbon for new developments but believe more consideration needs to be given to ensuring road infrastructure and resources need to reflect new developments. In particular the assertion at para 4.2.3 that Cherwell has excellent transport links does not reflect the fact that much of the existing infrastructure cannot cope. This will be exacerbated if as proposed 44% of the new region's planned new housing is allocated to Bicester. Support key objectives 13,14,15 and 26 but are not sure that the Plan follows through on them. In particular there should be provision for local communities to designate and preserve green spaces, and new industrial building should be focused in existing urban conurbations
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 3	A combination of all of the above options but would make a strong plea for limitations on the building of new warehouses which provide little quality employment and exacerbate existing traffic problems.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	too much recent development has been of poor design and built to low standards.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 14	This section is a good example of the "urban" mindset underlying this Plan. There should be support for villages to maintain and improve playgrounds.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	The Plan needs to focus much more on alleviating the blight of current traffic problems.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Development of Bicester has been uncontrolled, ugly with the town centre being hollowed out. A new approach is clearly necessary.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 23	We do not favour any further green field development, particularly to the West of Bicester.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 29	We do not favour any further development of Heyford Park. There is still no plan to mitigate the considerable traffic consequences of existing/planned development.
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-540	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	Middleton Stoney	Middleton Stoney is not appropriate since they would significantly impact on the green spaces in the village, add to traffic problems. There is no local need.

LPR-B-541	Margaret Easterbrook	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-541	Margaret Easterbrook	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-541	Margaret Easterbrook	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-541	Margaret Easterbrook	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.

LPR-B-541	Margaret Easterbrook	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-542	Peter and Aniea Ruggins	Sibford Gower	Object. The scale of development is inappropriate. Development would result in loss of agricultural land and extensive damage to habitats and negatively impacting the water table. The site is in the highest part of the village and is next to an area of outstanding natural beauty. Roads are inadequate with no footpaths. The doctors surgery is extremely busy. Sibford Gower is a dark vsky village. Development of brownfield sites in and around towns is more sustainable where amenities are available.
LPR-B-543	Land & Partners for Mr & Mrs Bishop	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the west of Hook Norton Road, Sibford Ferris	Land to the west of Hook Norton Road, Sibford Ferris is promoted for housing. Update of HELAA321.
LPR-B-544	Rosconn Strategic Land for HRN Stilgoe	Call for Sites Promotion - Land south west of Adderbury	Land south west of Adderbury is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-545	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey Limited	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north and south of Milton Road, Bloxham	Land north and south of Milton Road, Bloxham is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA100. A vision document and sustainability analysis technical note have been supplied.
LPR-B-546	The Bulford Trust	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of The Moors,	Land north of The Moors, Kidlington is promoted for mixed use development. Update to HELAA152. A preapplication report and transport feasibility report have been supplied.
LPR-B-547	Savills for Lone Star Land	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of Broughton Road, Banbury	Land north of Broughton Road, Banbury is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-547	Savills for Lone Star Land	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Bretch Hill, Balmoral Avenue, Banbury	Land at Bretch Hill, Balmoral Avenue, Banbury is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA035. The representation is supported by an indicative masterplan.

LPR-B-548	Christina Goldsworthy	Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury	<p>Object. Adderbury and Bloxham are rural communities and their growth in the last 10 years looks set to turn them into small towns but with few facilities, requiring travel by road to reach most of those facilities in Banbury. The road system was not designed for the large amount of traffic now using it. Residents are subjected to increasing levels of traffic, noise, light and environmental pollution in Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury, with consistent calls for reduced traffic and reduced speed. The roads to the north and east of Banbury are better capable of handling the increased traffic from Banbury's growth than the south and west - any growth in Banbury should be to Banbury's east and north. Development in the rural areas should be restricted to local needs only. Neighbourhood Plans, updated regularly to accord with regional planning demands and defined settlement boundaries, should control the growth of rural and village development and should not be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate operating under national government guidance. The sites put forward in the parishes of Adderbury, Milton and Bloxham, do not meet any of the Council's stated objectives, nor any of the previous consultation results. Development in Adderbury and Bloxham should be small scale so that these communities retain their identity as 'villages in the countryside' and do not become part of and wholly reliant on the facilities of Banbury. Any development in Milton Parish should be very small scale respecting the conservation village and its surrounding area. The proposed development of the old caravan park and its adjoining field should be the subject of a separate consultation with Milton villagers as it falls within the parish boundary but outside the village, in open countryside. Urban signage and lighting should not be sited in or around villages and the countryside but that these should be restricted to town. The overall landscape and character of the area should be protected and certain special individual features in the landscapes given special protection. Tranquillity and reduction of light and environmental pollution should be a factor in decision-making on development of any kind.</p> <p>Settlements should be prevented from coalescence and local design features more strongly enforced. Commercial and economic growth should be limited to specified urban areas. Improvement of the environment should be a major factor wherever previously developed land or green fields are considered for development.</p>
LPR-B-549	D A Bowdler	LPR-A-185	<p>Object. Further development here would be disastrous for our neighbours and us. The area is seen to be a green buffer between Banbury and the attractive landscape of this part of South West Northamptonshire. To build on the north side - east of the motorway junction - would ruin the openness of the rising countryside to the east of the town. Our lives would be negatively affected by noise pollution and road fumes, and the development would inevitably ruin the wildlife, impacting the flora and fauna of the area. None of the major landowners or developers live within the hamlet of Nethercote. The proposal of a 'relief' road from the A422 to Overthorpe Road will only add further misery to the inhabitants of Nethercote. Other residents and I have to use Ermont Way and Overthorpe Road for access, and cannot see how said relief road will benefit the town. Very few vehicles going to and from Overthorpe Road Industrial Estate travel east towards Brackley. Nethercote is well known for flooding in the surrounding fields, which would inevitably worsen and increase with the hard surfacing of roads, aprons, service yards etc. This water would need to drain somewhere if the fields are built upon, which would cause increase flood risk to our homes</p>
LPR-B-550	Felice Rea	LPR-A-104	<p>Object. It is in a rural area with very poor access and would be shoehorning properties into a field where there are no amenities and which is subject to flooding. There are more accessible options in terms of access and local amenities. The proposed site has very poor access and will require significant changes to road infrastructure which there is not space to do. The site is at the bottom of Chapel Close which ends with a bridleway and to a small gravel track to 4 properties. The Close is already a busy single lane road with no pavements and will not be able to handle further traffic. The bridleway is well used and with no pavements in Chapel Close is already hazardous with traffic flow. Chapel Close is a narrow lane and in most parts cannot accommodate two way traffic. More traffic would be dangerous for residents and users of the bridleway. Plot 4 is a sloping site with a large pond above it and to one side is a water sewage treatment plant which I believe only has capacity for existing volumes. Plot 4 does suffer flooding, the whole area including Bridleway does get extremely waterlogged. Further development is likely to lead to further flooding. There is an abundance of wildlife and further development would destroy natural habitat. Development of the site will lead to both light and noise pollution which will further have a detrimental impact on the village. Clifton is a very rural location which does not have the capacity or infrastructure for significant development. There are no pavements on most of the main road through the village making it dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians and access difficult to nearby Aynho and Deddington unless driving. There is no bus service either which will therefore increase road traffic in an area not designed for heavy flows. The main road to Aynho is narrow in parts, single lane and no pavements. There are very few businesses in Clifton so any development will increase commuter traffic without any benefit to the local community and will have a detrimental environmental impact.</p>
LPR-B-551	Wood Group UK for Bloor Homes	Option 30	<p>It is critical that the Local Plan provides a clear strategy for the Rural Areas. It is important that the role that rural areas will play in meeting housing need is recognised in the Local Plan. The Options Paper uses the term 'rural areas' but this is not defined. It is considered essential that the Local Plan provides a clear spatial strategy for the Rural Area which has sufficient granularity and a clear settlement hierarchy that sets out the role of relevant settlements that contribute to a sustainable pattern of development and help meet future development needs within the District. This approach would help ensure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations in the Rural Area and that existing infrastructure can be best utilised or enhanced where needed.</p>

LPR-B-551	Wood Group UK for Bloor Homes	Option 30	<p>The Local Plan should plan positively to ensure that the role of the Rural Area in meeting future needs is optimised. Limiting development to meet local needs (however these are defined) could be overly restrictive and result in a mismatch between supply (suitable sites) and need.</p> <p>The Local Plan should provide a clear strategy that helps direct development to the most sustainable settlements within the Rural Area. The scale of development should at least reflect needs arising within the area and recognise that an element of market housing will be required to help deliver affordable housing. Growth also has a role to play in supporting existing services, facilities and public transport networks. Planned growth can also provide tangible enhanced facilities and services. Rural sites also have a role to play in ensuring a mix of sites (in terms of size and location) is available within the Borough. Small and medium sized sites also have a role in helping to ensure that the Council can demonstrate a 5 year land supply over the life of the Local Plan. Rural sites, in the right location, can also help support existing infrastructure in locations that reduce the need to travel (relative to more isolated rural areas). The Options document also recognises that affordable housing need remains high in Cherwell and that more needs to be done in order to deliver affordable housing. Development should be directed to sites that are the least constrained. Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 101 Reference ID: 41101-20190509) sets out the approach to identifying development requirements (which clearly goes beyond consideration of local need). Reference to NPPF175, NPPF161 and NPPF32 is made in relation to how the local plan should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value; the plan should take a sequential approach to the location of development; and that the sustainability appraisal of the local plan should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gain). It is noted that the land at Banbury Road LPRA-056 is not subject to any significant constraints and is in a sustainable location.</p>
LPR-B-551	Wood Group UK for Bloor Homes	Option 31	<p>Allocating sites in the Local Plan is the most secure way of meeting needs. Working with communities to allocate specific sites in the Local Plan is considered to be the most secure way of meeting future development needs. It has the advantage of providing certainty in terms of delivering the spatial strategy, meeting housing requirements and associated infrastructure needs and may be appropriate in those instances where a NDP has not progressed. This approach would also provide certainty on delivery and for infrastructure planning. The Council should provide a parish level figure where an NDP is genuinely being prepared in order to ensure that proper provision for future development needs is met. This is consistent with the role of the local authority as the strategic policy making authority. The Council could also clarify what it considers to be a strategic site that should be identified in the Local Plan, with NDPs identifying nonstrategic sites. The Council should consider a policy similar to the South Oxfordshire Local Plan H4 which provides a policy safeguard for those instances where a neighbourhood area has been declared but a plan is not progressed. In the case of Deddington, it is clear that this is a sustainable location for growth and the north is an obvious direction for growth. Consideration could also be given to a trigger mechanism to make it clear that further development on the edge of sustainable settlements (including Deddington) can be brought forward if the Housing Delivery Test (for needs arising within the District) shows that the delivery is not being achieved. This could form an element of the Council's action plan as required by the NPPF. An example is noted from the Inspector at the Scarborough Local Plan. The LPR-A-056 site can accommodate 150 homes and should be allocated in the Local Plan on that basis. This will make a significant contribution to local housing need identified in the Parish Profile.</p>
LPR-B-551	Wood Group UK for Bloor Homes	Option 32	<p>The identification of Service Villages is Supported but the other elements of the hierarchy may need refining in order to deliver a sustainable pattern of development. Deddington is considered to be appropriately identified as a service village (at the top of the hierarchy), given the range of existing services. It is also noted that it performed relatively well in a study published in 2009 that appraised the 33 most sustainable villages in Cherwell (including Deddington) against a set of transport criteria to determine the most suitable locations, in transport terms, for housing development. Deddington was within the 14 top performing villages. It is noted that the adopted Local Plan identifies the service villages as suitable for 'minor' development but does not define this. Infilling and conversions are also allowed but, in all cases, development is restricted to the 'built up limits' of villages which is considered to be overly restrictive. It is also noted that the current settlement hierarchy acknowledges but does not differentiate between Service Villages that are in (or partly in) the Green Belt, which would clearly affect their ability to accommodate growth. Deddington is not in the Green Belt and not therefore constrained in this respect.</p>
LPR-B-551	Wood Group UK for Bloor Homes	Question - Settlement Boundaries	<p>The identification of settlement boundaries is not considered appropriate because it would need to be evidenced based and could be overly restrictive. The presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF also means that such boundaries would not necessarily provide the certainty that communities think they provide. Planning positively for future growth would provide greater certainty. If boundaries are to be identified they should <u>take account of allocated sites.</u></p>
LPR-B-551	Wood Group UK for Bloor Homes	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Banbury Road, Deddington	<p>Land at Banbury Road, Deddington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA323</p>

LPR-B-552	Ellie and Gary Hawtin	Adderbury	strongly object. Recent development has increased housing in the village by circa 20% in a short amount of time. The village has already had to deal with the pressures of the extra houses without any increase in amenities or infrastructure so to consider any further development on any large scale would be seriously detrimental to village life. The rural feel of the village has already been compromised with recent development and the expansion on the scales proposed will significantly impact the village. The character and community of the village will be lost and is not something that can ever be recovered once gone. The size of the proposed development is not in keeping with a village environment. Indeed much of the proposed development contravenes the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village. This will result in Adderbury becoming morphed into the village of Bodicote and/or Bloxham. The size of the proposed developments is not proportionate to the existing size of the village. Developments of such size should be restricted to towns not small villages. The village would be more than doubled by some of the proposed developments. The proposed developments would no longer allow views of the village church. The infrastructure in the village is not sufficient at present let alone if further development took place. Congestion on the main road running through Adderbury (A4260) is already severe. Further increase in traffic would result in gridlock at certain times of the day. The amount of traffic is already dangerous, with the proximity of the school. The pollution of traffic from this stretch of road is worrying with many children using the roads to walk to school. The road is also the main route for ambulances travelling into the JR hospital from Banbury, it would be chaos with further traffic and emergency services trying to access the hospital in Oxford. The village has a network of fields, footpaths and ecological and wildlife habitats which have already been disturbed by recent developments and will be further impacted by the proposed developments. There will be a detrimental increase in pollution from traffic, noise and light.
LPR-B-553	Darius Welsh	LPR-A-204	few Green spaces within walking distance for residents in Bicester. As well as being an orchard and wildlife area it serves as a local community hub. It is maintained by a number of local volunteer groups who also aim to integrate the orchard into the wider Bicester community and infrastructure. The Langford Community Orchard Group is a successful group who not only maintain the orchard, they provide a social environment for people to join and enjoy the sense of well-being that comes from the feeling of contributing and achieving something for your community. It also serves as an education and skills provider. Having these areas as designated green spaces will support CDC with its objectives of Healthy Place Shaping and Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change. I also think <u>they are perfectly placed to support CDC in providing options to live healthier lifestyles</u>
LPR-B-553	Darius Welsh	LPR-A-125	invaluable green space for the residents of Langford village and Bicester. It is appreciated by residents as one of the few natural green spaces to enjoy within walking distance and is popular for dog walking, sports activities and family outings. It is being squeezed out of existence by expansion on its borders from transport work on the east, industry on the north and retail units on the west. Without a protective intervention this will completely disappear under the pressures of development. Any development on the site will put unmanageable traffic pressures through the Langford Village estate.
LPR-B-554	Bruce Duncan	Adderbury	Object to the proposals to expand towards Milton. Adderbury is a village with very few facilities. It has already been substantially increased in size without any enhancement of its facilities. It is now in danger of being made into small towns that will have to depend on Banbury for most of their needs. The roads connecting Adderbury, Milton and Bloxham to Banbury are not designed to carry the amount of traffic that currently uses them, let alone any increase in that traffic. This is particularly so on the road connecting Adderbury to Bloxham that runs across the South of Milton.
LPR-B-554	Bruce Duncan	Bloxham	Object to the proposals to expand towards Milton. Bloxham is a village with very few facilities. It has already been substantially increased in size without any enhancement of its facilities. It is now in danger of being made into small towns that will have to depend on Banbury for most of their needs. The roads connecting Adderbury, Milton and Bloxham to Banbury are not designed to carry the amount of traffic that currently uses them, let alone any increase in that traffic. This is particularly so on the road connecting Adderbury to Bloxham that runs across the South of Milton.
LPR-B-555	David and Beryl Greenwood	Deddington	Deeply concerned re development on green field sites around Deddington. Existing infrastructure does not allow for more building on the scale proposed. The developments will result in the increase in traffic on the roads resulting in increased congestion at the Deddington Traffic Lights (already problematic at peak times) and the limited capacity of the school and Health Centre. Footpaths are narrow and inadequate and the streets are <u>narrow and totally unsuited to accommodate a modern influx of development</u>
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 1	While we support the broad vision and much of the detail, we think that there is not enough emphasis on the importance of finding a balance between the development necessary to achieve this vision, on the one hand, and on the other the conservation and enhancement of the natural world, the landscape and open countryside that survives today in Cherwell, but which may be gone within <u>a decade if not properly managed</u> .
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 2	KO 1. The definition of need is highly controversial. Support for housing and employment should be for meeting local needs, not aspirational targets for continued growth (an unsustainable concept when considered alongside environmental and climate change targets). It is particularly welcome to see objective KO5 supporting farming. We also think that KO9 makes a similar point to our comment above about the need to recognise the character and beauty of Cherwell's landscape etc. We note that KO10, which we fully support, would involve a very considerable change in development control policies, which currently do not succeed in meeting this important objective. We particularly support KO28 in the context of meeting the needs of a rural population. For example, health policies at the present time remain focussed on serving urban populations, and fail to provide sustainable primary healthcare services for people living in the countryside (see also our <u>comments on the Health Impact Assessment</u> ).
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 3	Support options 1 & 3. We do not support unbridled development at transport interchanges because of the huge impact this can have on the countryside. Limited local employment in larger villages is also supported

LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 4	We are very concerned about the proliferation of large-scale B8 developments in open countryside in and around Cherwell. We think that the impact of huge logistics centres (principally vast warehouses), if approved, will negate much of the Vision set out by the 2040 Local Plan. For example: the loss of farmland, the effect on longdistance views, the great increase in HGVs in formerly quiet rural areas, the increase in traffic volumes on major roads, the scale of use of unsustainable construction materials, and the loss of distinctiveness of a largely rural District. There should therefore be, in particular, no strategic rail freight or road transport hubs in Cherwell.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Supporting Employment	Require provision of bus services from the major urban centres (Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington) and railway stations to all new employment sites which will employ in excess of 100 people. We support more working at or near homes, encouraging ultrafast broadband and better mobile phone signals. The preference would be for development that supports higher wage, higherskilled employment and training rather than leisure, retail and hospitality. Local "green" jobs in research and new technology should be supported.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 5	Some change of use to residential could be permitted, but with an overall aim to foster a vibrant community, making use of specialist providers and small-scale enterprises, rather than a dormitory culture.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Supporting our Town	Encourage more markets including specialist markets e.g. crafts, food, local artists, antiques and second hand, eco or recycled etc.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 6	support option 1: increase the percentage of affordable and rented on all developments, not just 10 or more. Increase percentage of homes for young families and bungalows for disabled and/or elderly.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 7	support Option 1. As wages are tending to fall behind house prices, we suggest increasing the social rented element to, say, 35% and reduce the affordable/rented to 65%. We strongly agree with the statement in 5.4.11 to "seek social rented homes over other types of affordable housing such as affordable rent or intermediate housing, noting that a social rented home is the only truly affordable housing option for many low-income households in the district." No mention of shared ownership – this should be encouraged and supported with a policy requiring a minimum number of such dwellings for all developments of 10 or more homes.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 8	support option 1. It should be a minimum
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Separation Distances	Yes, there should be such a policy, but it must be accompanied by another policy requiring developers to plant trees on street frontages.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 9	Higher accessibility standards should be set. New homes with no possibility of a ground floor bedroom/ bathroom are just storing up problems for the future.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Travelling Communities	Permanent, properly managed sites should be provided where travellers can reside for periods of time.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Housing Policies	Offsite construction methods should be actively supported to minimise local disruption, and to support sustainable technologies. It is difficult to see how policy on infilling can be dealt with under the heading of design. It is often more a question of density, access, or impact on historic layouts.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 10	Many developers seem reluctant to adopt high levels of sustainable design and construction. Option 3 would encourage more emphasis on this. For example, the use of locally-available sheep's wool for insulation should be encouraged.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	agree that bespoke policies per building will be necessary
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 11	Option 1 - Identify – yes; but allocate sites – no; best left to the expert market. Require all new-build residential and industrial properties (inc. warehouses) to install solar pv (with grid output connection) and/or solar hot water generation sufficient to meet the electricity/ hot water needs of the property.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	There should be a requirement to provide electric car charging infrastructure generally and to take the opportunity to provide points in all new build housing.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Green Belt	Bicester should have a Green Belt to protect surrounding villages and countryside. MCNP Forum would welcome involvement of its member parishes in designing a suitable process for considering the nature and extent of such a Green Belt.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 12	Yes, in that order. However, CDC should also press developers harder to provide net gain on site wherever possible.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 13	support option 2



LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 14	Option 3 seems to be the most flexible and forward-looking, but it should not be used as an excuse for providing minimum levels of facility. Standards must remain high. Provision for older children must be considered e.g. facilities and building suitable for use by youth groups. If there is nothing for them, those living in rural situations can become disenfranchised resulting in antisocial behaviour. We would like to see active support for existing playgrounds in rural villages too since the cost of refurbishment can be prohibitive
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 15	All three options may be needed. Sports facilities should, above all, not involve having to travel great distances, and be accessible by public transport.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Local Green Spaces	MCNP put forward over 30 Local Green Spaces and the Examiner approved 24 of them. In the forthcoming review of our NDP we will be identifying more such spaces for designation.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	We support the focus on retaining Ancient Trackways, as there are several such features in the MCNP area. Conservation areas should be specifically mentioned in policies. The MCNP has a policy (PD4) that DM officers have found difficult to enforce. It requires applicants to submit a Heritage Impact Statement in cases where development might adversely affect a Conservation Area. We would like to see this requirement supported in a Local Plan policy.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The assessment of good design and "beauty" requires expertise. It is not something that can easily be done by a Development Management officer with no training in design or architecture. The Local Authorities with the most successful track records in persuading developers and other applicants to improve their designs have done so by employing suitably qualified and experienced staff. We would like to see Cherwell move in this direction.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The diagram on p.57 is interesting. For some of the villages in our rural area nearly all of the features are in place. Notably absent, however, are "community health and well-being facilities" and "keeping jobs and money local". The former is a fault of current health service policy, which favours GP services etc as urban facilities
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Reducing the need to travel should not be any different for rural areas. Perhaps time taken rather than distance travelled would be a better measure of impact. The relocation of key services, such as primary health care facilities, to locations such as Heyford Park, if well-connected with public transport, would greatly benefit – in particular – older people in the community who currently have to travel considerable distances for clinic and hospital appointments.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 16	support more homeworking, supported by the necessary infrastructure. There is still very poor mobile and WiFi coverage in many rural villages e.g. in areas of Heyford Park, Steeple Aston etc. This is needed to enable more home working and to keep children safe when they are out and about. Option 1 is essential. Digital infrastructure is still not yet regarded as an essential utility alongside water, electricity, etc
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Transport Policies	MCNP has found it frustrating that transport issues, particularly those relating to traffic volumes, are the responsibility of OCC as Highways Authority. We would like to see CDC adopt policies that more effectively protect rural areas of the District from increasing levels of traffic and pollution. Rural areas are in increasing danger of being marginalised by poorly designed traffic systems that effectively increase congestion and reduce access.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 17	support Option 1; we would support the preparation of a new IDP to identify infrastructure required to support any new allocations within the Local Plan.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Primary care, hospital and other health provision has been omitted. This is an important gap that should be addressed. See also our comments on the Health Impact Assessment. MCNP would support the re-opening of Ardley station for passenger use.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 22	support Options 2 and 3. Bicester housing could be built higher (as apartments) rather than sprawling further.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 23	Further development at Bicester must be limited to protect surrounding countryside and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 24	support option 1
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 29	It is the view of many of the parish members of MCNP Forum that Heyford Park must remain within the limits established in the existing Local Plan, on the grounds that the impact of any outward growth on the surrounding villages and countryside would cause unacceptable harm. Land within the existing boundary could potentially be utilised for housing need post2031. However, if a future need is identified for further housing development at Heyford Park, MCNP Forum would wish to engage with CDC and the applicants to discuss how best this need can be met. The Forum would favour any such provision being based on specific identifiable needs for the area including affordable housing for particular segments of the population. Such housing would need to be accompanied by public transport infrastructure improvements. There is also an identified need for a cemetery in line with MCNP policy.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 30	support Option 1 and we have locally-specific policies, PD1 to PD6, in the MCNP.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 31	MCNP's approach has been to use Option 2, apportioning an approximate number of additional dwellings permitted in the Plan period, for Category A and B villages. These numbers will need to be reviewed during 2022.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 32	We have generally supported the categorisation of villages, and refer to it in the rationale for our own policies PD1 and PD2. However, some of our villages have been frustrated by the absence of periodic review of the categories. For example, where pubs and shops have closed, or bus services have been reduced, continued Category A status of a village can put it at risk of unwanted development. Status should be reviewed by CDC on an ongoing basis.

LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Settlement	We have done so successfully in our neighbourhood plan policies, and would encourage other villages to do likewise.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 33	option 1
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Option 34	Option 1
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	A more important issue for us in the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan (MCNP) Forum is: there has been no contact from CDC with our NP group regarding the Local Plan Review. As we had such a helpful start to our "made" existence in May 2019 with the workshop held with CDC officers, it is particularly disappointing that there has been no real followup. We appreciate that numbers of officers have left CDC and new staff have taken up posts, and also of course that Covid has presented real difficulties, but the lack of continuity in the important relationship between our NDP and the Planning Department needs to be addressed. It might perhaps help if an individual officer was assigned to lead on communications, and for it to be a proactive role. This is particularly important as we approach the need for a Review of the MCNP in 2022. We also play an important role in the Oxfordshirewide organisation that supports NDP groups throughout the County, and there is great potential for it - ONPA (Oxfordshire Neighbourhood Plans Alliance) - to work with Cherwell DC to encourage and support embryonic NDPs in the District.
LPR-B-556	MCNP Forum	Health Impact Assessment	<p>comments in relation to rural services: Page 41 Access to services: this section points out that access to services is a significant problem for an ageing population in rural parts of Cherwell. This issue has been taken up by MCNP Forum with several references in our NDP to the need for more primary care facilities to be established. One project we have promoted alongside CDC is the need for a new primary care centre to be established at Heyford Park to serve people living in the neighbourhood (an estimated 3,800 people live within a threemile radius of Heyford Park in addition to the 8,000 Heyford Park residents expected by 2031). CDC has consistently supported this idea and the Dorchester Group has earmarked a site for a new primary care facility in its Masterplan for the development. Unfortunately, OCCG has consistently refused to give support to this proposal. However, some progress has recently been made after a successful appeal at national level supporting the establishment of a new pharmacy at Heyford Park with 3 associated clinical rooms. This will allow patients of the Alchester Medical Group (AMG) to be seen at Heyford Park for the majority of their care including access to the associated pharmacy which will dispense their prescriptions. AMG is also committed to expanding this service into a full Branch Surgery once numbers of registered patients are sufficient to justify this. This new service will create the basis of an opportunity to develop one of the 20 minute "health and wellbeing facilities" referred to on page 57, aimed at offering rural residents better access to local services. Similar opportunities may occur in other rural areas of Cherwell. This could be complemented by a new rural bus service operating say 68 times a day linking the villages in this part of the neighbourhood plan area. This could be an employment opportunity for people wishing to run a community transport service.</p> <p>However, we should also reduce the need to travel into Oxford / Banbury / Bicester for local outpatient services which could easily be provided on a local basis, accessing funds from new NHS funding for digitally-enhanced services such as mobile X-ray units, especially as Heyford Park is the base for most of the current mobile scanning services in Oxfordshire. Some of the housing at Heyford Park (say 30 - 50 housing units) should be allocated for key workers in health and social care on a rental or shared ownership basis to boost recruitment of these vital staff. This would attract key younger staff newly qualified and looking to start NHS careers in Oxfordshire. We particularly note the following on p.39: 5.2 POPULATION • There has been a marked increase in the number of elderly people compared with other age groups in Cherwell. • The level of services and facilities in the rural areas is generally declining. We would therefore expect to see policies in the Local Plan that address these findings. There are existing plans for a 45- 60 unit Extra Care housing scheme at Heyford Park, which we expect to see come to fruition over the next few years.</p>

LPR-B-557	James Castle	LPR-A-077	<p>Objects to LPR-A-077. The proposed development contradicts and does not support KO1, KO23, KO8, KO9, KO13, KO16, KO28 of the local plan review doc and contradicts Strategic Objective 12 (SO) of the adopted local plan. Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District's housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. Existing 2015 Local Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031. 12 sites totalling 109.28ha, providing circa 3,250 new homes are proposed around Adderbury; compared to the current population of 2,811 (2011 census). Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. development on these sites expressly contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. "Measures will be taken to mitigate the impact of development within the District on climate change. Distributing growth to the most sustainable locations". Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. This risk is not only from a sheer volume perspective but clear links with increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development of this land would be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. It has been clearly demonstrated that the current supply of housing more than adequately provides for the housing demand, therefore there is no further need for housing development in this location. Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development on these sites would be contrary to Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. This area should remain free of substantial new build structures. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA (Conservation Target Area – Other Sites) and as such, according with Policy ESD 11; development which would prevent the aims of a CTA being achieved will not be permitted. The proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development would result in the loss of the remaining open space to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Increased traffic congestion as a result of this overdevelopment has therefore substantially increased vehicle emissions and has degraded ambient air quality for residents. This is of particular concern when severely congested roads with stationary traffic are located adjacent to schools and private residences. This is most noticeable on the Oxford Road/Anyho Road traffic light junction but now as a consequence of increased traffic volumes vehicles are often queuing along the High Street in Adderbury as far as Chapel Lane. Further residential development in Adderbury decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury. KO23 specifically guides against unsustainable and irresponsible development of valued green space, countryside and conservation area land in relation to Cherwell's towns and in this specific case, its villages. The Cherwell Plan notes that c.21,734 of new housing supply is required. However, since 2016, completions have averaged 1,265 per year. In addition, the area has over 8,000 homes with permission that have yet to be built and further land capable of accommodating 8,600 homes which has been allocated for development, but which has yet to receive planning permission. Based on current build rates and current planning consent together with existing available sites, Cherwell has over 13 years of underutilised supply to meet future demand. Any development on this land would be contrary to Adderbury Local Plan Policy AD5: Local Gaps. The Neighbourhood Plan defines</p>
LPR-B-558	Agneta Monkell	Adderbury	<p>Fully supports the objections put forward by WARA in separate rep. Would like the Councils response to the pattern of applications being refused, repeated and approved on the third go. Urbanisation of the english countryside is the most important aspect. A simple solution would be rectangular communal garden squares surrounded by blocks of flats; saves land and works perfectly well. In other European countries, roughly 50% of new builds are blocks of flats which preserves the countryside. In England the corresponding figure is 15%. Suggests reading a chapter of Jeremy Paxman's book "the english, a portrait of a people" which sets out the irreversible and devastating consequence of England turning in to a sprawling suburbia.</p>
LPR-B-559	Kathy Yorke	Sibford Gower	<p>Questions how the services and infrastructure will cope with an additional 350 homes. The proposals seem totally inappropriate.</p>
LPR-B-560	Lisa Arts	LPR-A-086	<p>this area has already experienced a significant increase in housing, resulting in disruption to local wildlife, antisocial behaviour, increased traffic and also vehicle speeding (evidenced by the need to introduce traffic calming measures). Additional housing developments would not only exacerbate these problems in the local area but would also impact Adderbury as a whole. The community feeling within the village would be lost, the scenery would be affected, footpaths would be disrupted and traffic congestion would be increased further. There is already limited parking space in the village for amenities such as the hairdressers. Furthermore, additional housing will cause Adderbury to lose its rural and charming village character.</p>
LPR-B-561	Thomas Wootton	LPR-A-178	<p>The overall land submitted for potential development through the plan is c.770 hectares of which site LPR-A-178 covers 60 hectares almost 8% of the overall submission. If the 60 hectare site was fully developed this would dramatically increase the overall size of Adderbury and could potentially change the feel of "village" life forever. This development would also result in the loss of local farmland used for walking and exercise where often wildlife, crops and livestock provide connection to the great British countryside and support wellbeing. If this site is developed it would also add to the other sizeable developments on the south side of Banbury which could lead to an overwhelming pull on existing infrastructure. This could also lead to the eventual deterioration of the boundaries between Adderbury and Banbury.</p>

LPR-B-561	Thomas Wootton	General	pose the question of awareness re this consultation. From my limited interactions there seems to be an overall lack of awareness unless you have social media. With this in mind I assume the council is comfortable the communication strategy adequately considered all demographics and levels of digital literacy
LPR-B-562	Colin Galloway	Adderbury	Strongly objects. Proposed development is totally out of proportion to the village facilities. The current road structure is quite unsuitable if approval is given to all these development sites. We have had several new developments over the last few years which have caused huge congestion within the village and on the road to Banbury. We also feel that a proper public consultation with MAXIMUM publicity should have been given to this project. Most people in the village are completely unaware of the plans.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Call for Sites Promotion - Land south of Green Lane, Chesterton	Land south of Green Lane, Chesterton is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA359. A vision document has been supplied.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 1	generally supports the proposed vision, but has no specific observations on its content.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 2	KO 1, Wates considers that land should be allocated to meeting housing needs in-full, including an appropriate quantum of any unmet need as may arise from neighbouring authorities. With regard to KO 2; agree that it is essential that the new Local Plan supports home working, in order to reduce the need for daily travel. This potential also needs to be reflected in the spatial strategy, as rural communities may benefit from recent changes in working practices and commuting, such that they are better able to accommodate future development. KO 31, it is agreed that supporting vibrant rural communities is a key objective, particularly so because (outside of Bicester and Banbury, and where the district adjoins Oxford) Cherwell is largely rural. Wates adds that Chesterton (where it is promoting land for residential development) is a particularly suitable location for new housing, as the settlements benefits from good public transport connections into Bicester. The frequency of the existing bus service is also set to increase as a consequence of the Great Wolf development at Bicester Golf Course (where a S016 obligation will provide a subsidy for the route). It is also the case that pedestrian and cycle infrastructure between Chesterton and the Bicester, has been greatly improved through the introduction of the new parkland and routes situated to the east Chesterton / west of Vendee Drive. The Park and Ride on the A41 / Vendee Drive junction is also made more accessible as a consequence of these improvements, and this provides very frequent services between Oxford and Bicester. A Vision Document (illustrating the proposed development) is provided at Appendix 1 to this representation. A Location Plan, which also identifies local services in Chesterton, is provided at Appendix 2. An Illustrative Masterplan is provided at Appendix 3.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 3	Wates promotes land primarily for residential development. However, employment land and/or employment generating uses sometimes form part of Wates' holistic masterplanning and placemaking proposals. Based on this experience, Wates maintains that the success of an employment site depends on a wide range of factors, including the sectoral focus and operational nature of potential occupiers. This is indeed recognised at NPPF paragraph 83. Large logistics centres (for example) are typically successful when located in close proximity to the strategic road network. Lastmile distribution facilities require proximity to population centres. Bicester and Banbury have been particularly suited to capturing these uses, as shown by recent schemes at Wendlebury / Chesterton. This will help to generate additional employment opportunities for residents of these villages. Wates anticipate that the main urban centres will continue to provide a focus for officerelated development. However, as a consequence of the pandemic, smaller settlements now have greater potential to support employment, particularly so as remote working has emerging as a credible and widespread practice. As a result, there has been a tangible growth in small-scale office hubs / flexible spaces in rural locations, as well as significant demand for new home working dwelling extensions and garden annexes. Consistent with the above, Wates remarks that home-working is a particularly sustainable basis for employment, as the propensity to commute (by motorised vehicle) is reduced. The potential to improve the sustainability of large and small villages (and to revitalise local shops and other facilities), through residential developments that are genuinely designed to enable home-working, should be factored into the Local Plan options. This will help to ensure that the Local Plan accords with the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 84 and 85 and will contribute to achieving net zero carbon emissions.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 4	The NPPF is clear (at paragraphs 82 and 83) that Local Plans should identify and meet employment needs of different sectors and proactively encourage economic growth. As such, only option 3 complies with national planning policies.

LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - Supporting Employment	KO 2 identifies supporting home working as a key objective for the new Local Plan, in order to reduce the need for commuting / daily travel. There is also some discussion regarding home working within other parts of the consultation document, particularly in relation to 'liveable neighbourhoods', digital infrastructure, and transport and connectivity. However, the Local Plan and the evidence base should be further developed to explore the implications of the trend towards remote working in greater detail. This is necessary because the focus of local economic development may have changed in quite important ways. For example, many companies now have less of an operational imperative to maintain largescale office footprints, when compared to pre-pandemic levels. Conversely, the potential for remote working means that highly-skilled employees now have much greater flexibility regarding where they live. One implication of this change, is that it is perhaps less important (from the perspective of promoting local prosperity) to capture new inward investment in the form of (for example) a physical new headquarters building. Conversely, it has become more important to provide an attractive location for a company's skilled and well-renumerated employees to live. Cherwell (as an attractive Oxfordshire district) is well-placed to attract highly skilled workers who might have traditionally worked in London. New housing development at rural villages is would serve to drawin such people, whose high levels of disposable income is likely to reinforce the viability of local services.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 6	The affordable housing requirement applied through the new Local Plan should respond to evidence of need. However, it must be based on a comprehensive Viability Assessment. This needs to account for all projected infrastructure requirements, in order that planning obligations (cumulatively) do not impede successful delivery. Wates maintain that such an approach is necessary in order that the new Local Plan achieves consistency with the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance relation to 'Viability and plan making', as referenced at NPPF paragraph 58.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 7	The tenure mix should be based on detailed Plan-wide evidence, taking account of the cumulative impacts of all planning obligations on development. Such matters will need to be considered through a comprehensive Viability Assessment.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 8	The NPPF at footnote 49 indicates that local planning policies may make use of the nationally described space standards (NDSS), but only where the need for such a standard can be justified. With respect to affordable housing (and in Wates' experience), Registered Providers in Oxfordshire (and elsewhere) will typically require that all affordable units, which they will adopt, are built to accord with the NDSS. In effect then, this is already the established, conventional requirement, which the new Local Plan could apply. However, at this stage, Wates would remark that the evidence cited in support of the application of the NDSS appears only to relate to affordable housing provision. There is then no specific presented evidence that indicates that market housing should meet with the minimum standards. Nonetheless, Wates would raise concerns regarding the proposal to apply the NDSS as a minimum requirement for all market and affordable dwellings. Certainly, most volume housebuilders do (in general) now seek to design their house types to comply with the NDSS. However, there may well be instances where it is not possible to meet the standard, because of the circumstances of a particular development and the characteristics of a site. Likewise, there is a need to provide variety and choice, and a blanket minimum requirement may preclude innovations through off-site manufactured housing, custom and self-build developments, and low-impact formats, such as so-called 'tiny homes'. Nonconventional housing stock will play an important role in improving affordability and reaching net zero targets. Wates maintain that a better approach would be to regulate development proposals through general development management policies, that allow for amenity to be considered in context.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - Separation Distances	Wates remarks that where Local Plans and/or supporting SPDs strictly apply minimum separation distances, this tends to result in lower development densities overall. To this it is added that the updated NPPF places a greater emphasis on design, including achieving tree-lined streets. Whilst that's generally to be welcomed, the requirement to provide tree-lined streets will add to land-take and will also drive down achievable densities. A similar effect occurs through the incorporation of swales and other aboveground SuDs / Green Infrastructure features. Wates' primary concern is that the cumulative impacts of design policies on development density need to be properly considered. If a favoured policy approach results in lower average densities, there will be a corresponding need to allocate more land for development.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 9	It is increasingly commonplace for Local Plans to require a percentage of new homes to be wheelchair accessible, in accordance with Part M(3) of the Building Regulations. It is similarly common for Local Plans to require a percentage of new homes to be provided as 'accessible and adaptable' dwellings, in accordance with Part 4(2). Wates consider that it may be appropriate to introduce such a requirement in the new Local Plan. However, it is important that any such requirement is based on detailed evidence of need and is factored into the Planwide assessment of viability.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 10	Wates endorses the move to zero carbon development and supports Local Planning policies that seek to achieve this. However, in this instance, there is a case for ensuring that any additional local standards are agreed on an Oxfordshire-wide basis. This will ensure consistency across the County, which will make it easier for developers to respond to any requirements. In addition, it is remarked that additional standards are likely to impact on development costs are therefore viability. Therefore, any proposed local standards need to be costed and factored into the Viability Assessment that will support the Plan. It may well be the case that rural areas within the district where higher residential values can be achieved will be those best able to absorb additional buildcosts. This may need to be reflected in the spatial strategy and distribution of development
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	supportive of policies that seek to address climate change and the move to net zero. However, it is important that all policies / standards are considered holistically, such that impact on design and viability can be fully understood and assessed.

LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 12	Wates considers that the Local Plan position should follow the approach set out in the Environment Bill, which allows for flexibility. In this respect, we note that it may not be appropriate to secure biodiversity net gain on the closest available site, as the suitability of a site for enhancement will depend on the nature of the habitats involved. Conservation Target Areas and land within the Nature Recovery Network may well be appropriate locations to secure mitigation. However, other land may come forward that is also suitable for enhancement. Indeed, there is a growing private sector market to deliver land for the purpose of BNG and the Plan's policies should not impede this (as a source of supply). Wates agree that it is very important (to integrated within the Plan) an effective mechanism to provide developer contributions.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 13	Wates agree that natural capital assessments can represent a useful spatial planning tool at a strategic level, which can be used to inform Local Plans and (in future) Nature Recovery Strategies. However, the usefulness of such assessments for individual applications needs further consideration. Ultimately, it is important that the Plan does not introduce new development management requirements unnecessarily or where this would lead to duplication. In this respect, the consultation document infers that the principal benefit (of requiring natural capital assessments to accompany major planning applications) would be that this helps to secure a BNG. However, the Environment Bill will require that this is demonstrated through the Biodiversity Metric. In turn, this already necessitates baseline surveys of the habitats in and around a development site. As such, it's not clear what an applicationspecific natural capital assessment would add to the process
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Wates would remark that it is important that all polices / standards are considered holistically, such that impact on design and viability can be fully understood and assessed. Based on experience elsewhere, Wates notes that the cumulative effects of landscape / biodiversity buffers, SuDs and Green Infrastructure, can reduce development densities. That may well be justified as an appropriate response to site constraints. However, it does have implications for the average housing densities that the Plan may achieve.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 14	Wates supports a flexible approach (option 3), as this will allow for sitespecific responses to be developed. This flexibility is important, as developments now need to achieve greater integration between all forms of open space and Green Infrastructure. This is not to say that LAP, LEAPs and NEAPs should not be provided where appropriate. However, it is important to recognise the contribution that informal and incidental spaces (where well-designed) make towards overall open space calculations.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 15	Wates remarks that sports hubs (such as that recently approved at Chesterton) bring with them the benefits of scale and typically provide higher quality assets. This assists with viability and induces demand, and helps support healthy communities.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Wates notes that the approach to assessing heritage impacts is set out clearly and comprehensively in the NPPF, the Planning Practice Guidance and in national legislation. As such, any new Local Plan policy should to achieve conformity with national requirements, but should not need to add additional (unnecessary) complexity by going beyond them. However, it is remarked that having an up-to-date list of non-designated heritage assets (a 'Local List') would provide greater clarity for developers.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	supports the emphasis on achieving 'beauty', which is set out in the updated NPPF. However, Wates agree with the sentiment expressed in the consultation document (at para 5.11.1), which states that place-making is about more than simply what buildings look like. The Cherwell Design Guide (2017) already provides a framework for effective masterplanning and design, and it can be applied at both outline and detailed levels. Policies in the new Local Plan should build on this existing work. Nonetheless, there may be a case for updating the document to (for example) address the impacts of new technologies and to account for the changing way that SuDs and Green Infrastructure is masterplanned within new developments.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	A 20-minute neighbourhood is a concept that is likely more applicable to existing urban areas and new strategic allocations, in so far as the concept relies on high-levels of population density to sustain a wide spectrum of services and interactions. However, Wates would remark a 20-minute neighbourhood is not a new concept. As such it does not fully reflect recent trends towards online shopping and working from home. Likewise, it is not a concept that could be easily replicated in rural areas, where achieving sustainable development may require a different approach (as is recognised at NPPF paragraphs 85 and 105). Nonetheless, many of the notions described through a 20-minute neighbourhood already reflect what is generally regarded as representing 'good design'. It may therefore be appropriate to reference the concept in the Plan, with appropriate caveats
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The pandemic has accelerated the evolution of technologies that are changing the nature of transport and connectivity. Remote working has become highly prevalent and online sales and deliveries constitute a growing part of shopping preferences. Likewise, the introduction of electric vehicles (including autonomous vehicles) is now an important aspect of Government transport policy, both for the purposes of delivering goods and for facilitating personal travel. Wates believes that these changes will reduce the need for travel, as well as the carbon footprint associated with travel. The effect will be to render rural locations more sustainable and this should be reflected in the Plan's spatial and housing distribution strategy. However, during this time of transition, it is important that the Plan includes policies that support 'futureproofing'. The Plan can promote this particularly through policies relating to electric vehicle infrastructure. For example, requiring new homes to be served (as a minimum) by passive charging infrastructure (i.e., conduits that would allow EV chargers to be installed at a later date) would be a relatively affordable measure. In addition, the Plan (or a subsequent SPD) could include design measures requiring that visitor parking bays be provided for autonomous delivery vehicles, as well as autonomous car sharing facilities (as are being trialled in the USA). Such measures could further reduce the need for car ownership, even in rural areas, and the Plan should anticipate this. It is however crucial that any new requirements are given appropriate consideration in the Local Plan Viability Assessment. It is also important that any proposed measures are factored into assumptions about achievable development densities.

LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 16	Wates believes that high-quality digital infrastructure is vital to support effective remote working, which in-turn reduces the propensity for travel. It may therefore be appropriate to include a policy which specifies requirements for digital infrastructure as part of new developments. However, the Plan should be clear about what form / standard of digital infrastructure is needed
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 22	Wates maintains that Bicester (alongside Banbury) represents the most sustainable location to accommodate housing growth within the Planarea. However, there is an opportunity to meet some of the required growth at those satellite villages which are wellconnected to it. Chesterton (where Wates is promoting land for development) benefits from good public transport connections into Bicester. Indeed, the frequency of the bus service is set to increase as a consequence of the Great Wolf development at Bicester Golf Course (where a S016 obligation will provide a subsidy for the route). It is also the case that pedestrian and cycle infrastructure between Chesterton and the Bicester, has been greatly improved through the introduction of the new parkland to the east Chesterton / west of Vendee Drive. The Park and Ride on the A41 / Vendee Drive junction is also made more accessible as a consequence of these improvements, and this provides very frequents services between Oxford and Bicester. The continued expansion of Bicester (through strategic allocations) brings with it increasing concerns about separation with the villages. A response to this would be to grow the satellite villages, particularly in the direction away from Bicester. In the case of Chesterton, this would mean development to the south / south east. Such a strategy would facilitate growth at settlements that benefit from good connections to Bicester and which therefore have access to a wide-range of services. Indeed, anecdotally it should be noted that Chesterton is as geographically proximate to the centre of Bicester, as some areas within the strategic allocations to the north west and south east of the town. A Vision Document (illustrating the proposed development) is provided at Appendix 1 to this representation. A Location Plan, which also identifies local services in Chesterton, is provided at Appendix 2. An Illustrative Masterplan is provided at Appendix 3.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 23	Wates considers that a strategy based on the satellite villages around Bicester should be considered. In particular, Chesterton (to the west of Bicester) is verywell related to the town and is connected to it through public transport links, as well as enhanced pedestrian and cycle infrastructure. The range of services and employment opportunities available within the village is also improving. This is as a result of the approved Great Wolf development at Bicester Golf Course and the new Bicester Sports Association facilities. Land South of Green Lane is particularly suitable for residential development. It lies to the south west of the settlement, such that the delivery of new homes at this location would not reduce the sense of separation between Chesterton and Bicester. The site is also very well placed to provide connectivity between the newly approved sports facilities that lie immediately to the west and the rest of the village. The site is not subject to any significant constraints or designations, and is well bounded by existing tree-lined boundaries. The site is also large enough to accommodate substantial areas of new Green Infrastructure, tree planting, biodiversity net gain and community facilities. A Vision Document (illustrating the proposed development) is provided at Appendix 1 to this representation. A Location Plan, which also identifies local services in Chesterton, is provided at Appendix 2. An Illustrative Masterplan is provided at Appendix 3.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 30	Whilst there is a requirement for development to be concentrated in an around the large urban centres, the delivery of new homes within the rural area has proved to be an important component of housing supply under the current Local Plan. Accordingly, Wates maintains that the rural areas should continue to play a role in meeting the housing needs of the wider District. This is essential, not least because of the length of time it takes to deliver large-scale strategic allocations. In this context, development at other settlements will help to sustain the supply of new homes in the early part of the Plan-period and (by extension) will support a rolling five-year housing land supply, as per NPPF paragraph 74. Moreover, there is also an opportunity to deliver growth at the satellite villages around Bicester (which have good connections to the town), noting that changes in technology and behaviours (such as the propensity for home working) have rendered these settlements more sustainable. There should therefore be an expectation that the rural areas make a contribution towards achieving sustainable development and meeting housing needs. As has been outlined, Chesterton (as a satellite settlement to Bicester) is a particularly suitable location to accommodate future development.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 31	The NPPF allows Local Plans to allocate land for development and requires that Plan's meet identified levels of housing need in full. Noting that the current Local Plan has not always been successful at sustaining the required 5-year housing land supply, there is a case for the allocation of non- strategic sites (in rural areas) via the new Local Plan. This will help to promote timely delivery and a support diversity of supply. Neighbourhood planning could certainly play a role in meeting housing needs and there will be communities that want to identify local sites for development. However, Neighbourhood Planning is by now a well-established concept. Therefore, where a particular Parish Council has not (up to this point) decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan, it is reasonable to infer that they will not do so in future. In such instances, the Local Plan should look to allocate sites at the rural settlements. This is essential to secure the supply of deliverable sites for housing.
LPR-B-563	Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Option 32	Consistent with previous comments made in this representation, Wates maintains that the Rural Settlement Hierarchy (and the approach to housing in the rural areas) should reflect the impact of new technologies and changing consumer habits. For example, a settlement that has lost its village shop or postoffice, is not necessarily rendered unsustainable in an environment where online deliveries are prevalent. In a similar fashion, rural settlements are becoming less car dependent, given the propensity for people to work from home. However, in this new context, it is equally clear that having access to high-quality public open space, sports facilities, etc, is a key benefit to health a well-being and quality of life. The same is also true of cycle and walking routes, and (in this respect) Wates remarks that the satellite settlements around Bicester have (by virtue of the infrastructure improvements achieved by the Council through the current Plan) have become much more accessible. Chesterton, for example, benefits from new parkland to the east of the village / west of Vendee Drive, which makes it far easier to walk into the town or access it by bike. These improvements also allow for improved access to the park and ride facility on the A41 / Vendee Drive. The existing bus route is also to be improved through S106 contributions associated with the permitted Great Wolf water park development. New sports facilities have also been approved on land immediately to the south west of the settlement.

LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Acceptable parking arrangements would be a key criteria in such a policy to understand if the proposal is acceptable.
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Safer dedicated cycling route that are not part of the main road
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 28	Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. In rural areas I believe that only brown field sites should be used to create housing. We need the green spaces and fields to be able to explore nature with our children and not clog it up with concrete
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 32	Yes more weight should be given to the availability of certain services and facilities. Most important are Secondary School, pharmacy and regular bus service. More weight should be given to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by walking and cycling
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Question - Settlement	Yes as villages are becoming absorbed into towns. I have chosen to live in the countryside so I am able to explore the natural environment with my family, if I wanted to be in town I would have chosen to live in one
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Islip	development in Islip should be kept to a minimum and should only be on brownfield sites. One of the reasons we live in a rural area is because there is a community and green spaces. The mass development that have been proposed would ruin Islip. Development should be kept to areas where there are amenities already established.
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Set up review meetings at a set time in local halls.
LPR-B-564	Vicky Clark	Option 30	Proposed sites should consider the bigger impact that a residential development will have on the current villagers. Development should be proportionate for all surrounding villages and not condensed into one area
LPR-B-565	Eric Cronin	Adderbury	interested in cycling "connections between town centres and villages" and the "health and environmental benefits." Especially between Adderbury and Banbury. The Oxford Rd., is very busy with no cycle route and this is acting as a barrier to cyclists from the south of Banbury for them to get to work and for leisure cyclists. During the early phases of building Longford Park, the developers were not required to extend the existing cycle path south of the Flyover along the Oxford Rd. Now that a new phase is to be built we need to make sure that the opportunity is taken to connect Adderbury and Banbury. At least to the Longford Park estate. Once this is done there is connectivity between Adderbury and all the industrial and retail parks to the north via Bankside,
LPR-B-566	Dr Michael Boswell	LPR-A-091	The rural character and the special landscape setting of the village is being compromised and the separation between the settlements of Banbury and Bodicote has already been eroded by the Longford Park development and it is further intended to diminish the separation between Bodicote and Twyford through developments on both sides of the Oxford Road. the developments are far from a sympathetic infilling, being of a much larger and dominant scale compared with Bodicote village. The ingress of new residents is disproportionate relative to the 3771 village population. Development sites around Bodicote village account for a near majority of allocated development sites around the whole of Banbury according to the Cherwell Local Plan. Bodicote village boundary is considered highly sensitive in providing the setting for the village. The open nature of the south and west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting. the developments would result in an increase in traffic and the likelihood of short cuts through the village. No traffic management plans implemented following other developments in the village; traffic management is required. Serious implications on the highly sensitive historic core of the village which contains LBs within conservation area. No Neighbourhood Plan has been formulated since the development of Longford Park; a Neighbourhood Plan is required to facilitate development consonant with local wishes and needs. Developments should preserve the rural and historical character of the village and the setting of the village. Further development on green field sites is unwelcome. The scale of the proposed development impinges on the setting of the village.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Withycombe Farm, Bretch Hill, Banbury	Land at Withycombe Farm, Bretch Hill, Banbury is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA027.



LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 1	Supports the main principles set out by the Suggested Vision for Cherwell. A clear focus upon a sustainable vision and identifying the key components in achieving this. Growth will be required in order to meet the Suggested Vision but limited reference to achieving this. Later sections of the Plan refer to the role that the allocation of land will play in meeting housing and employment needs for the District and it is considered that reference to growth should be made within the Suggested Vision. By way of example, bullet 12) identifies that (through the Local Plan) 'Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington have reshaped and adapted to maintain their roles...'. The importance of these centres and maintaining their roles is acknowledged, however it is not immediately clear as to what re-shaping and adaption means. Clarification here would assist the reader and it is considered that growth at these locations will assist in achieving this particular item. Reference to the Oxfordshire Strategic Vision and Draft Oxfordshire Plan Vision is correctly made, <i>its repetition in full is perhaps unnecessary.</i>
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 2	Separation of Key Objectives to sub categories is helpful. It is considered the extensive list of Key Objectives (31 in total) distracts from the actual content, which in some instances is repetitive in nature. A reduction to the number of Key Objectives will better focus the plan. Supports KO1. This is essential to provide support for the living standards within the County and relates well to the vision for the District. Support the other objectives proposed including raising the value of the local economy, support for the growth of all sectors to create an inclusive economy, increase in education, training and skills, and encouragement of local companies to invest in the local workforce. KO23- this should explicitly include reference to sustainable urban extensions and planned expansion on the edge of Banbury. The spatial strategy, whilst likely to comprise a combination of options under the emerging plans for the area, is likely to have a focus on edge of Banbury growth <i>being such a wellconnected location.</i>
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 3	Bloor Homes considers employment land should be well connected to centres of population, both existing and proposed, and hence accessible to the workforce. This is likely to result in a focus at main urban centres but it is recognised that a variety of approaches, to support the District as a whole, <i>may be appropriate in differing scales.</i>
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 6	Support an evidence-led approach to establishing the housing need in respect of both affordable and market provision. Levels of affordable housing has to also be tested through viability appraisal so as to avoid an adverse impact on housing delivery in the context of housing and placemaking within the vision and objectives for the plan. A range of affordable housing levels may continue to be appropriate across the District but this needs to be <i>established within development viability appraisal work.</i>
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 7	An evidence-led approach is supported, recognising that the NPPF supports a range of housing types and tenures. An error in the second option above appears to refer to 30% social rent, when in fact Policy BSC3 of the 2015 Local Plan refers to 30% 'as other forms of intermediate affordable homes'
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 8	Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements exceeding the minimum standards required by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area, and justify setting appropriate policies in their Local Plans. Unlike need for affordable housing, this issue is considered as being Oxfordshirewide and not one that should be decided upon, possibly differently, by each local authority in the County.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Question - Separation Distances	Minimum separation standards should not be set in development plan policy as this can be too prescriptive and fail to take into consideration local conditions and site characteristics. An SPD or local <i>design code could be an appropriate means of considering this matter.</i>
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 9	Reliance upon buildings regulations is appropriate. If the Council is minded to introduce accessibility standards it should be via an evidenced approach to meet identified need.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 10	Local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area, and justify setting appropriate policies in their Local Plans. This issue is considered as being Oxfordshire-wide and not one that should be decided upon, possibly <i>differently, by each local authority in the County.</i>
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 12	A single approach is not necessarily appropriate. A variety of measures is likely to be necessary in order to secure gains on a district or county wide basis.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 14	A combination of local 'neighbourhood' facilities and wider-serving facilities is important to serve day-to-day recreational needs. Therefore a combination of options could be appropriate.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 15	The sports needs of local communities will vary significantly depending on existing service provision and access to wider-serving facilities. Provision should take account of existing facilities in order to provide the most appropriate approach relevant to the area. This could be via on-site provision or <i>financial contribution to new facility provision.</i>
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The NPPF, in particular section 12 Achieving Well Designed Places, is relevant and should inform policies in this regard. It is important to avoid ambiguity between the National Model Design Code, any local codes and policy / supplementary planning guidance.

LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Question - Transport & Connectivity	An appropriate transport strategy is important in delivering sustainable development and thereby achieving the appropriate balance that is summarised by paragraph 5.12.7 – 5.12.10. Land on the edge of urban areas which are, or can become, well connected through public transport and walking and cycling are typically preferable to more rural or isolated sites where the opportunities for travel by sustainable travel modes, or linked trips, are lower.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Question - Transport Policies	This is a matter which applies on a county-wide basis and could be left for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and Local Transport Plan – with appropriate referencing.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 17	A costed and consulted upon infrastructure delivery plan is necessary but only where it takes a lead from the work put in for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. This must be crossboundary and look to deliver on the set of core objectives to deliver the plan vision.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 18	Banbury is one of the most sustainable locations within the District and based on service and facility provision should continue to accommodate future growth. The extent of growth required will, to some extent, influence the appropriate growth strategy to pursue but Bloor Homes promote that urban extensions and edge of settlement growth will be required. The western edge of Banbury has previously been assessed as a sustainable development location. Consider further urban extensions into the open countryside is considered the most appropriate approach in order to deliver sustainable growth.
LPR-B-567	Savills for Bloor Homes (Western)	Option 19	Consider sites to the west of the town is appropriate, though growth requirements may dictate that more than one option is required.
LPR-B-568	Barton Wilmore for Bicester Sports Association	Call for Sites Promotion - BSA Sports Facility, Akeman Street, Chesterton	BSA Sports Facility, Akeman Street, Chesterton is promoted for leisure use. Update to HELAA349.
LPR-B-568	Barton Wilmore for Bicester Sports Association	Option 1	Support the Council's stated commitment to work with their partners to ensure investments in social and physical infrastructure is timely and to ensure that people are given the opportunity to access sport and recreational activities when and where they need it.
LPR-B-568	Barton Wilmore for Bicester Sports Association	Option 2	Support the inclusion of KO 28 which seeks to provide sufficient accessible, well maintained good quality services, facilities and infrastructure to meet needs including for sport and recreation. This is consistent with the NPPF which requires Local Plans to provide a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs (NPPF paragraph 35).
LPR-B-568	Barton Wilmore for Bicester Sports Association	Option 15	A combination of seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements and use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use is considered likely to be the most sustainable strategy moving forwards. The proposed expansion of the Chesterton Site will establish a highquality, multi-sports venue capable of sustainably serving the Bicester area and it is therefore considered imperative that the Local Plan Review fully recognises and appreciates the contribution that this facility has to play in meeting Bicester's existing and future needs and provides a framework which supports ongoing enhancements of this facility moving forwards.
LPR-B-568	Barton Wilmore for Bicester Sports Association	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	The Council should identify and clearly allocate land which currently contributes, or is capable of contributing, towards sport and play provision to ensure that there is a clear sight of provision that is sufficient to meet the identified needs of the District over the plan period. Paragraph 6.3.25 of the CIP2 clearly acknowledges that 'whilst major new development in the town will deliver new open space, sport and play facilities we know from our evidence that there are shortages in provision'. It is not sound for the Strategy to rely solely on the strategic sites and a more proactive approach to identifying other sites (such as Chesterton) which can play a pivotal role in outdoor sports pitch provision serving the Bicester area moving forwards.
LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	LPR-A-214	Any suggestion to develop this site should be thrown out immediately. encroach so close to the village of Hanwell that they are effectively merging Banbury and Hanwell. Hanwell is a "distinctive" village, "rich in historic heritage", and set in a conservation area. Any development north of the current housing limit will completely and irrevocably damage this heritage and conservation of it. The development site would certainly not "cherish, protect and enhance the rich historic heritage" of Hanwell village, goals which are set out in the Local Plan. The current Local Plan 2012031 has a Policy C15 (Prevention of coalescence of settlements) however the site would completely contradict this policy. Hanwell village residents were led to believe that Dukes Meadow drive was the line the development would not cross, however this has been undone with the extensive developments already taken place along the Warwick Road. This must not be breached in future. The continued sprawl of Banbury damages the image of Banbury as a small market town. Banbury has a fascinating history which should be preserved and celebrated. There has been an unfair bias towards development to the north and south of Banbury over the last decade. Noticeably less development in the southwest direction along the Broughton Road and also to the East of Banbury. The development would go against KO23. Hanwell village is home to the Hanwell Community Observatory. The light pollution from additional housing will have a huge impact on the observatory which contains large astronomical telescopes. Light pollution is also a problem for biodiversity of an area with wildlife moving away from the light. The developments must not be driven by financial forces.

LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	LPR-A-152	Any suggestion to develop this site should be thrown out immediately. encroach so close to the village of Hanwell that they are effectively merging Banbury and Hanwell. Hanwell is a “distinctive” village, “rich in historic heritage”, and set in a conservation area. Any development north of the current housing limit will completely and irrevocably damage this heritage and conservation of it. The development site would certainly not “cherish, protect and enhance the rich historic heritage” of Hanwell village, goals which are set out in the Local Plan. The current Local Plan 20112031 has a Policy C15 (Prevention of coalescence of settlements) however the site would completely contradict this policy. Hanwell village residents were led to believe that Dukes Meadow drive was the line the development would not cross, however this has been undone with the extensive developments already taken place along the Warwick Road. This must not be breached in future. The continued sprawl of Banbury damages the image of Banbury as a small market town. Banbury has a fascinating history which should be preserved and celebrated. There has been an unfair bias towards development to the north and south of Banbury over the last decade. Noticeably less development in the southwest direction along the Broughton Road and also to the East of Banbury. The development would go against KO23. Hanwell village is home to the Hanwell Community Observatory. The light pollution from additional housing will have a huge impact on the observatory which contains large astronomical telescopes. Light pollution is also a problem for biodiversity of an area with wildlife moving away from the light. The developments must not be driven by financial forces.
LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	LPR-A-205	Grave concerns about the proposed development site.
LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	LPR-A-047	Grave concerns about the proposed development site.
LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	LPR-A-154	Grave concerns about the proposed development site.
LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	Question - Green Belt	the Council should place greater emphasis on more sustainable options including brown field sites. For example, Banbury Town Centre has many unoccupied buildings all able to be developed into flats, perfect for transport links and amenities, whilst also increasing the use of the centre, which in turn encourages enterprise and sparks regeneration. This is a far more sustainable option and much better for the local and global environment. Make use of creative infill in town and the larger villages which already have infrastructure in place. Heyford Park offers a fantastic opportunity for building a centre with sustainability and the local and global environment at the forefront. I would encourage the council to place the environment right at the top of its list of considerations. Tree planting needs to be of paramount importance. Even a glance at an ordnance survey map of Banbury and the surrounding area shows an abhorrent lack of woodland. Not only will this provide amenity for the town and surrounding villages, be good for wildlife and biodiversity, but also help in what is now crucial for our climate, to store carbon. Sprawl of towns with very limited public transport leads to increased dependence on cars. This is a very poor environmental decision.
LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	Hanwell	Hanwell village will not cope well with an increase in traffic due to the additional housing. It has a narrow road, with 3 pinch points where traffic is single file. More houses will inevitably cause an increase of traffic through the village, potentially leading to hold ups at these pinch points and increase pressure. The road through the village is not suitable for an increase in traffic. The increase in traffic is a very real safety concern also. Hanwell has narrow pavements and I have often witnessed cars drive over the pavement to avoid slowing at the pinch points in the village. Hanwell village is home to the Hanwell Community Observatory. The light pollution from additional housing will have a huge impact on the observatory which contains large astronomical telescopes. Light pollution is also a problem for biodiversity of an area with wildlife moving away from the light
LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	Question - Development Management Policies	Development management policies should be updated and introduced through the Local Plan Review as follows: Update of existing policy: C15 Prevention of coalescence of settlements The current Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 is not robust in references to non-coalescence. B.2 Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities, states "B.89 We aim to avoid development in inappropriate locations and coalescence with neighbouring settlements." The Council "aiming to avoid" coalescence is not a good enough level of protection for Hanwell. The current Local Plan 2011-2031 contains Policy C15 (Prevention of coalescence of settlements) as a 'saved' policy from the 1996 Plan that continues to be in place. This policy is outdated and weak. It lacks clarification on the degree of extending the edge of towns (i.e. reduction of open land between settlements) that will result in the identity of individual settlements being lost. It lacks a definition of “coalescence” and “close proximity” in the context of development in Cherwell, or a definition of the “strategic gap” that should be preserved between settlements. It lacks any indication of the weighting that should be given Policy C15 versus competing development pressures. It lacks reference to the multiple benefits of retaining open countryside around rural settlements, by only stating that “rural communities may feel particularly threatened where they are in close proximity to urban areas”. Policy C15 must be replaced or overhauled to address the above weaknesses. The new policy must become an effective planning policy to define and then protect the strategic gap between towns and surrounding villages. At present, Policy C15 does not deter housing developers proposing sites to build houses over farmland between Hanwell and Banbury to within 100m from the edge of the Hanwell village Conservation Area (reference: LPRA-214). 100m between the edges of Banbury and Hanwell cannot objectively be considered a sufficient preservation of open land between the town and village. However, in the absence of a robust policy there is insufficient clarity on these matters. In the past, Policy C15 has not deterred housing developers promoting and building on sites over farmland around Banbury. It is not just Hanwell that is impacted; Bodicote also since 1996.

LPR-B-569	Diana Sadler	Question - Development Management Policies	<p>Development management policies should be updated and introduced through the Local Plan Review as follows: New policy: Landscape designations. Landscape designations are required to protect open agricultural land around towns, to ensure this is not built upon resulting in coalescence with surrounding villages. Such important “strategic gaps” between settlements are important to distinguishing nearby settlements, and should be preserved through either:</p> <p>(a) extending the boundary of existing village Conservation Areas; or</p> <p>(b) creating a new formal “Green Buffer” designation.</p> <p>Without such designations and strategic policy there is a risk of piecemeal erosion of land between towns and surrounding villages. Once land is developed the countryside is lost forever, and surrounding villages become closer to coalescence with the edge of expanding towns. Such designations are vital to protect the limited open land between Banbury and Hanwell village. Despite existing policies and attempts to preserve open land between the town and village, Banbury has continued to expand northwards. Through the Local Plan, greater powers are required for CDC to protect the ensure the town and villages do not merge to protect the distinctive identity and setting of Banbury and its surrounding settlements. The areas of countryside, or gaps, between both the existing or planned edge of Banbury and the surrounding settlements, are important in maintaining the character and setting of the town and villages and creating distinctive approaches and their rural setting. The Green Buffer should prevent development extending beyond the settlements to such an extent that the identity of individual settlements is lost, and development coalesces, and valuable open countryside is lost. The designation will be essential to protect important gaps, preventing development which would harm its character. These designations are required to ensure planning decisions give more weight to protecting open land rather than to the delivering housing land (the 5 year supply of homes). The reliance on general policies to protect open land in Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 has failed to protect agricultural land between Banbury and surrounding villages. If CDC are serious in addressing shortcomings in the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, the Local Plan review must come up with robust policies to protect the strategic gap between say Banbury and Hanwell village.</p>
LPR-B-570	Anthony Scholz	LPR-A-041	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.</p>
LPR-B-570	Anthony Scholz	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.</p>
LPR-B-570	Anthony Scholz	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.</p>

LPR-B-570	Anthony Scholz	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-570	Anthony Scholz	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-571	Adrienne Baba	Bloxham	understand there is a desperate need for new housing. There should be a maximum limit placed on such developments so that local services such as schools, surgeries and roads are not overstretched (which is already the case in Bloxham). There are also plenty of other reasons why these developments are detrimental to the locality, such as reduction of habitat for local wildlife, erosion of conservation areas and increased traffic pollution. In an ideal world some of the land earmarked for development (often landbanked for decades) could be used instead to benefit villagers, for example as village allotments giving people the chance to grow their own vegetables (good for physical and mental health, the environment, biodiversity) or for planting trees (good for carbon capture, landscape, wildlife). Regardless of planning and land-banking and for the same reasons cited above, every village should have access to an allotment (not all do) and a commitment to tree planting should be part of every village's policy.
LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the west of the M40 and north of the A34, Weston on the Green	Land to the west of the M40 and north of the A34, Weston on the Green is promoted for mixed use development. Update to HELAA392.
LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Option 1	Support the Council's proposed vision. In particular we support the recognition that Cherwell's spatial location within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc is one key factor which provides significant opportunities for post COVID-19 recovery.
LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Option 3	A varied portfolio of land is required to ensure the greatest choice and competition in the market, appealing to different sectors and end users and enabling different developers into the market. A homogeneous supply of employment land will restrict the market and impact employment delivery rates. We consider the only logical spatial option is option 5. This ensures a balanced dispersal of development, from key employment developments across all four spatial options, with growth directed in a manner which is commensurate to each. Due regard must be had for other matters when distributing and allocating sites, such as site suitability, Green Belt, market demand, site availability, site access, viability and availability of key infrastructure and services. There may be a site which may be seen to be preferable due to a location in a main urban centre, but it may have site specific problems relating to contamination and viability that makes the redevelopment of the site for employment uses unviable, with residential being preferable due to the higher land values to pay for remediation. The above approach ensures that employment land is delivered throughout the plan area geographically and throughout the plan period temporally, to ensure employment growth reflects and serves population growth. Clearly in locating the majority of development in just one spatial location, as proposed by the question, is inappropriate in that it would necessitate significant increases in commuting with those living outside of such areas needing to commute for work. Distributing growth through the options will provide geographically dispersed employment growth which would reduce the need for all residents to commute into larger centres, reducing congestion and pollution which would place high strain on the road network if located in just one spatial option. The recommended approach is considered particularly necessary given the existing strategy does focus growth on a spatially small part of Cherwell, with employment growth focused at Banbury, Bicester and to a lesser extent at Kidlington. On this basis, there are legitimate arguments that these areas should have a lower level of growth in terms of new allocations moving forward, given they already benefit from extant strategic employment allocations with significant land remaining for development. Option 1 would simply place further pressure on these settlements, encouraging unsustainable patterns of commuting and impacting on local highways, services, and infrastructure provision.

LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Option 4	<p>It is assumed the first sentence is an error, as it is verbatim the question asked at Option 3 and relates to location rather than composition of employment land, as per options 13 above. We are of the opinion that the introduction of Class-E was a clear signal from Government that greater flexibility is required in the uses of buildings without the need for planning permission, particularly in response to issues such as the decline of the high- street and economic downturns. It is to us unacceptable if Local Planning Authorities attempt to subvert the new Class-E without reasonable justification.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the rationale of seeking to control uses forthcoming on employment sites, we consider an approach which seeks to limit uses to only Bclass uses is overly restrictive and in conflict with the flexibility Class-E was introduced to deliver. We consider the Council should increase flexibility on its employment sites by adopting a wider definition of suitable uses which could be brought forward on such sites. For example, proposals could be required to be employment generating. Many ClassE uses are likely to have a significantly higher employee numbers than traditional B uses, particularly B8 uses. In terms of job provision, other uses could be more economically beneficial and as such shouldn't be entirely excluded. For example, the Employment Density Guide 3rd edition (November 2015) sets out that B8 uses tend to range between an employment density of 7095sqm per full time employee. In terms of Retail uses for example, the employment density can be as low as 15-20sqm per full time employee. Retail is likely to provide significantly more jobs than traditional B8 uses. It is requested that the definition of suitable uses on employment sites be extended to employment generating uses rather than using the use class order. This could be caveated with requirements for uses to deliver an appropriate employment density, for example no use with an employment density lower than B8 uses, to ensure no loss in job provision through such a revision. Or the level of employment generating uses outside of E(g)/B2/B8 could be restricted to be no more than 50% of the site for example. Clearly there could be requirements that such proposals would need to demonstrate that they do not have undue impacts on the town centre for example. The Council could open up the Policy to enable the development of B and all E Class uses as suggested. The Council could ensure there is supporting criterion to ensure such a policy would not have adverse impacts on the town centre for example. This approach would enable the delivery of uses which would be entirely suitable in such locations, such as showroom retail, gyms, nurseries, medical etc. The policy should apply some flexibility and caveats as to when other uses would be acceptable. It is unproductive and inefficient to have land which could be brought forward for economically beneficial purposes vacant awaiting uses which may not be suitable or unviable. It is vital that there is flexibility to ensure landowners and developers can bring forward economic growth flexible, commensurate with modern requirements and in the way most suiting for each individual site, reflective of demand, location, access to public transport, availability of services, etc.</p>
LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Option 6	<p>Urge caution to any attempt to increase the expected rate of affordable housing and any such attempt must be supported by significant viability evidence and market support. Increasing the rates of affordable housing will reduce land returns and could see landowners instead wish to bank land, rather than release for a lower sum to pay for additional affordable housing, above a reasonable level. This could result in lower levels of housebuilding, and whilst schemes coming forward may deliver a higher ratio of affordable housing, if building drops too much this could result in less affordable housing being delivered in overall terms. The drop in market housing delivery would however reduce the supply of new housing, which would accelerate house price growth and worsen issues of affordability, not remedy them. It is worthy to note the substantial contributions that will be required both to satisfy wider policies within the plan and to ensure local health and school capacities. There are also forthcoming requirements to deliver biodiversity net gains which will further impact the viability of sites. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF sets out that plans must be both positive and deliverable. Paragraph 58 affirms that it is the role of up-to-date policies to inform development management process, and as such the Council must demonstrate its policies and attributable development burden will be deliverable at this stage. It is not acceptable to try and kick such an issue back to site specific viability work at the planning application stage. The most efficient way to increase affordable housing delivery would be to increase the number of housing allocations, delivering more market and affordable housing. This would slow house price growth in general terms and would deliver more affordable units, both of which would significantly improve the current housing position and accord with the Governments goals to boost significantly the supply of housing, whilst also contributing to the overarching goals and aims of the Oxford Cambridge Arc.</p>
LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Option 8	<p>Any attempt to introduce such standard on all new dwellings must be supported by significant evidence on viability and also on the impacts such a move would have on house prices. Many housebuilders build various different house types of the same number of bedrooms, precisely to provide choice to the market. In particular this benefits those who may not be entitled to affordable housing, but may not be able to afford a larger house which of course would come with associated increase in price. Housebuilders are best placed to make such judgements as ultimately it is they who will need to sell their product to the available market at a profitable price. There is also freedom in the market to decline to purchase a property if purchasers consider a property is too small to meet their needs. Furthermore, some people will prefer the reduced maintenance and cleaning associated with a smaller footprint property. To introduce such a requirement, the Council would need to provide evidence that the houses being built in the area are demonstrably too small and that there is evidence which necessitates a policy intervention. Strongly object to 2nd criterion. Affordable housing should be tenure blind, that means it should not be possible to differentiate differing tenures of property. Clearly if all affordable units are bigger than their market counterparts, this would have a significant impact on their ability to be truly tenure blind. It may cause significant issue to housebuilders, who may not be able to use the same house type for affordable and market housing, given the requirements on affordable would necessitate a larger house type. This could add significant cost and delay as new house types are drawn up and delivered to meet this policy requirement, or impact viability as affordable housing costs spiral upwards against likely receipts for market equivalents. It would seem to us to be entirely unethical that the market housing buyers, who ultimately fund the delivery of the affordable units through their house purchase, would then be in a position where the dwellings they could purchase would be smaller than the affordable equivalent. Whilst we agree that affordable housing should be of a standard and quality to match that of market, we equally disagree that affordable housing should be delivered at a larger size than their market equivalents. If such a policy requirement was to be introduced, the Council would need to demonstrate that it would be viable, not have undue impacts on housebuilders and provide evidence which would support the view that affordable housing delivered currently is not sufficiently sized and that it is causing issues which require policy intervention.</p>

LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Agree that 20-minute neighbourhoods offer a useful metric for urban and strategic development but given the rural nature of the Plan area cannot be applicable to all developments, particularly those in the more rural areas. It could form the basis of new development within urban areas and particularly strategic scale development, which could utilise the principle during the masterplanning phase to ensure new communities are truly walkable.
LPR-B-572	Fisher German for Mr N Goodwin and Mr and Mrs P Beecroft	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The increasing transition to homeworking, the prevalence of online shopping and the growing sustainability of personal cars, in particular the growing popularity of hybrid and electric models, mean that whilst still forming a useful tool, the transport hierarchy as displayed is beginning to be somewhat antiquated to be used in isolation. In more rural areas, the application of the hierarchy in isolation is inappropriate and considering low carbon alternatives is likely to be beneficial. This includes looking at elements such as internet connectivity and the sustainability credentials of schemes being advanced, particularly where they contain mitigatory measures such as renewable energy as an integral part of the proposal which would assist offsetting transport carbon creation.
LPR-B-573	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard uthill	Option 30	support option 2 to direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. Though brownfield development on suitable sites is to be preferred, allocating appropriate amounts of suitable greenfield sites will be necessary to meet housing need. Villages and smaller settlements have an important role to play in distributing growth across the District. Any new draft policy should build in flexibility to a spatial approach to housing land and allocations across the District, and should have sufficient scope to allow the decision taker to have regard to the potential of sites on an individual basis.
LPR-B-573	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard uthill	Option 31	support option 3 which is a combination of options 1 & 2, it is important to ensure flexibility and a responsive planning policy framework and avoid prescriptive policies that fail to account for individual circumstances that will change spatially as well as over time. Ultimately, in tandem with Option 30, support the need to allocate sufficient housing in the rural areas to meet identified housing needs. Local need can of course be both market and affordable housing. We believe this should be through the identification of a housing requirement figure for the rural areas that can then be delivered through a criteria based policy for which planning applications can be determined and/or through the identification of sites through Neighbourhood Plans.
LPR-B-573	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard uthill	Option 32	The options presented appear to be paving the way for a review of the settlement hierarchy and categorisation, which we noted previously, however no specific wording or Policy content is presented. A strict interpretation of settlement hierarchy fails to account for situations such as this, it potentially gives licence to restrict development in a location that is well served by local services and facilities and where there is a local need for housing. This is contrary to paragraph 79 of the NPPF. Indeed, by encouraging modest growth amongst these villages it ensures that the shared services can be sustained and therefore prevents further longer journeys to the main centres. The adopted Local Plan policies allow next to no additional housing for these villages, which is a threat to the sustainability of their services and amenities. Allocations and/or positively worded policies are required to deliver modest growth in villages such as Wardington.
LPR-B-573	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard uthill	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Settlement boundaries should not be introduced in a District which currently doesn't define them. Planning policies need to remain flexible to account for changing circumstances in the future. Defined and rigid settlement boundaries would fail to achieve this, and with respect this question fails to take account of the changing circumstances and shifting sands which COVID19 presents. If boundaries are to be considered, they need to be large enough and policies flexible enough (e.g. to consider 'edge of boundary locations') to accommodate growth and not be a barrier to future development needs of the District. This question appears to be placing a potential barrier to development and a barrier to realising the future potential of settlements, it is introducing restrictions and introducing a lack of flexibility.
LPR-B-573	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard Tuthill	Call for Sites Promotion - Land adjoining Judges, Wardington and Land off The Greensward, Wardington	Land adjoining Judges, Wardington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA400.
LPR-B-573	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard Tuthill	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off The Greensward, Wardington	Land off The Greensward, Wardington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA401.
LPR-B-573	Walsingham Planning for Mr Richard uthill	Option 31	The adopted Local Plan policies allow next to no additional housing for lower category villages, villages which as discussed above can form a network of settlements which share facilities and services. The lack of growth in such locations is a threat to the sustainability of their services and amenities, and fails to provide housing to meet a local need. The distribution of growth throughout the District in sustainable locations and of a scale that is proportionate to their location needs to be built into flexibly worded policies in order to achieve the aims of the consultation document and the issues raised. Allocations and/or positively worded policies are required to deliver modest growth in villages such as Wardington.

LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 1	Under (14) Our Rural communities there should be specific reference to the value and importance of delivering additional housing growth in such areas in order to support the objective of creating thriving village communities
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 2	KO31 should be amended to make reference to the need to deliver market housing in rural communities (not just affordable housing) as it is by maintaining and securing additional resident population in rural villages that assists the viability of local services and facilities. KO23 should be amended to recognise that, whilst development is to be focussed to the most sustainable locations, a settlement hierarchy will be adopted that cascades development down through the villages and rural settlements of the District in recognition of the value of such to KO31 (as amended above)
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 3	5 - a combination of all of the above
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 6	Rates of affordable housing should be evidence-based and consistent throughout the District. The proportion of affordable housing set out in (2) above should be a maximum.
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 7	Other affordable housing tenures – such as low cost market housing – should be promoted and prioritised ahead of social rented housing in order to encourage social mobility through housing tenures.
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Question - Separation Distances	No, should remain a matter of judgment based on site conditions.
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 9	2 - rely on Building Regulations
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 10	1 - Leave for Building Regulations (and future policy direction, if any)
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Question - Green Belt	No the Green Belt should be maintained given that a fundamental feature of the Green Belt, and reason for its designation, is its permanence.
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 12	Financial contributions (where compliant with the Regulations) subject to thorough testing and a higher level policy that requires (if at all) a specific degree of net gain.
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 13	1 - Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The principle of 20-minute neighbourhoods, and the benefits, are accepted and acknowledged. However, the delivery of such should not be sacrosanct or a specific policy requirement as it may not be practical, feasible or deliverable on sites depending on the specific characteristics of the site. Reference to such could be purely aspirational. It should also be recognised that this is less practical or deliverable in the rural areas of the District
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 29	2 - No further development should be permitted at Heyford Park beyond that which is already planned. It would be more beneficial to the sustainability of existing rural settlements for any rural housing to be spread, on a hierarchical basis (judged on sustainability) between existing villages/settlements. Such an approach would best support the viability of local services and facilities and the social cohesion of existing settlements. Further growth at Heyford Park would undermine this prospect to the detriment of well established communities
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 30	2 - there should be a step-change in the delivery of housing in rural areas, with a significant proportion of the District-wide housing need directed to the rural areas. This should be based on an analysis of the sustainability of existing settlements (i.e. developing criteria that allow the sustainability of settlements to be assessed (eg availability of shops and services, public transport, jobs, communities facilities, and access to larger centres) together with their existing size. Then, having established a settlement sustainability hierarchy, housing growth should be proportionately allocated to settlements based on their sustainability score.
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 31	Whilst a combination of the above may be practical, it should not be at the exclusion of the Local Plan allocating such sites – in the same way that the Local Plan will do so for the other larger settlements of the District. There is no reasonable or logical basis for distinguishing, in this respect, between the approach to be taken in the towns and villages of the District
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 32	The hierarchy should be based on sustainability scoring as detailed in response to Option 30. That would include: shops, services, facilities, community facilities, parks and open space, employment opportunities, public transport, population size, access to (and proximity to) larger centres etc. The criteria and scoring should, itself, be subject to full public consultation.
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 33	3 - a combination
LPR-B-574	JCPC for Moorfields Advisory	Option 34	The current approach – which facilitates objective and subjective assessment based on site specific circumstances – remains the best and most appropriate.



LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Call for Sites Promotion - Land between the M40/A41 and Graven Hill, south of Bicester	Land between the M40/A41 and Graven Hill, south of Bicester is promoted for housing / mixed use. An Evolution Document has been supplied.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 1	Supportive of the suggested Vision. The type of place the Local Plan envisages will be created aligns with that set out in the emerging Oxfordshire Strategic Plan. Pleased to see reference to Cherwell's strategically important position within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, which will be a driver for growth in the area, and the focus on a more sustainable form of growth, both from an environmental and social perspective, which aligns with Thakeham's principles.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 2	The list of objectives provided is very comprehensive and look to provide a clear framework to guide the delivery of the Vision to 2040. Whilst the objectives will likely need to evolve to become more locationally specific as strategy is developed, it is good to see a focus on sustainability, promoting net zero carbon development and generally minimising the impact of development on the environment, which will be essential to the success of the development strategy. It is good to see the objectives focusing on healthyplace shaping which will also be integral to the success of the development strategy, with a need to ensure future development maximises opportunities for journeys to be made on foot or bicycle. This will necessitate ensuring new developments prioritise non-motorised transport and include a full range of day to day services and facilities, appropriately laid out, which can often best be achieved within strategic scale developments, such as that proposed at South Bicester.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 3	It is inevitable that a blended approach will be necessary. Most employment land should be located at and around Banbury and Bicester, which will likely dovetail with significant transport interchanges. Kidlington is constrained by the Oxford Green Belt and any release of land from the Green Belt will be a strategic matter and would therefore be a matter for the Oxfordshire Plan rather than the Cherwell Local Plan Review.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 4	This will be largely dependent on the level of need for each use class, which is a matter for the Oxfordshire Plan, and their specific locational needs. Employment generating uses should be located as close to existing or proposed residential areas as possible to encourage shorter journeys or associated with existing or proposed key transport links. This is particularly the case for mixed employment sites that may include leisure or retail uses. The plan will need to ensure that there are a mix of job opportunities across the District to ensure that all skill levels are catered for.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 6	The affordable housing requirement that would best be considered across the whole of Oxfordshire as part of the overall housing need position. It is recommended that how affordable housing is distributed should be determined through a viability study and a study into where the need arises rather than maintaining the existing split across the District. The type of development that will likely be planned in different areas needs to be considered in setting the targets and this should be factored in to the viability considerations to ensure there are not future issues with under delivery when site specific factors are taken into account.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 7	The affordable housing requirement will be a matter for the Oxfordshire Plan. Thakeham are content to support any affordable housing tenure mix provided it meets the needs of the District and ensures that all households are accommodated. Care needs to be considered as regards the impact of First Homes that this does not distort the tenure mix such that shared ownership is squeezed out completely or reduced to levels that do not allow sufficient family accommodation to be available to those who need it. Examples might include families trading up in shared ownership accommodation for larger accommodation or formation of two new households following divorce but where neither household would qualify as first time buyers.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 8	Thakeham supports the Council's aspiration to see good quality homes delivered across their district, such policy requirement which seeks all dwellings to meet NDSS need to be supported by robust evidence that there is a specific need to introduce such standards
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Separation Distances	Arbitrary separation distances are not an appropriate tool to achieve good urban design since they cannot reflect the specific character of an area. It is instead recommended that policies directly address issues of privacy and natural light, allowing the District Council to focus on the issues specific to the site.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 9	Any policy requirements in respect of housing accessibility requirements should be based off identified need, with sufficient flexibility incorporated to ensure that provision is directed to the right places. In particular, blanket policy requirements for M4(2) in all new developments should not be adopted as these requirements should be based off identified need, whilst requirements in relation to M4(3) can be particularly onerous and should only be directed to developments where there is an identified end user
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Housing Policies	Thakeham strongly welcomes policy endorsement for modern methods of construction, which it proposes to use at South Bicester. Thakeham are keen to locate their MMC factory within the South Bicester development which would diversify the supply of homes in the area, drive up quality and ensure a more efficient use of materials in the construction process, which is integral to delivering the objectives for the area. Policy support for this approach would therefore be welcome. However, it is noted that a similar option was set out in the recent Oxfordshire Plan consultation, and it may be better to have a county-wide policy ensuring consistency of approach rather than potentially having different standards in each LPA area.

LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 10	Thakeham has a commitment to all homes being zero carbon in lifetime use and carbon neutral in production by 2025, with a focus on first improving the fabric of buildings, constructed from sustainable timber sources, consideration of sustainable energy features and a sustainable procurement strategy which encourages the use of recycled materials. Thakeham hopes to locate their new MMC factory at its South Bicester development providing new jobs in the area and ensuring all of its developments in Oxfordshire will have locally sourced MMC constructed homes helping to reduce the environmental impact of construction. Thakeham have recommended that any construction standards for Oxfordshire are set out in the Strategic Plan and not deferred to the District Plans which is proposed as an alternative option. Deferment to District Plans would hinder the aspiration to address climate change across Oxfordshire and would also potentially lead to an element of confusion moving forward as different authorities adopt different policy standards. It may dissuade some SMEs from working in different parts of the county due to the challenges of adhering with different requirements, which would hinder job growth created by these SMEs.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 11	There should be an aspiration to maximise the use of renewable energy in new developments, with any policy being complementary to the overall aspiration for reducing the production of greenhouse gases – noting any policy requirements need to be viable. Strategic development can contribute to delivery of renewable energy, both through renewable energy in buildings and through onsite provision. In the example of South Bicester, zero carbon placemaking will be underpinned by low carbon energy production, alongside battery and alternative storage solutions, with the potential to facilitate multidirectional energy paths and flows across the development. Smaller scale development will not be in a position to generate onsite provision in the same way as South Bicester so it is important that policies consider the contribution renewable energy within buildings can make to maximising renewable energy generation. It is important that policies are not overly prescriptive and provide flexibility in approach to cater for the likely evolution of renewable energy over the Plan period, particularly as this evolution may be quicker than any future updates to <u>planning policy</u> .
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	It is important that the benefits that development can bring to existing communities and the natural environment are recognised, particularly when they improve resilience to climate change. By way of example, South Bicester will deliver significant benefits to the local community in terms of the management of flood water through taking a strategic approach to management of flood water on site. This would include a 'flood bypass' for Wendlebury, diverting water from the centre of the village, significantly reducing risk for existing residents. The nature of the site at South Bicester means that there is a significant opportunity to deliver a net gain in biodiversity as part of a holistic approach to ecological and landscape enhancement. South Bicester will deliver an extensive amount of different types of water, wildlife and landscape uses, where higher value habitats will <u>be created</u> .
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 12	Thakeham support the aim of delivering net gain on site where this is achievable and appropriate. If it is not achievable onsite, it is suggested that offsite contributions are used to enhance targeted areas identified in the Plan rather than sites 'nearby'. This will ensure the Plan maximises the level of biodiversity net gain across the District in the most efficient way. Thakeham are aiming to achieve 20% net gain in biodiversity as part of the South Bicester development.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 13	Thakeham advocate the need to aim for net environmental gain across the District and natural capital will be a key part of this. Thakeham would prefer to see policies setting out specific requirements for development to achieve this aim, such as those associated with biodiversity net gain, rather than a requirement for a particular form of assessment that would not necessarily prove policy compliance.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Whilst having a policy on net gain will be essential in driving up ecological enhancements through development, it should also be recognised that the Local Plan has a role to play by directing growth to those areas where development can take advantage of identified opportunities for ecological enhancement. By way of example, the southern part of the South Bicester site lies within an area mapped as a Natural England Network Expansion Zone where new or enhanced ecological connections would contribute to the targets for the area, making it an ideal opportunity to use development as a <u>mechanism for delivering net gain in an area where it would make a difference to the wider ecological network</u>
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 14	Suggestions one and two apply a one-size-fits-all approach that in practice doesn't always work. Thakeham's preference is suggestion three as this will <u>likely provide the best outcome for local communities</u> .
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 15	Thakeham believe that strategic sites should seek to provide as much provision to meet their own needs as possible. This will not be possible for all sites and therefore financial contributions should continue to be used to mitigate the increase in demand. How these contributions are spent should be on a case-by-case basis: if there is a clear deficit within a settlement, a new hub might be appropriate, but if improvements to existing infrastructure <u>would resolve the deficit this should take precedence</u> .
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	It is likely that design codes will need to vary between settlements and sites, and it is likely some details will need modification over time to reflect changes in government guidance. As such it is recommended that the Local Plan includes a policy requiring development to have regard to the latest local design codes but leave the codes themselves to supplementary planning documents, site specific development briefs and neighbourhood plans. Care will need to be taken to ensure any policy is consistent with the proposed policy approach set out in the emerging Strategic Plan.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Fully endorse the concept of 20-minute neighbourhoods.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Larger strategic sites provide an opportunity to shape travel habits by providing social infrastructure alongside housing, and providing public transport hubs that can be used to serve employment areas further afield. For example, at South Bicester, Thakeham propose walking and cycling over car travel with pedestrian, cycle and bus links to Bicester Village Station. All Thakeham homes will have a fast-electric vehicle charging point and Thakeham will also provide incentives for cycle ownership.

LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 17	Thakeham advocate an updated methodology that reflects the increasing importance of climate, healthy places and sustainable economy, which are all central to the proposals for South Bicester. In terms of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, a catchment basis is recommended for social infrastructure such as education, health and public open space. Place is still important, but a methodology based on place quite often fails to recognise patterns of usage that cross administrative boundaries.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 18	As a key settlement, Banbury should be a focus of additional growth over the next Plan period. Experience has shown that trying to define the nature or location of growth in the abstract is unhelpful. For example, the difference between an urban extension and a new settlement is only a matter of distance and is highly subjective. Instead, it is more appropriate to consider the actual site options available and which would provide the most sustainable pattern of growth in and around Banbury.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 22	As per Thakeham's representations to the Strategic Plan, Bicester should be a key location for growth over the next plan period given the availability of employment, the access to sustainable modes of transport and, importantly, the availability of suitable strategic development sites. Experience has shown that trying to define the nature or location of growth in the abstract is unhelpful. For example, the difference between an urban extension and a new settlement is only a matter of distance and is highly subjective. Instead, it is more appropriate to consider the actual site options available, their characteristics, including for example their connectivity to public transport, and generally which would provide the most sustainable pattern of growth in and around Bicester. Our view is that this would point towards development at South Bicester as being the most appropriate location for further growth, irrespective of whether it is considered as a new settlement or an urban extension.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 23	If the Oxfordshire Plan does not facilitate substantial green belt release in Cherwell, most likely around Kidlington, the strategy for Bicester will need to recognise that the town will act partially as a commuter hub to serve Oxford. While as much as possible should be done to make use of the rail services into Oxford, it is inevitable that many will continue to either use private cars or buses and coaches to reach the diffuse employment opportunities around the City. Consequently, it is logical for future greenfield sites to be located to the south of Bicester to provide ease of access to employment and public transport corridors into Oxford. Thakeham's South Bicester proposals not only provide links to the Bicester Village Train Station but are well located to ensure that Oxford-bound road traffic does not cause further capacity issues within or around Bicester.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	As a rule, these spaces and facilities should be subject to a policy stating that proposals resulting in their loss would normally be refused. However, there should be a degree of flexibility to ensure that developments that provide significant net gain in spaces and facilities are not unreasonably penalised to the loss of some existing areas.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Sites should provide an integrated transport solution such as what is being proposed for South Bicester. In addition, the selection of sites is fundamental with South Bicester providing exceptional links to Oxford without the need to travel through Bicester first. Strategic development at South Bicester would facilitate the creation of a transport hub with the scale of the development enabling the area to be planned in such a way that the range of new services and facilities can be linked by dedicated cycle and pedestrian routes which limit the need to travel by car for local journeys. Strategic scale development would also viably contribute to improving bus services in the area, further enhancing opportunities for sustainable travel.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Option 26	Green belt release is a strategic matter and should be left to the Oxfordshire Plan.
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Whilst Thakeham support the use of settlement boundaries to provide certainty as to where development will be permitted, it is important that any boundaries are drawn to encompass new growth planned through the Local and Strategic Plans. There have been instances where settlement boundaries are not defined until after a development has taken place, but we would advocate any new settlement boundaries being drawn around new allocations to provide clarity that they are integral to the settlement which they adjoin
LPR-B-575	Bidwells for Thakeham Homes	Question - Development Management Policies	The development management policy review is long overdue and very welcome, but in terms of timing and the scope of the Cherwell Local Plan, the preparation of a robust development strategy causes some difficulty as the amount of employment, housing or other forms of development, nor its distribution, cannot be known until the Oxfordshire Plan has been adopted.
LPR-B-576	Walsingham Planning for Richborough Estates		Rep provided WeTransfer link only - no rep content
LPR-B-577	Historic England	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Historic England recognises the need for urgent action to mitigate and adapt to climate change and is committed to the achievement of net zero. We are researching and promoting how the historic environment can positively contribute to overall global sustainability through adaptation and mitigation. There are few 'one size fits all' energy improvement solutions appropriate for these homes and studies show reusing these buildings is key to cutting the UK's carbon emissions. agree with the council's assertion that each building will require bespoke approaches that consider the risks and benefits of different measures. modern approaches to energy efficiency may not be appropriate for traditional buildings. Furthermore, as the consultation document rightly points out, the significance of heritage assets could be harmed by inappropriate retrofit measures. Support historic buildings being dealt with on a casebycase basis and therefore we would prefer them to sit outside any policy standard within the local plan. reference and links provided to Historic England documents on energy efficiency and historic buildings and climate change.
LPR-B-577	Historic England	Question - Green Belt	note that the plan does not anticipate strategic matters relating to the Oxford Green Belt being addressed by this plan. may wish to comment should this position change.

LPR-B-577	Historic England	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	the local plan will need to, as a starting point, be consistent with national policy. This means ensuring that national policy is correctly reflected in the plan. if strategic policies are to be contained within this plan HE would advocate a strategic policy for the historic environment in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 20 & 21. to demonstrate a positive strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, the plan should go beyond this. in order to demonstrate the positive strategy required by the NPPF, heritage should be considered holistically throughout the plan. heritage should not be thought of as only a constraint, but also as something that can be drawn on to achieve positive outcomes. Heritage at risk also needs to be given full consideration. This approach also appears to be supported locally. Strong heritage policies will take account of locally specific issues and respond accordingly. It is therefore welcome that the council has identified ancient routeways as an area to be considered for a specific policy approach. This helps to demonstrate that the council is being proactive in the management of the historic environment. Request for the following to be set out as evidence base for the Reg 19 stage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of conservation areas, whether supported by appraisal, date of appraisal/last review and whether the council considers a review is due;</li> <li>• Status of list of non-designated heritage assets/local heritage assets (i.e. content, last updated, criteria and method for identifying new assets);</li> <li>• Status of local heritage at risk list, scope (grade II listed buildings (non-ecclesiastical), non-designated assets).</li> <li>• Commentary on the relationship between the above items and the plan itself (part of the positive strategy)</li> </ul>
LPR-B-577	Historic England	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The NPPF requirement for the plan to set out a positive strategy applies to the historic environment. the issues of design and the historic environment will often interact and as such we would advocate a robust approach to design policy in the plan and supplementary documents. In considering how best to take account of the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code, the historic environment and relevant evidence (including any necessary updating) should be considered at the outset of the creation of new design policy. Historic England would be pleased to provide further advice as the need arises.
LPR-B-577	Historic England	General	The plan does not currently include any site allocations: it only includes a list of all sites that have been submitted as part of the call for sites process. HE do not have capacity to comment on such a long list of sites. However, will comment on proposed site allocations when they are consulted upon, presumably at the next iteration of the plan (reg 19, proposed submission). Appendix 2 of rep provides links to good practise advice and HE advice notes which it is recommended are reviewed as part of the plan preparation
LPR-B-577	Historic England	Option 29	Previously raised concern about further site development through the Oxfordshire Plan second Reg 18 consultation and CDC Sept 2020 consultation. HE's position has always been that all 56 hardened aircraft shelters, as well as a number of further unscheduled buildings within the airfield are of national importance. In addition to the prospect of further housing development in or around the former base, a pre-application for the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, has now been submitted (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project). Concerned about the harm that could ensue from these two projects, individually and cumulatively. Heritage assets that could be harmed would include the Upper Heyford Conservation Area itself and the settings of the scheduled Cold War Structures and the unscheduled structures of national importance (given the functional relationship between the scheduled and unscheduled structures, and the rest of the base, most, if not all of the base is likely to be considered within the setting of the scheduled and/or unscheduled structures). More specifically, the combination of further development around the eastern end of the runway and the rail freight interchange, also located to the eastern end of the runway, would be likely to harm the setting of the airfield and its runway. The setting of the airfield is important in understanding its function, with the area to the east of particular importance to understanding the operation of the runway, as well as the evolution of the base. There may be some scope for further development at or near Heyford Park, but in order to identify potential harm and suitable locations for development, a heritage impact assessment would be required at planmaking stage. This should not be left until planning application stage, as to do so would mean any identified development capacity would not be sufficiently evidenced and as such, this would render the plan unsound.
LPR-B-577	Historic England	Option 34	support the definition of valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance. This would help to differentiate more sensitive areas from less sensitive thereby helping to direct development away from more sensitive areas
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 1	Under (14) Our Rural communities there should be specific reference to the value and importance of delivering additional housing growth in such areas in order to support the objective of creating thriving village communities.
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 2	KO31 should be amended to make reference to the need to deliver market housing in rural communities (not just affordable housing) as it is by maintaining and securing additional resident population in rural villages that assists the viability of local services and facilities. KO23 should be amended to recognise that, whilst development is to be focussed to the most sustainable locations, a settlement hierarchy will be adopted that cascades development down through the villages and rural settlements of the District in recognition of the value of such to KO31 (as amended above)
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 3	5 - a combination of all of the above
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 6	Rates of affordable housing should be evidence-based and consistent throughout the District. The proportion of affordable housing set out in (2) above should be a maximum.

LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 7	Other affordable housing tenures – such as low cost market housing – should be promoted and prioritised ahead of social rented housing in order to encourage social mobility through housing tenures.
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Question - Separation Distances	No, should remain a matter of judgment based on site conditions.
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 9	2 - rely on Building Regulations
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 10	1 - Leave for Building Regulations (and future policy direction, if any)
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Question - Green Belt	No the Green Belt should be maintained given that a fundamental feature of the Green Belt, and reason for its designation, is its permanence.
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 12	Financial contributions (where compliant with the Regulations) subject to thorough testing and a higher level policy that requires (if at all) a specific degree of net gain.
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 13	1 - Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The principle of 20-minute neighbourhoods, and the benefits, are accepted and acknowledged. However, the delivery of such should not be sacrosanct or a specific policy requirement as it may not be practical, feasible or deliverable on sites depending on the specific characteristics of the site. Reference to such could be purely aspirational. It should also be recognised that this is less practical or deliverable in the rural areas of the District
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 29	2 - No further development should be permitted at Heyford Park beyond that which is already planned. It would be more beneficial to the sustainability of existing rural settlements for any rural housing to be spread, on a hierarchical basis (judged on sustainability) between existing villages/settlements. Such an approach would best support the viability of local services and facilities and the social cohesion of existing settlements. Further growth at Heyford Park would undermine this prospect to the detriment of well established communities
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 30	2 - there should be a step-change in the delivery of housing in rural areas, with a significant proportion of the District-wide housing need directed to the rural areas. This should be based on an analysis of the sustainability of existing settlements (i.e developing criteria that allow the sustainability of settlements to be assessed (eg availability of shops and services, public transport, jobs, communities facilities, and access to larger centres) together with their existing size. Then, having established a settlement sustainability hierarchy, housing growth should be proportionately allocated to settlements based on their sustainability score.
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 31	Whilst a combination of the above may be practical, it should not be at the exclusion of the Local Plan allocating such sites – in the same way that the Local Plan will do so for the other larger settlements of the District. There is no reasonable or logical basis for distinguishing, in this respect, between the approach to be taken in the towns and villages of the District
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 32	The hierarchy should be based on sustainability scoring as detailed in response to Option 30. That would include: shops, services, facilities, community facilities, parks and open space, employment opportunities, public transport, population size, access to (and proximity to) larger centres etc. The criteria and scoring should, itself, be subject to full public consultation.
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 33	3 - a combination
LPR-B-578	JCPC for Manorwood Consultancy	Option 34	The current approach – which facilitates objective and subjective assessment based on site specific circumstances – remains the best and most appropriate.

LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 2	Any future draft wording of policies needs to avoid being too prescriptive and inflexible and ensure responsiveness is built into them. This need for flexibility will be absolutely essential as the economy seeks to navigate and then recover from the challenges presented by the current COVID-19 crisis. The planning system should be a tool to unlock the potential of sites rather than restrict or hamper them. KO1 - Though brownfield development on suitable sites is to be preferred, allocating appropriate amounts of suitable greenfield sites will be necessary to meet housing need. Villages and smaller settlements have an important role to play in distributing growth across the District. It is important to note that 'sustainable locations' should not just be considered to be the main urban areas of the District. Other settlements, such as larger rural villages, also form sustainable locations where growth should be accommodated as an integral component of the spatial strategy to shape the delivery of the emerging vision and key objectives of the Plan. It is noted that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, and it is a requirement of the NPPF to maintain this. Current policies and allocations have not delivered enough homes, therefore new allocations need to be made in order to meet this need. KO15 It is not clear what the new policy concerning 'natural capital' seeks to achieve, bearing in mind there are already a suite of policies which cover areas such as trees, biodiversity, habitats, landscape impact etc. Policies – including the Key Objectives – need to realise the potential of individual sites and allow a site-by-site assessment rather than the application of broad-brush policies which are in turn too restrictive. .
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 6	recognise the importance of affordable housing provision. A flexible approach should be adopted at this stage in identifying the percentage requirement until a review of infrastructure costs and values has been carried out. It is going to be important for economic recovery and wider housing delivery to avoid placing undue burdens and restrictions on development. there is the need to ensure any new policy isn't prescriptive and allows for individual site circumstances and viability to be taken into account; this is the case with current Policy BSC 3 of the adopted Local Plan.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 8	re-emphasise the need to ensure flexibility in policies and standards and to avoid an overly prescriptive approach. Understand the ambition for space standards, there will however be occasions where site constraints or market demands require a site specific flexible or innovative approach to separation distances and space standards. Not everywhere will be a uniform housing estate on a greenfield site. Good design and layout is more important than a prescriptive standard that must be adhered to at all costs. Separation Distances may be better considered through a design guide SPD.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Question - Separation Distances	re-emphasise the need to ensure flexibility in policies and standards and to avoid an overly prescriptive approach. Understand the ambition for space standards, there will however be occasions where site constraints or market demands require a site specific flexible or innovative approach to separation distances and space standards. Not everywhere will be a uniform housing estate on a greenfield site. Good design and layout is more important than a prescriptive standard that must be adhered to at all costs. Separation Distances may be better considered through a design guide SPD.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 10	support Option 2 which seeks to reflect standards set by Central Government. It will be important for economic recovery and ongoing development in the District to avoid placing undue burdens and restrictions on the planning system. There is the need for flexibility to be built into any policy which reflects changes in national level guidance, standards and ambitions, any new policy should be flexible which moves with Government standards and objectives over time.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 12	need to be flexible and avoid a one size fits all approach. As currently drafted, the need to have options and present alternatives risks a Policy becoming too narrow, inflexible, and a burden on development. It is a 'cart before horse' approach to plan-making. The consultation document is seeking to narrow down the possibilities, and in doing so risks future draft Policy becoming too prescriptive. For example, there will be situations where option 1 is appropriate and situations where option 3 is appropriate. Any new Policy may wish to seek to incorporate a combination of all of the options in order to ensure individual development proposals are assessed with maximum flexibility in mind
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 13	preference is for Option 3 and no change to the existing arrangement. There is already a suite of other existing policies which cover this topic, and in the absence of any draft wording it is unclear what this Policy will introduce above that already considered as part of a planning application (e.g. landscape impact, biodiversity net gain etc.). risks placing additional burdens and obstacles on the planning system and development proposals.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principles as part of proposals at LPR-A-185. The site would meet the criteria of a 20-minute neighbourhood and would represent a well located, designed and sustainable development at Ambrosden.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 30	support option 2 to direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. Though brownfield development on suitable sites is to be preferred, allocating appropriate amounts of suitable greenfield sites will be necessary to meet housing need. Villages and smaller settlements have an important role to play in distributing growth across the District. It is important to note that 'sustainable locations' should not just be considered to be the main urban areas of the District. Other settlements, such as larger rural villages, also form sustainable locations where growth should be accommodated as an integral component of the spatial strategy to shape the delivery of the emerging vision and key objectives of the Plan. Any new draft policy should build in flexibility to a spatial approach to housing land and allocations across the District, and should have sufficient scope to allow the decision taker to have regard to the potential of sites on an individual basis. Current policies and allocations have not delivered enough homes, therefore new allocations need to be made in order to meet this need.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 31	support option 3 which is a combination of options 1 & 2, it is important to ensure flexibility and a responsive planning policy framework and avoid prescriptive policies that fail to account for individual circumstances that will change spatially as well as over time. Support the need to allocate sufficient housing in the rural areas to meet identified housing needs. Local need can of course be both market and affordable housing.

LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Option 32	options presented appear to be paving the way for a review of the settlement hierarchy and categorisation. the services which Ambrosden possesses have not significantly changed to warrant a different classification. It is a Category A large village which possess a school, post office, shops, public house, and a church, as noted by the 'Parish Profile' of Ambrosden produced by the Council as supporting evidence to this consultation. The circumstances have not changed since the previous policy classification was introduced, and Ambrosden remains one of the higher order settlements in the District capable of accommodating modest in scale housing growth.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Settlement boundaries should not be introduced in a District which currently doesn't define them. Planning policies need to remain flexible to account for changing circumstances in the future. Defined and rigid settlement boundaries would fail to achieve this, and with respect this question fails to take account of the changing circumstances and shifting sands which COVID19 presents. If boundaries are to be considered, they need to be large enough and policies flexible enough (e.g. to consider 'edge of boundary locations') to accommodate growth and not be a barrier to future development needs of the District. This question appears to be placing a potential barrier to development and a barrier to realising the future potential of settlements, it is introducing restrictions and introducing a lack of flexibility.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden - Parcel 1	Land off Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden - Parcel 1 is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA406.
LPR-B-579	Walsingham Planning for L&Q Estates	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden - Parcel 2	Land off Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden - Parcel 2 is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA407.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 2	Any future draft wording of policies needs to avoid being too prescriptive and inflexible and ensure responsiveness is built into them. This need for flexibility will be absolutely essential as the economy seeks to navigate and then recover from the challenges presented by the current COVID-19 crisis. The planning system should be a tool to unlock the potential of sites rather than restrict or hamper them. KO1 - Allocating appropriate amounts of suitable greenfield sites will be necessary to meet housing need. Villages and smaller settlements have an important role to play in distributing growth across the District. It is noted that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, and it is a requirement of the NPPF to maintain this. Current policies and allocations have not delivered enough homes, therefore new allocations need to be made in order to meet this need. KO15- It is not clear what the new policy concerning 'natural capital' seeks to achieve, bearing in mind there are already a suite of policies which cover areas such as trees, biodiversity, habitats, landscape impact etc. In support of KO20, it will be necessary to allowing appropriate levels of development in rural settlements, to deliver the market and affordable homes necessary to allow families to remain in their local area and to meet the needs of ageing populations. This doesn't necessarily require allocations but instead could be through a flexible, permissive policy approach for the lower tier settlements (i.e. the villages) identified by the Settlement Hierarchy. Policies – including the Key Objectives – need to realise the potential of individual sites and allow a site-by-site assessment rather than the application of broad-brush policies which are in turn too restrictive.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 6	support Option 2 to keep the percentage levels the same. It is going to be important for economic recovery and wider housing delivery to avoid placing undue burdens and restrictions on development. The policy needs to be based on up to date evidence, and the policy needs to have built in to it the ability to take viability into account. There is the need to ensure any new policy isn't prescriptive and allows for individual site circumstances and viability to be taken into account; this is the case with current Policy BSC 3 of the adopted Local Plan
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 8	re-emphasise the need to ensure flexibility in policies and standards and to avoid an overly prescriptive approach. would note footnote 49 of the NPPF states that policies may make use of the nationally described space standard, but only where the need for an internal standard can be justified. Understand the ambition for space standards, there will however be occasions where site constraints or market demands require a site specific flexible or innovative approach to separation distances and space standards. Not everywhere will be a uniform housing estate on a greenfield site. Good design and layout is more important than a prescriptive standard that must be adhered to at all costs. Separation Distances may be better considered through a design guide SPD.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Question - Separation Distances	re-emphasise the need to ensure flexibility in policies and standards and to avoid an overly prescriptive approach. would note footnote 49 of the NPPF states that policies may make use of the nationally described space standard, but only where the need for an internal standard can be justified. Understand the ambition for space standards, there will however be occasions where site constraints or market demands require a site specific flexible or innovative approach to separation distances and space standards. Not everywhere will be a uniform housing estate on a greenfield site. Good design and layout is more important than a prescriptive standard that must be adhered to at all costs. Separation Distances may be better considered through a design guide SPD.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 10	support Option 2 which seeks to reflect standards set by Central Government. It will be important for economic recovery and ongoing development in the District to avoid placing undue burdens and restrictions on the planning system. There is the need for flexibility to be built into any policy which reflects changes in national level guidance, standards and ambitions, any new policy should be flexible which moves with Government standards and objectives over time.

LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 12	need to be flexible and avoid a one size fits all approach. As currently drafted, the need to have options and present alternatives risks a Policy becoming too narrow, inflexible, and a burden on development. It is a 'cart before horse' approach to plan-making. The consultation document is seeking to narrow down the possibilities, and in doing so risks future draft Policy becoming too prescriptive. For example, there will be situations where option 1 is appropriate and situations where option 3 is appropriate. Any new Policy may wish to seek to incorporate a combination of all of the options in order to ensure individual development proposals are assessed with maximum flexibility in mind
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 13	preference is for Option 3 and no change to the existing arrangement. There is already a suite of other existing policies which cover this topic, and in the absence of any draft wording it is unclear what this Policy will introduce above that already considered as part of a planning application (e.g. landscape impact, biodiversity net gain etc.). risks placing additional burdens and obstacles on the planning system and development proposals.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 30	support option 2 to direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. Allocating appropriate amounts of suitable greenfield sites will be necessary to meet housing need. Villages and smaller settlements have an important role to play in distributing growth across the District. Any new draft policy should build in flexibility to a spatial approach to housing land and allocations across the District, and should have sufficient scope to allow the decision taker to have regard to the potential of sites on an individual basis. Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, and it is a requirement of the NPPF to maintain this. Current policies and allocations have not delivered enough homes, therefore new allocations need to be made in order to meet this need. Combined with the impact of COVID-19 it would follow that policies need to have more flexibility enshrined in them than is currently the case. it will be necessary to allow appropriate levels of development in rural settlements to deliver the market and affordable homes necessary to allow families to remain in their local area and to meet the needs of ageing populations. This doesn't necessarily require allocations but instead could be through a flexible, permissive policy approach for the lower tier settlements (i.e. the villages) identified by the Settlement Hierarchy. Successive Local Plans have placed restrictive policies upon rural villages limiting development to minor development, infill and conversions. Opportunities for such development are finite and have gradually depleted, and minor development has been lacking. Therefore, allocated development at rural villages is necessary to deliver the housing requirement proportionally and sustainably throughout the District.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 31	support option 3 which is a combination of options 1 & 2, it is important to ensure flexibility and a responsive planning policy framework and avoid prescriptive policies that fail to account for individual circumstances that will change spatially as well as over time. it would be less onerous for the Council to identify a housing requirement for rural areas (or identified settlements or Parishes) and use a criteria-based approach to identification, rather than make a large number of small allocations which each then need to be justified. This would allow a flexible approach to the spatial distribution of housing in the rural areas. Support the need to allocate sufficient housing in the rural areas to meet identified housing needs. Local need can of course be both market and affordable housing.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Option 32	options presented appear to be paving the way for a review of the settlement hierarchy and categorisation. Whilst Shutford is a category C village in the adopted Local Plan, it is part of a close network of small villages reliant upon each other for shared services and amenities. The 'Parish Profile' of Shutford produced by the Council as supporting evidence to this consultation highlights the Church, public house, recreational facilities, and local bus service. However, within 4km of the village are a number of surrounding villages (including Shutford, North Newington, Swalcliffe, Balscote, Sibford Gower/Ferris, Tadmarton, Shenington and Wroxton) which together provide a level of local services that an individual village of 500 residents could not sustain. A strict interpretation of settlement hierarchy fails to account for situations such as this, it potentially gives licence to restrict development in a location that is well served by local services and facilities and where there is a local need for housing. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF is explicit in requiring housing to be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas. It states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Indeed, by encouraging modest growth amongst these villages it ensures that the shared services can be sustained and therefore prevents further longer journeys to the main centres. The adopted Local Plan policies allow next to no additional housing for these villages, which is a threat to the sustainability of their services and amenities. Allocations and/or positively worded policies are required to deliver modest growth in the village of Shutford
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Question - Settlement Boundaries	re-emphasise the need to ensure flexibility in policies and standards and to avoid an overly prescriptive approach. would note footnote 49 of the NPPF states that policies may make use of the nationally described space standard, but only where the need for an internal standard can be justified. Understand the ambition for space standards, there will however be occasions where site constraints or market demands require a site specific flexible or innovative approach to separation distances and space standards. Not everywhere will be a uniform housing estate on a greenfield site. Good design and layout is more important than a prescriptive standard that must be adhered to at all costs. Separation Distances may be better considered through a design guide SPD.
LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the west of Fringford, Fringford	Land to the west of Fringford, Fringford is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA399.



LPR-B-580	Walsingham Planning for R2 Developments	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the north of Epwell Road, Shutford	Land to the north of Epwell Road, Shutford is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA202.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 1	Agree with the vision and the focus on the key settlements of the District.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 3	1 - The focus should be on the most sustainable existing urban centres – that is, a focus on Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington as set out in (1) above.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 4	The approach should be flexible recognising structural shifts in the market/economy likely over the plan period. To that extent, Classes B and E should be facilitated, but not to the preclusion of Sui Generis activities that have employment-generating capabilities
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Question - Supporting Employment	Nothing specific, but the policies should be sufficiently flexible to be responsive to market changes and demands
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 6	Levels of affordability (in plan policy) should be subject to general viability testing at a macrolevel, but indications are that the levels (in (2)) should be maintained or decreased.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 7	Dependent on housing needs assessment, but suggestion is that other affordable housing tenures should be pushed and promoted ahead of social rented schemes to act as a catalyst for greater social/housing progression and mobility.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 8	This question needs to be considered alongside objectives/considerations in respect of density, separation distances, garden sizes. Different forms of development (eg greenfield development, development on previously developed land within existing settlements) will have varying capabilities to meet the requirements whilst facilitating the proper, efficient and effective development of land. To that extent, if standards are to be referenced at all, the policy should indicate those standards will be applied flexible to recognise different site circumstances.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Question - Separation Distances	This question needs to be considered alongside objectives/considerations in respect of density, separation distances, garden sizes. Different forms of development (eg greenfield development, development on previously developed land within existing settlements) will have varying capabilities to meet the requirements whilst facilitating the proper, efficient and effective development of land. To that extent, if standards are to be referenced at all, the policy should indicate those standards will be applied flexible to recognise different site circumstances.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 9	2 - rely on Building Regulations

LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 13	1 - Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The principle of 20-minute neighbourhoods, and the benefits, are accepted and acknowledged. However, the delivery of such should not be sacrosanct or a specific policy requirement as it may not be practical, feasible or deliverable on sites depending on the specific characteristics of the site. Reference to such could be purely aspirational, albeit it is not a facet of good planning that has already endured for a number of years.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 22	Firstly Bicester, in a strategically significant location in regional and national terms, should accommodate significant additional growth. That should necessarily be in the form of major urban extensions in to the open countryside (Option (1)) but in a form that maintains the generally concentric form and morphology of the settlement (that is, not an extension to an existing, recent strategic extension that would unbalance the form of the settlement, <b>but one that completes the concentric form of the town).</b>
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Option 23	Given matters expressed in response to option 23, growth should be considered (and focussed) to the north and east of the town and, more specifically to the northeast. In particular, site LPR-A-085 (Land north-east of Skimmingdish Lane/Bicester Road) would – either individually or in conjunction with adjoining land – ensure a re-balancing of Bicester that reflects the morphology of the town, and has the potential to positively <b>integrate with planned strategic infrastructure.</b>
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Strategic scale urban extensions could provide significant additional green spaces together with sport and recreation facilities. Such developments would contribute positively to a network of green infrastructure. In such respects, development of LPR-A-085 (Land northeast of Skimmingdish Lane/Bicester Road) would afford the potential for the delivery of significant improvements to formal and informal open space and sport and recreation facilities.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	Whilst there are no specific comments on the submitted sites, it should be recognised that strategic scale urban extensions afford the potential for the delivery of new (hitherto publicly inaccessible) areas of Local Green Space that would be of particular community benefit and, with comprehensive planning, would secure a network of connected accessible open spaces. The development of LPR-A-085 (Land north-east of Skimmingdish Lane/Bicester Road) <b>provides an opportunity to secure such Green Space benefits.</b>
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north east of Skimmingdish Lane / Bicester Road, Bicester	Land north east of Skimmingdish Lane / Bicester Road, Bicester is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA337.
LPR-B-581	JCPC for Messers Deeley, Morgan, Horton, Astonhill Land Ltd	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of Launton	Land north of Launton is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA449.
LPR-B-582	Alan Thompson	LPR-A-152	concerns re traffic and environmental issues. Hanwell is essentially a rat run between the Southam Road and Warrick road. The traffic levels at peak times are not only extremely high but average speeds are well in excess of current speed restrictions. high traffic volumes/speeds results in road rage; Increased local housing will only serve to worsen this problem. I have no doubt whatsoever, there will be a fatality in the near future if this is allowed to go unchecked. From an environmental perspective, the increase in litter as a direct result from increased housing is nothing short of horrendous. From the litter and pollution generated from the initial construction phase through to new residents' litter, the environmental impact is unacceptable. The evidence is there for all to see at the boundary between the latest development and what remains of our green belt. It's a sad fact that our villages are steadily being consumed by the constant expansion of towns. Enough is <b>enough. Hanwell has shouldered it's fair share of local development.</b>
LPR-B-582	Alan Thompson	LPR-A-214	concerns re traffic and environmental issues. Hanwell is essentially a rat run between the Southam Road and Warrick road. The traffic levels at peak times are not only extremely high but average speeds are well in excess of current speed restrictions. high traffic volumes/speeds results in road rage; Increased local housing will only serve to worsen this problem. I have no doubt whatsoever, there will be a fatality in the near future if this is allowed to go unchecked. From an environmental perspective, the increase in litter as a direct result from increased housing is nothing short of horrendous. From the litter and pollution generated from the initial construction phase through to new residents' litter, the environmental impact is unacceptable. The evidence is there for all to see at the boundary between the latest development and what remains of our green belt. It's a sad fact that our villages are steadily being consumed by the constant expansion of towns. Enough is <b>enough. Hanwell has shouldered it's fair share of local development.</b>

LPR-B-583	Julie Holloway	Shutford	Shutford is a category C village for planning purposes as it does not have the required services / infrastructure for development. There is no school, doctors surgery or shop. We have a village hall, pub, church and small playground only. roads in and around Shutford are of poor quality and have very little lighting. Single tracked roads, pinch points, roads unsuitable for heavy/additional traffic- all make the village unsustainable for large construction projects or vehicles. Shutford has a lot of underlying stone and this has made even small developments difficult in the past. There have been historical and ongoing problems with the village sewerage / drainage problems inc. a report of raw sewage overflowing into Sor Brook. Given the state of the ground conditions these would be difficult and extremely costly to improve on and upgrade. Thistle Hill is an extremely valuable natural resource . The Environment Bill states that local authorities are responsible for delivering on all aspects included within the bill. Neither site proposed in the village should be included in the final plan.
LPR-B-584	Mrs David	Hempton	Ref to LPR-A-001 to LPR-A-150. Objects to proposed development of 1.2 acre site on land south of The Lane, Hempton. No access to the site and strongly opposes the use of The Lane as it is so narrow. Traffic in Hempton is dangerous enough now - ridiculous to think of adding more.
LPR-B-585	Edgars for Lagan Homes	Option 30	2 - should be supported, as it includes a number of important benefits. small-medium sized sites in villages can make an important contribution to the vitality and viability of villages. Existing services and facilities that are available to residents rely upon a sufficient population in order to remain viable, and to continue in supporting local residents for their daily needs without requiring to travel greater distances. Small-medium development sites can contribute towards population, assisting in contributing to economic vitality and directly contributing to existing local services and facilities. small- medium rural sites have an important role to play in supporting the sustainability of the rural areas of the district.small-medium sites in more rural areas are often quicker to implement and deliver. Ref to NPPF para 69. The authority should not solely rely on a small number of strategic sites, as these can be slower to deliver; allocating smaller sites in rural areas can support wider delivery numbers, consistency in new homes delivery and affordable homes delivery, and in general terms can present less risk of delivery issues than compared to strategic sites. This point is supported by the fact that Table 1 of the Local Plan Review Paper 2 outlines that in the period 2011-2021 in Cherwell the 'rural areas' was the category where the most homes had been delivered in percentage terms against the originally planned for figures for the 2011-2031 period. Given this, further allocation should be made to the rural areas. Option 30 (2) of Housing in Rural Areas would align with Option 5 of the latest version of the Oxfordshire Plan. Option 5 of the Oxfordshire Plan related to a 'focus on supporting rural communities'. Any strategic regional plan should include support for rural areas, and Local Plans should help to support this through allocating specific sites and directing levels of growth to rural areas. Site LPRA-101 has been submitted previously for the allocation and delivery of 15 homes. the site could come forward with a high-quality design the responds to the local context and supports the village of Fritwell in economic terms and in terms of providing affordable housing.
LPR-B-585	Edgars for Lagan Homes	Option 31	Option 31 (1), allocating specific sites to meet identified housing needs, is an appropriate measure. Allocating sites through the Local Plan process would provide certainty on housing delivery for the rural areas and certainty to meeting identified housing needs. In a Plan-led system, Lagan Homes would support further allocations of specific sites to meet housing need. The rural areas would benefit from the certainty that site allocations can provide. It is important to ensure that sufficient site allocations are made for housing in order to deliver both locally, and in terms of wider regional growth visions. This should include a role for villages, for example Category A villages, rather than exclude such places, to ensure that contributions are made across the board. Re site LPRA-101 Since the submission of the site to the previous call for sites, Lagan Homes has been investigating the potential design (minimising and mitigating heritage impacts) and investigating the quantum in more detail and would welcome discussions with CDC on this well-screened small site in a location that would contribute to Fritwell as an existing Local Plan defined 'Category A' village, contributing socially and economically to the local context.
LPR-B-585	Edgars for Lagan Homes	Option 32	the Local Planning Authority should have awareness of the level of certainty there is in existing services and facilities being maintained. Allocating growth to rural areas can be key to ensuring that villages remain sustainable, with new development helping to support existing services and facilities. Directing growth only to the most sustainable locations in the district could lead to a decline in viability of services and facilities of the rural areas over time- Therefore, supporting rural areas is a key consideration in developing any rural settlement hierarchy.
LPR-B-585	Edgars for Lagan Homes	LPR-A-101	Site LPR-A-101 has been submitted previously for the allocation and delivery of 15 homes. the site could come forward with a high-quality design the responds to the local context and supports the village of Fritwell in economic terms and in terms of providing affordable housing. Since the submission of the site to the previous call for sites, Lagan Homes has been investigating the potential design (minimising and mitigating heritage impacts) and investigating the quantum in more detail and would welcome discussions with CDC on this wellscreened small site in a location that would contribute to Fritwell as an existing Local Plan defined 'Category A' village, contributing socially and economically to the local context.
LPR-B-586	Emma Brown	LPR-A-077	Objects. Croft Lane is unsuitable to accommodate more traffic from the proposed development. Visibility is already restricted when cars park to use local facilities. Parking in the village has got worse over time, with delivery vehicles/bin lorries blocking the narrow lane. Development would result in major disruption to residents of Croft Lane as they would be unable to access thier properties due to construction traffic. Croft Lane is also a popular lane for walkers and dog owners and provides access to the countryside. The field is unique as it has access from croft lane and meadow view allowing access to the countryside along the public footpath.

LPR-B-587	Mrs K Winter	Sibford Gower	Notes that CDC seem intent on destroying the villages. Conservation of the countryside, agricultural land and wildlife no longer seem to matter; will be lost forever if covered with concrete. May need all the agricultural land we have to feed ourselves in the future. 360 homes will result in 720+ cars using roads which were not made for the current level of traffic let alone more. Government looks to reduce car usage not increase it. No work in the village which will mean people will have to travel to work by car and all outings will require car usage. Facilities in village include a small short and limited post office with no room for expansion. the development will require new infrastructure- water, electricity for car charging, street lighting. Street lighting not favoured as it will be detrimental to the wildlife and natural world. Banbury is derelict- empty properties should be used for housing where infrastructure already exists rather than use agricultural land. Historic part of England. Never going to catch up on the housing situation anyway due to foreigners coming to the country and people owning a second home. 720 trees should be planted instead.
LPR-B-588	North Newington Parish Council	Parish Profile - North Newington	The parish profile attached to the Local Plan is out of date and inaccurate. Information provided to update. <b>Primary School</b> – Bishop Carpenter C of E – School Lane: 102 places – oversubscribed in 2021, the school has access issues in extreme weather due to its position in the village and school drop off and pick up times often result in road blockages and tailbacks onto Main Street and the Banbury Road. There is no safe means by which parents from outside of the village can walk or cycle with their children to school and for those living in the village the walk to school is not fully paved from any direction. <b>Recreation Ground / Playing Field:</b> Comes under Oxfordshire County Council jurisdiction but is maintained by the school / parish. Facilities are minimal – i.e., 2 goal posts. <b>Equipped play area:</b> Maintained by the parish, suitable only for under 9's. <b>Bus Services:</b> Removed in October 2021, the service was of little use to the village due to the pickup and drop off times. Similar services have been in place and removed due to lack of viability over the past 10 years. School bus services which are not mentioned in the parish profile are oversubscribed and extremely expensive, with some of those living on the Shutford road end of the village unable to access the service. Please note two of the proposed developments are on this side of the village <b>Day Nursery</b> – Castle Preschool No footpath from the village to the preschool and two extremely dangerous corners on the route mean that village residents are often unwilling or unable to walk or cycle with their children to the local facility. <b>Digital Connectivity:</b> High speed broadband often compromised by bandwidth issues. Mobile phone reception is limited on all major networks. <b>Neighbourhood Plan:</b> The Parish Council are exploring the opportunity / benefits of adopting a neighbourhood plan.
LPR-B-588	North Newington Parish Council	North Newington	transport infrastructure concerns resulting from new development - village used by many in surrounding villages as a 'rat run'; new development in North Newington and the surrounding villages would escalate an existing problem. Existing roads are narrow due to parking constraints, and road access is more difficult during peak school times. Parish council supports the promotion of the 20MPH for Oxfordshire villages campaign. Public transport is non-existent and safe cycle and walking routes to Banbury do not exist. Limited transport infrastructure to support the village. Access to the M40 or trainline is constrained by existing high levels of traffic on Broughton road. Sewerage and Drainage- questions whether there is infrastructure capacity to accommodate new developments in terms of power, water and drainage. Housing on the southern plot from Main Street would cause possible flooding to current properties. Existing residents experience with water pressure and sewerage problems; more development would exacerbate the issues. Conservation and community wellbeing- if not carefully considered, the creation of more homes in rural areas could lead to adverse impact on the wellbeing of existing residents; a holistic net gain in wellbeing for existing and new residents should be considered. Development in the village with a large number of conservation sites would be detrimental to the fabric and history of the village. The proposed development behind Main Street is out of character and on an incline and therefore would likely be visible from the road changing the nature of the village landscape. There are a number of public rights of way from the village. important to maintain the footpaths around the village which provided a great many people with access to nature and exercise during the restrictions throughout the pandemic. reference to NPPF 2021 in relation to the three objectives for housing development and commentary re the north newington proposals. North Newington is not the right type of land in the right place, due to its limited infrastructure. North Newington is a Category C village without the amenities needed to meet this social objective. There is no village shop, village hall or even a frequent bus service. Social needs would therefore not be met. Taking agricultural land to build houses is certainly not adhering to this environmental objective. Animal and wildlife habitats would be destroyed, and traffic would be increased, adding to congestion and pollution. The Parish Council's preference would be for greater development to progress within the existing urban conurbations and particularly on brownfield sites. Such developments are likely to be more environmentally sustainable, affordable to a greater demographic and economically viable to build. This can be supplemented by proportionate and considered infill reflecting an 'option C' village as defined in the current Local Plan. prefer that each development plot is considered by their own merits and would not be supportive of increasing dwelling numbers at a greater rate than delivered in recent years.
LPR-B-589	Stephen and Denise Mobbs	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Noise, light & air pollution will be exacerbated & the urbanisation of these rural areas will destroy the appearance forever.

LPR-B-589	Stephen and Denise Mobbs	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPRA-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Noise , light &amp; air pollution will be exacerbated &amp; the urbanisation of these rural areas will destroy the appearance forever.</p>
LPR-B-589	Stephen and Denise Mobbs	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPRA-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Noise , light &amp; air pollution will be exacerbated &amp; the urbanisation of these rural areas will destroy the appearance forever.</p>
LPR-B-589	Stephen and Denise Mobbs	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Noise , light &amp; air pollution will be exacerbated &amp; the urbanisation of these rural areas will destroy the appearance forever.</p>
LPR-B-589	Stephen and Denise Mobbs	LPR-A-258	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Noise , light &amp; air pollution will be exacerbated &amp; the urbanisation of these rural areas will destroy the appearance forever.</p>

LPR-B-590	Charlotte Hefferman and Timothy Palmer	LPR-A-175	entirely opposed to any large scale housing development that would dramatically disturb the character of the village, and it's setting within the landscape. Wardington has 57 Grade II Listed Buildings and sits in a Conservation Area. Part of site 1 is within the Wardington Conservation Area and adjoins a listed building. the proposed site is not within the boundaries of the village settlement and so does tally with the Category B policy of infilling and conversion within settlement limits. The latter would relate to development/ conversion within the settlement boundaries, sensitive to the listed designation of buildings. The proposed plan is outside of this so the policy does not apply. development on the proposed site would remove the open space, surrounding that aspect of the village, which is an essential part of the sense of place and it is the open landscape that frames the village. The development will result in more cars in the village, and the existing narrow roads are not suitable for increased traffic. increased air, noise pollution and congestion in the village will diminish the quality of life of local residents. The site development does not align with the Cherwell Local Plan for sustainability. It does not promote active travel, but rather a greater dependence on car travel, due to the need to travel for work and employment opportunities. The site development would incur the loss of rural landscapes and local identity. Due to their small size, hamlets and villages are particularly susceptible to losing their historic identity through new development. To the east of the village, the construction of HS2 is already significantly impacting the landscape. Planning policy needs to protect small rural villages from the impacts of such developments. The land's existing designation as adjoining a conservation area and adjoining a registered battlefield, mean it is completely inappropriate for planning consideration and we would like to request that the Council carefully considers all aspects of this proposed development, in relation to the negative impact this would have on the local area and people, and in terms of how it fails to align with the Council's Local Plan for Sustainable Development
LPR-B-591	Angela Green	Adderbury	Strongly objects. No facilities in the village except a small local shop and 4 pubs. No doctors or dentists or take aways. Roads already subject of heavy congestion, roads are narrow, out dated and dangerous and often flood. Further planned increase to the village is completely disproportionate to the village; the 60ha site would be more than double the size of Twyford. New development backing on to respondents property has resulted in noise disturbance from dogs and cars starting, lighting disturbance from car lights. Development of the land will result in the loss of agricultural land for growing crops and rearing sheep; need to produce more food locally. Development would result in loss of country walks and views over fields; the heart of country life. Development would result in the destruction of the environment and local wildlife habitats. Land proposed to the east of Adderbury would be impacted by the noise, light and pollution from the M40. Other villages in Cherwell that can accommodate development.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 2	The 'health' of Town Centres and Town Centre population is inter-twined. This need to be reflected in both plan and policy making. The following amendments to the key objectives are requested. KO7: Support Cherwell's urban centres, including where beneficial, redevelopment and renewal, to maintain and enhance their vitality, viability, distinctiveness and safety. Acknowledge the importance of residential led mixed-use developments in Town Centre developments as a regeneration tool. KO 23 focus development in Cherwell's sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and the setting of its towns and villages. KO23 does not go far enough. The following additional KO is requested. "As a means to facilitate Town Centre regeneration, focus development on brownfield Town Centre sites, and acknowledge the importance of residential led mixeduse developments in Town Centre developments as a regeneration tool".
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 5	The approach of Option 2 should be the preferred approach. As the Country come out of the pandemic, the planning system, now more than ever, needs to grasp the changing role of the Town Centre and the implications for plan and policy making. Quote provided from The House of Commons, Housing Communities and Local Government Committee report February 2019 titled 'High Streets and Town Centres in 2030' paragraph 38. The Committee considers that high streets and town centres will experience 'largescale structural change' which will require intervention by local authorities. Intervention will by necessity include adjustment to planning policies and the rebalancing of planning decisions in order to respond to the structural economic change to town centres. The Committee considers (98) that 'planning is crucial to high street and town centre transformation' It is essential that planning policy move away from the outdated approach of protecting retail use within Town Centre. Regeneration and the 'health' of Town Centres can no longer be maintained and improved by focusing on the retail function of Town Centre.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Question - Supporting Our Town Centres	The Council's Town Centre and Retail Study (September 2021) (TCRS) concluded that there are a number of areas within the Town Centre that needs regeneration and that these areas should be brought forward in a holistic manner. Calthorpe Street & Marlborough Road is included within the areas that need regeneration. many of the Town Centre shops are failing and facing huge viability challenges. Quotes from paras 9.11 and 9.21 of the TCRS which illustrate the need for bold interventions, increase intown living, greater encouragement of residential developmet in the town centre. The TCRS has identified 6 sites that represent key regeneration opportunities. Site 3- Calthorpe Street & Marlborough Road is included in this list. The TCRS further describes the site and confirms its suitability for residential development. Town Centre policy should acknowledge the role that residential development can play in regeneration. Planning policy should encourage residential development on Brownfield sites within Town Centres. The Local Plan should allocate Town Centre sites that are suitable for residential mixeduse development, that will assist in Town Centre regeneration. Site 3 Site 3 - Calthorpe Street & Marlborough Road – as set out in the TCRS should be allocated in the emerging Local Plan for residential mixed-use development. In line with government direction, to ensure the most effective use of land through housing densities, there must be scope for tall buildings, in appropriate Town Centre and other locations, such as transport hubs, around bus and train stations. Development plans should define what would constitute a tall building, this may simply be a building that is taller than those around it. Suggested planning policy wording – (wording taken from National Design Guide (2021)) 'As a means to facilitate Town Centre regeneration, residential development on Brownfield Town Centre sites will be supported. In appropriate locations, well-designed tall buildings can play a positive urban design role in the built form, and can act as landmarks, making a positive contribution to views, as well as increasing housing density'
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 6	Option 2 preferred.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 7	Option 2 preferred.

LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 8	Option 1 preferred.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Question - Separation Distances	No, this could compromise the design process and the effective use of land. Embedded effective design elements can mitigate amenity issues such as, massing, overlooking and privacy.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 9	Option 1 preferred.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 10	Option 1 preferred.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 11	Option 1 preferred.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 12	Option 2 preferred.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes, only in the urban areas of Banbury and Bicester.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 18	Planning policy should prioritise development on brownfield sites in Town Centre locations.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 19	Planning policy should prioritise development on brownfield sites in Town Centre locations. In line with the findings of the TCRS, the site that have been identified as key regeneration site should be allocated in the emerging Local Plan. Site 3 - Calthorpe Street & Marlborough Road – as set out in the TCRS should be allocated in the emerging Local Plan for residential mixed-use development. Please see answer to earlier QUESTION SUPPORTING TOWN CENTRES
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Option 20	Option 2 should be progressed. As the Country come out of the pandemic, the planning system, now more than ever, needs to grasp the changing role of the Town Centre and the implications for plan and policy making. Quote provided from The House of Commons, Housing Communities and Local Government Committee report February 2019 titled 'High Streets and Town Centres in 2030' paragraph 38. The Committee considers that high streets and town centres will experience 'large-scale structural change' which will require intervention by local authorities. Intervention will by necessity include adjustment to planning policies and the rebalancing of planning decisions in order to respond to the structural economic change to town centres. The Committee considers (98) that 'planning is crucial to high street and town centre transformation' It is essential that planning policy move away from the outdated approach of protecting retail use within Town Centre. Regeneration and the 'health' of Town Centres can no longer be maintained and improved by focusing on the retail function of Town Centre.
LPR-B-592	Framptons for Skape Banbury	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Prioritising residential development on brownfield site development in Town Centres.
LPR-B-593	Framptons for Wardington Parish Council	Option 2	supports the key objectives set out in the consultation. Fundamentally the purpose of the Plan is to address and use implications arising from both the need to accommodate future growth, particularly in housing and employment provision, and the urgency to respond to the climate emergency. While it is acknowledged that the national planning context for the preparation of development plans is evolving, the consequential changes will be subservient to the principal functions of the Local Plan. As such, it is considered that the Plan could usefully set out the overarching key objectives of the Local Plan so that all land use planning considerations remain focussed upon the objectives of the highest imperative. As presently drafted the objectives may all be considered to have the same weight. The extensive list of objectives devalues those which should be of the highest imperative in planmaking and decision-taking. The other objectives then flow from these overarching objectives. The overarching key objectives should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To address the challenge of the climate emergency.</li> <li>• To ensure that new development contributes to sustainable development</li> </ul>
LPR-B-593	Framptons for Wardington Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	consider that this principle is sound, but emphasises the need for future growth to be located adjoining existing urban areas, and larger rural settlements of the District which have a range of facilities and services. It is of course accepted that the level of services in the larger (Category A villages) will not replicate the level of services available that may be available in the urban areas. Nevertheless, some level of growth should be allocated to the villages which have a range of services- so as to both support the existence of these villages and to avoid villages that cannot support such facilities, being under pressure to accommodate growth that would not amount to a sustainable pattern of development
LPR-B-593	Framptons for Wardington Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	agrees with the approach set out in the Transport Hierarchy in promoting sustainable patterns of development. It is of course acknowledged that the opportunities to promote sustainable transport will not be the same in rural areas as urban areas. Nevertheless, the underlying objective of the Transport Hierarchy should not be abandoned for the rural areas. The evolution of low carbon technology for transport does not address the need to promote active travel, particularly by walking. Further significant levels of growth across the rural areas of the District are unlikely to be conducive to the provision of effective public and community transport.

LPR-B-593	Framptons for Wardington Parish Council	Option 30	consider that in the interests of promoting sustainable patterns of development, the primary focus of growth should continue to be the main urban areas of the District, and then the larger villages which have a wide range of services and facilities. In other settlements such as Wardington, which has minimal facilities, housing should be limited to meet local needs as may be identified by the local community. WPC do not support any form of dispersal strategy for growth across the rural areas to meet wider District needs. Such an approach will lead to patterns of development that are not sustainable, particularly in terms of connectivity between new housing and services. The consequences will be that the character and identity of small village communities will be eroded. Increased travel will be promoted between small rural settlements and larger centres. No overall strategic benefit in the interests of sustainable development is to be gained from a dispersal strategy of growth across the rural areas of the District.
LPR-B-593	Framptons for Wardington Parish Council	Option 31	consider that the preferred approach to the provision of housing to meet local needs is to work with the local communities to establish whether: (I) There is a local need, (II) The scale of any local need. The alternative of setting a Parish level figure could result in unsustainable patterns of development, where there is a mismatch between the Parish figure and a demonstratable scale of local housing need.
LPR-B-593	Framptons for Wardington Parish Council	Option 32	considers that additional weight should be given to availability of day to day services within rural communities. Such services should include: - Primary School - Local convenience shop - Health facilities It is of course recognised that there is a limit to the level of services which even the larger villages of the District can provide. Hence the criterion of accessibility between the larger villages and urban centres is an important consideration in determining the level of growth into the larger rural settlements. While larger villages may serve a hinterland of villages, it should be recognised that accessibility to services in larger villages from smaller villages is generally not feasible by walking, cycling or public transport. Hence, the assignment of housing growth unrelated to local need should be avoided in smaller villages because occupiers would be reliant upon the private car to access day to day services. The identification of Settlement Boundaries is considered expedient to establish a plan distinction as to where the principle of new development is acceptable, and where the principle is not supported. Such clarity as to the application of planning policy provides confidence to the local community as to the geographic area where the principle of new development is acceptable.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 1	broadly support the suggested vision for Cherwell and welcome the suggestion of new development built to high energy efficiency, with well designed market and affordable homes and the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods. Keen to explore point 14) relating to rural communities, which references thriving communities, enhanced connectivity through digital infrastructure and modes of transport. We consider this point should reflect how rural communities are anticipated to accommodate housing growth in order to support the District's housing needs, and the importance that this can contribute to these thriving rural communities.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 2	support the principles of the draft key objectives. Consider the most important objectives to be KO1, KO22, KO23, KO27, KO30 and KO31. It is important to note that 'sustainable locations' should not just be considered to be the main urban areas of the District i.e. Banbury and Bicester, where the majority of growth was directed to in the 2015 Local Plan. Other settlements, such as larger rural villages, also form sustainable locations where growth should be accommodated as an integral component of the spatial strategy to shape the delivery of the emerging vision and key objectives of the Plan. This is reflected by paragraph 79 of the NPPF (2021).
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 6	recognise the importance of affordable housing provision and the need for this to be considered through the plan making process in the context of up to-date and detailed local evidence of housing need and viability. A balanced approach should be taken in setting the percentage requirement for affordable housing, reflecting evidence of infrastructure costs and values associated with the wider delivery of the plan. Difficult to comment on the optimum policy requirement for affordable housing going forward, without first having the benefit of engaging in and reviewing the evidence that will test this and ultimately inform the preferred option for the Local Plan.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 7	It is essential that the Local Plan enables the delivery of a sufficient supply of homes. Any local policy requirements associated with the affordable housing tenure mix should therefore be set in the context of an assessment that fully considers the needs of different groups in the community. At this stage, it is difficult to comment on the affordable housing tenure mix in advance of the publication of an evidence base that assesses the optimum mix to plan for locally over the new plan period.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 8	support the consideration of space standards through the local plan making process and the recognition that any policy requirements would need to be underpinned by local evidence, and assessments of need and viability. Any future policy wording should allow flexibility for sitespecific circumstances where meeting the proposed minimum standards might not be possible in certain circumstances
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Question - Separation Distances	consider that separation distances are a matter that would be better dealt with through a wider design guide SPD rather than a planning policy requirement that might set minimum separation distances.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 9	It is not considered that a planning requirement relating to housing accessibility is necessary, in addition to the requirements set out within Building Regulations.



LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 10	Option 2 is supported. Support sustainable construction and the proposed provision of policies within the Local Plan, however they should align with Government policies and not necessarily exceed them, particularly given there will likely be significant changes and enhancements over the lifetime of this Plan.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 12	All options set out for off-site biodiversity net gain should be considered, as there is not necessarily one preferred approach that suits all sites/scenarios. It is noted the Council is potentially proposing to impose a higher net gain requirement than that set out in the Environment Bill. For this to be a policy requirement and allow Applicants to gather an understanding how to meet this requirement, it supports a blended approach of the three options for off-site mitigation suggested.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 13	Option 3. the introduction of a policy requirement to ensure biodiversity net gain will require some time for Applicants to understand the implications of this on new developments. Introducing an additional requirement of natural capital may be too onerous at this stage
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 15	A blend of the 3 options will help deliver meaningful sports provision in the district and allow flexibility dependant on sitespecific circumstances. Whilst Option 2 'seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements' will create centralised sports hubs, it excludes Option 3 to enhance existing facilities to enable increased use which might see the decline in smaller, more local facilities. A combination of the 3 options will mean that sports provision is generally more accessible to the district, and in turn reduce trip movements in comparison to only providing a number of centralised sports hubs.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principles as part of our proposals at land at The Bourne, Hook Norton. The site would meet the criteria of a 20- minute neighbourhood and would represent a well located, designed and sustainable development at Hook Norton
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Question - Transport & Connectivity	agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach and the transport hierarchy. Consider the approach does not necessarily need to differ in the rural areas, but should focus on low carbon technology. Hook Norton is an example of a well-connected rural area with existing employment opportunities and services within the village. Consideration needs to be given to the impact of COVID-19 on the increased prevalence of working from home and providing homes and amenity space that supports this trend going forward. Commuting patterns have changed and it is not necessarily certain that rural areas will rely on the private car for employment purposes in the same way that they may have done in the past. That being said, a focus to low carbon technology is not viewed negatively as any approach to sustainable travel is supported.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 30	Option 2 (direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs) is the preferred approach as it is recognised that the rural areas will undoubtedly need to accommodate some of the housing growth anticipated for the District in addition to the urban centres. It is considered this is a more proactive approach than Option 1 to limit development based on meeting local need. The development of new homes in the villages will likely have greater connectivity to the surrounding rural environs, thereby providing greater leisure and health benefits which are considerations further brought to the fore by the current circumstances. Development at a variety of scales of settlements is therefore likely to be required and appropriate in order to achieve sustainable development, and reduce commuting patterns, hence proportionately directing development to the rural areas will assist this. Hook Norton is a large rural settlement within the District with a good range of services and facilities. It is considered that a rural settlement the size of Hook Norton can accommodate proportionate growth.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 31	consider that a combination of allocating specific sites and providing a parish level figure to allow flexibility is the best approach. In the case that allocated sites are not delivered, this will allow for alternative development to come forward in accordance with the housing requirement set at the parish level. Community involvement and/or Neighbourhood Planning can contribute to both options. In the current plan period the main rural settlement growth has come from speculative development. The benefit of allocating specific sites is that the growth and its necessary supporting infrastructure can be anticipated and planned for comprehensively, resulting in more sustainable pattern of development across the most sustainable rural settlements.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of The Bourne, Hook Norton	Land north of The Bourne, Hook Norton is promoted for housing. The representation is accompanied by a Development Framework for the site.
LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Option 32	support the development of a rural settlement hierarchy where additional weight is given to the availability of certain services and facilities, and accessibility of the settlement to urban centres. The opportunity to engage in and comment on the development of the criteria to inform any associated evidence would be welcomed. The opportunity to support, maintain and enhance village services and facilities over the plan period through proportionate growth should inform any such process. Consider important services and facilities are those that provide basic essentials for everyday life and healthy well-being, such as convenience store, doctor's surgery, community centre/meeting place (including cafes or public houses) and sports facilities. Access to schools is also important. Hook Norton is an example of a well-serviced rural settlement that should be placed higher up in any rural settlement hierarchy.

LPR-B-594	Turley for L & Q Estates Ltd	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Settlement boundaries can be helpful in defining the extent of the built up area in rural communities, however, they should not be used as a barrier for development where development would be sustainable and support the rural community. In particular, in the case there becomes a housing shortfall. L&Q Estates support that rural settlements should proportionately accommodate growth and it is likely that this will not be achieved solely through infilling and redevelopment of brownfield land. It is logical to consider that new development can be accommodated on land adjacent to existing built up limits of rural settlements and/or on land with a logical connection to the existing settlement on a sitespecific review basis (i.e. where a site might not physically adjoin what is considered to be the built-up limits but development might still relate well to the existing settlement). The future Local Plan should therefore establish flexibility in the circumstances that the Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable housing land supply to enable schemes to be brought forward on green field sites through the development management process, even if the sites are not explicitly allocated for development.
LPR-B-595	John and Amanda Assheton	Bloxham	Additional housing over the last 10 years has not been matched by infrastructure requirements to retain quality of life. Roads, traffic, noise, light pollution, urban signage amongst other things are considerably worse, and schools and other amenities are in no way adequate for the current situation, let alone the proposed increase this proposal suggests. The area is a desirable place to live and work because of the lack of urban sprawl, which is proposed. Regeneration of Banbury and improvements to current infrastructure are much needed; adding further to the already well over stretched situation indicates that those promoting the sites have zero interest or respect for the area. Once woodland and farmland is bulldozed over, it will never be available for agriculture again.
LPR-B-595	John and Amanda Assheton	Adderbury	Additional housing over the last 10 years has not been matched by infrastructure requirements to retain quality of life. Roads, traffic, noise, light pollution, urban signage amongst other things are considerably worse, and schools and other amenities are in no way adequate for the current situation, let alone the proposed increase this proposal suggests. The area is a desirable place to live and work because of the lack of urban sprawl, which is proposed. Regeneration of Banbury and improvements to current infrastructure are much needed; adding further to the already well over stretched situation indicates that those promoting the sites have zero interest or respect for the area. Once woodland and farmland is bulldozed over, it will never be available for agriculture again.
LPR-B-595	John and Amanda Assheton	Milton	Additional housing over the last 10 years has not been matched by infrastructure requirements to retain quality of life. Roads, traffic, noise, light pollution, urban signage amongst other things are considerably worse, and schools and other amenities are in no way adequate for the current situation, let alone the proposed increase this proposal suggests. The area is a desirable place to live and work because of the lack of urban sprawl, which is proposed. Regeneration of Banbury and improvements to current infrastructure are much needed; adding further to the already well over stretched situation indicates that those promoting the sites have zero interest or respect for the area. Once woodland and farmland is bulldozed over, it will never be available for agriculture again.
LPR-B-596	Fiona Gibson	Kidlington	alarmed and disappointed at the proposals to develop on more green belt land; the council should be protecting the green belt for the environment and the health of the existing residents. Feels that the voices of the local residents are not being heard and the council is listening to builders and OCC. COP26 illustrated how important the environment is this includes valuing the land and its role in carbon capture, building on every piece of green land really is an outdated concept and the council should be pushing for the redevelopment of brownfield sites. don't feel that this local plan, considers the local residents in any way. The proposals will destroy Kidlington as a village and destroy the landscape green setting which should be preserved and valued. Council should consider a KGS network around kidlington to protect the unique and irreplaceable countryside.
LPR-B-597	Jonathan Eifion-Jones	LPR-A-185	Object to proposals and request removal from the plan. against the development affecting Wykham Lane. Traffic is already too heavy and too fast; further development will make the situation worse and presents a greater danger to the Tudor Hall School. uncomfortable with the current planned development as it going to impact the area to the south of Salt away as it starts to impinge on what has always been rural / agricultural land and can only adversely impact the natural habitat. developments like this change the character of the region with no breaks and boundaries between the likes of Banbury, Bodicote and Bloxham and significantly reduces the attractiveness of the area. the proposals, for what is currently farm land, fly in the face of and is completely contrary to some of the 'key objectives' of the Consultation Paper: - Supporting a sustainable rural economy including sustainable agriculture and farm diversification; - Enhancing sustainable connectivity, improving habitat connectivity to mitigate climate change impacts on biodiversity, and mitigate against the effects of development on the microclimate;- Protect, conserve and enhance 'natural capital' assets such as soils, woodlands, hedges and ponds in order to capture and store carbon;- Focusing development in Cherwell's sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and the setting of its towns and villages.
LPR-B-597	Jonathan Eifion-Jones	LPR-A-116	Object to proposals and request removal from the plan. uncomfortable with the current planned development as it going to impact the area to the south of Salt away as it starts to impinge on what has always been rural / agricultural land and can only adversely impact the natural habitat. developments like this change the character of the region with no breaks and boundaries between the likes of Banbury, Bodicote and Bloxham and significantly reduces the attractiveness of the area. the proposals, for what is currently farm land, fly in the face of and is completely contrary to some of the 'key objectives' of the Consultation Paper: - Supporting a sustainable rural economy including sustainable agriculture and farm diversification; - Enhancing sustainable connectivity, improving habitat connectivity to mitigate climate change impacts on biodiversity, and mitigate against the effects of development on the microclimate;- Protect, conserve and enhance 'natural capital' assets such as soils, woodlands, hedges and ponds in order to capture and store carbon;- Focusing development in Cherwell's sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and the setting of its towns and villages.

LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Stocking Lane, Shenington	Land off Stocking Lane, Shenington is promoted for housing. The submission includes a Site Promotion document; Transport Strategy; and, Landscape and Visual Briefing Note.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 1	The Paper places a great deal of emphasis on the importance of the Oxford to Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework which is a forthcoming strategy produced by the Government. However, caution is required when considering this Framework, given that the plans for a major new road linking the two cities have been scrapped and, in July 2021, the Housing minister, Christopher Pincher, publicly distanced the Government from the 2017 commitment to build one million homes by 2050 in the OxfordCambridge Arc, saying that the Arc is "not about housebuilding" but economic development. No acknowledgement of either of these recent changes within the Paper. Until there is further certainty in respect of the framework, CDC should continue to consider and plan for its own housing and economic needs within its own District, based upon its own development strategy.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 1	Broadly supported. Whilst Elan Homes is supportive of the above, it is unrealistic to think that investment in transport services and other infrastructure to serve rural communities will be forthcoming without a proportionate level of housing growth and funding generated by any associated planning obligations. The vision should therefore refer to supporting proportionate housing growth, as well as business growth, which is already identified in the vision.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 2	No objectives set out which would directly deliver upon the vision set out above for rural areas. For example, Objective KO7 discusses support for Cherwell's urban centres, but a similar objective is not included for supporting rural areas and villages
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 6	The percentage of affordable housing required on major development sites should be based upon evidence collected by the council in respect of affordability across the District. It would not be appropriate to arbitrarily define percentages, nor would it be appropriate to simply carry forward the percentages contained within the adopted local plan without having first tested to see whether they are still appropriate.
LPR-B-598	LPR-B-598	Option 7	Any policy requirements for the tenure mix of affordable housing should be based upon read latest available evidence in respect of need.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 8	Does not necessarily object to the utilisation of the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS), footnote 49 to paragraph 130 f) of the NPPF confirms that: " <i>Policies may also make use of the nationally described space standard, where the need for an internal space standard can be justified.</i> " The utilisation of the NDSS within Cherwell District should accordingly be based upon demonstrable evidence of need, which should form part of the Local Plan Review evidence base.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 9	The imposition of accessibility standards through planning policy is unnecessary as they are already considered within Building Regulations.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 30	Supports the acknowledgement within the Paper that approximately 31% of the District's population live outside the main urban areas. The housing and economic needs of this population need to be met in a sustainable way that limits their need to travel wherever possible. This is increasingly pertinent following the Covid19 pandemic whereby an increased number of people are working from home either on a part time or permanent basis. Elan Homes submits that the only way to achieve this is to plan for proportionate growth at these settlements to provide housing but to support existing and encourage the provision of new facilities and services. This approach would be in line with Part 2 of Option 30 as set out above.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 31	CDC should work with communities (and landowners, promoters and developers) to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. This Should be achieved as part of the local plan review and not left for any subsequent document or plan. It would be inappropriate to provide a parish level figure to each area as there is no guarantee that a neighbourhood plan or other similar plan would be forthcoming in these areas and therefore the identified housing and economic needs would not be met. It would not be appropriate to allow these needs to be met by windfall development as it is likely that settlement boundaries in rural areas will be tightly drawn and therefore restrict growth to a Number of small infill sites which would not provide the diversity of growth, particular housing mix, required.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 32	Both the availability of services and facilities and accessibility by non-car modes of transport are equally important when considering the overall sustainability of settlements. however, consideration should also be given to settlements which may be made more sustainable through the provision of growth and development. For example, additional housing growth in a settlement may serve to support a new service or facility where one was not present previously, thereby improving the overall sustainability of the settlement. Whilst it is accepted that the production of a settlement hierarchy requires a degree of planning judgments, CDC should ensure that the process is undertaken in the most robust way possible, including providing clear and reasoned justification for any judgments, made based upon up-to-date evidence.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Question - Settlement	Supports the use of settlement boundaries as they provide clear guidance as to the acceptability or otherwise of development.
LPR-B-598	Pegasus Group for Elan Homes	Option 34	Policies concerning the countryside landscape character should be based upon evidence which includes an assessment of their character and value. National planning policy, guidance and case law is clear that countryside should not be protected for its own sake and that valued landscapes are landscapes which show demonstrable physical attributes, rather than just popularity1. It would be wholly inappropriate to afford the entire countryside within Cherwell a blanket policy or protection from development

LPR-B-599	June Hughes	LPR-A-077	<p>Object. Since 2014 Cherwell has made a disproportionately large contribution to meeting the District's housing supply. A significant part of this contribution has been made by Adderbury. The existing 2015 Local Plan provides enough homes to the period to 2031. Twelve potential sites could provide a minimum of 3,250 new houses (adopting CDC's Site Capacity Sense Check methodology- Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution para B.102 &amp; Policy Policy BSC 2) have been proposed around Adderbury including a large 60 hectare site between Twyford and the M40, stretching from the Kings Sutton Road to the Aynho Road. This compares to a current population of approximately 2,811. These proposals contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Development contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. "Measures will be taken to mitigate the impact of development within the District on climate change. Distributing growth to the most sustainable locations". Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. Increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Development would be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. The current supply of housing more than adequately provides for housing demand. Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Development would be contrary to Policy ESD 10. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA and according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. Increased traffic congestion as a result of over-development has substantially increased vehicle emissions and has degraded ambient air quality for residents. This is of particular concern when severely congested roads with stationary traffic are located adjacent to schools and private residences. This is most noticeable on the Oxford Road/Anyho Road traffic light junction. Further development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury.</p>
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 1	<p>vision is supported and we agree that rural communities should realise their full potential to create more sustainable and well connected rural living by making the most of new technologies, supported by business growth, with new rural models for transport and service provision complimenting existing services. The role that the rural villages play should not be underestimated as they provide an essential complimentary role to the larger settlements through addressing local housing need for all ages and providing local employment opportunities.</p>
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 2	<p>support the key objectives as they are ambitious and aspirational, providing the framework for achieving sustainable development as set out in the NPPF (July 2021). Whilst the stated draft objectives all have merit, we consider that the plan's primary objective should be meeting the housing needs of all sectors of Cherwell's communities via the provision of a variety of residential sites across the district through a mix of site sizes, dwelling types and tenures.</p>
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 3	<p>consider that there should be a range of employment sites in various locations across the district as individual employers have different locational requirements depending upon the nature of their industry. The Cherwell LPR should therefore contain flexibility to enable economic opportunities to be maximised across the district to provide for the economic growth and jobs that are needed. Furthermore, in response to the pandemic, local shared community employment hubs are becoming a popular alternative location to home based working in the event that residential space is limited. The sustainability benefits of such a facility are many, not least in terms of active travel and the reduction in carbon emissions produced from commuting patterns. Such facilities in the villages should be considered as an additional option to contribute to the employment land suggestions</p>
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Supporting Employment	<p>The contribution that tourism brings to job creation and the local economy should not be downplayed and further consideration of how the LPR can maximise opportunities for this element of local income generation in the villages should be made.</p>
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 6	<p>consider that the rates of affordable housing should be informed by an up to date objective evidence base focussed on the needs of Cherwell specifically. Agree with the concerns raised in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (September 2021) that caution should be given to onerous affordable housing policy requirements that may impact site, and whole plan, viability, resulting in limited residential development, and reduced affordable housing, coming forward across the District.</p>
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 7	<p>consider that affordable housing tenures should be informed by an up to date objective evidence base focussed specifically on the needs of Cherwell. Agree with the concerns raised in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (September 2021) that caution should be given to onerous affordable housing policy requirements that may impact site viability, resulting in limited residential development, and reduced affordable housing, coming forward across the District. In light of the Government's proposed discounted First Homes requirement, the policy should be expanded to include provision for this new affordable housing requirement on at least 25% of all affordable housing provision</p>

LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 8	consider that the requirement for housing internal space standards should be left to national policy and Building Regulations. Housebuilders will only build properties that are likely to be purchased having assessed prevailing market conditions. Imposing space standards restricting what builders can build takes away choice from home buyers which is likely to prevent more people from buying their own home and also exacerbate the acute shortage of housing that has been experienced over several decades.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Separation Distances	considered that unless there is robust evidence demonstrating that a separation distance policy is required that national policy, national planning guidance and Building Regulations should provide the necessary policy and legislative framework.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 9	Building Regulations and national policy, including the national design guide, provide adequate standards for new homes.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Housing Policies	Modern methods of construction, such as modular homes, are one emerging way of alleviating the housing crisis however, it is essential that the Council allocates sufficient sites at various scales and locations across the authority to ensure that identified current and future need is addressed. It is considered that the production of a supplementary design guide, in the form of a Residential Design Guide SPD, may be a more appropriate platform to consider alternative construction methods.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 10	consider that Buildings Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 provides the most suitable standards for sustainable design and construction and concur with the findings of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (September 2021) that the Cherwell LPR should not over complicate the requirements further as this is likely to impact on housing delivery. We concur with the observation made in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal that the tightening of the minimum requirements set out in Building Regulations and the 'Future homes Standards can lead to significant cost implications effecting site, and whole plan, viability therefore, caution is advised in relation to going over and above the current, and anticipated, national requirements.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 12	a combination of the three options should be available to provide biodiversity net gain or compensatory habitat. Limiting the options to proximity to the site may hinder sustainable development opportunities from coming forward, impacting upon housing delivery, and that a flexible approach to biodiversity net gain and compensatory habitat will maximise the potential for residential development coming forward.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 13	major development proposals are already required to undertake an assessment of a site's natural capital and the benefits that developing the site will offer. Further evidence requirements on developers is likely to delay application submission, consideration and housing delivery on the ground
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	the policy requirements contained in the emerging Environment Bill, Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and the NPPF are sufficiently robust to ensure that the natural environment is protected and enhanced, whilst not too onerous that development is prevented from coming forward.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 14	the current minimum play space provision approach provides the opportunity for LAPs to be integrated into smaller scale proposals whilst enabling larger play space provision to come forward proportionately on bigger sites. There is a risk that younger children may feel intimidated with allage areas of play which may result in unhealthy consequences. As highlighted by the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (September 2021) there is the potential for illocated play provision to be the magnet for antisocial behaviour therefore a flexible policy approach is preferred.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 15	concur with the considerations of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (September 2021) that more centralised sports hubs can act as focus for the whole community, facilitating more effectively club development, and support the use of financial contributions in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites. However, it is considered that a combination of the above options would enable the best outcomes as this would provide flexibility for locational situations and be proportionate to the scale of development being proposed
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	It is considered that the NPPF, the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050, The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides the necessary protection for the historic environment.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	the recent changes to the NPPF and the recently established National Design Code provide the required policy requirement for achieving good design and 'Beauty'. Planning applications should be considered on their own merits in the context of their location and surroundings therefore, over prescriptive blanket policy may result in an unintended 'sameville' design response across the District
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods do offer a helpful set of principles for ensuring places are well designed and sustainable and that elements of the principles already exist in national policy whereby accessibility distances in proximity of services and facilities are considered for developments. As evidenced by the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment Covid Update (July 2021), the pandemic has seen a reliance by communities on their local services, amenities and facilities which demonstrates that 20minute neighbourhoods are already established in parts of the District. This is embellished further through the availability of on-line shopping for every day needs and the ability to work remotely. Proportionate growth of villages should be encouraged as it assists the viability of existing village facilities and underpins further the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods.

LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Development often provides the catalyst for encouraging active travel and public transport use due to the requirement for travel plans, the creation of new travel corridors, improved networks, shared transport, electric vehicle charging provision and investment in public transport. Development at villages would also benefit from these improvements and it is important that this opportunity is not overlooked.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question -Transport Policies	the range of policies and documents identified is sufficient however, caution should be exercised in relation to the timing of the baseline assessments due to the ongoing repercussions of the pandemic. It is uncertain at this current time what the new 'normal' will be in relation to travel options and preferences in light of emerging flexible working arrangements and attitudes towards public transport use
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 17	the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) will provide the necessary framework for infrastructure delivery. There may be benefit for the Cherwell Infrastructure Delivery Plan to consider catchment areas and travel to work patterns to enable upgrades at pinch points. It may be difficult to measure social and environmental benefits of schemes as the value added may not be quantifiable, therefore updating the methodology may prove problematic.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 30	It could be observed that until the overall quantum of residential development for the district is established through the strategic Oxfordshire Plan 2050 that consideration of development across the district is premature. It is recognised that there is a considerable need for affordable, and market, housing in rural villages and across the District now, which is evidenced by the increasing number of applicants on the housing register and the number of allowed appeal decisions in the District over the past couple of years. Development in rural villages plays an important role in addressing the need across the District and it is essential that there is a balanced approach towards the locational strategy for housing growth in Cherwell District as part of the emerging Local Plan Review 2040. Development in rural villages assists in maintaining the vitality and viability of services and facilities in the villages. Well-targeted housing growth can assist with maintaining and enhancing infrastructure in rural areas, including community infrastructure. Owing to the time it takes for strategic allocations to be developed it is considered that Cherwell District Council must identify a widerange of large, medium and small residential allocations to ensure consistent compliance in terms of housing land supply within the definition of deliverable under NPPF. It is recommended that specific allocations in the villages is made in the Local Plan Review. Some villages, such as Cropredy, have capacity to proportionately meet the District's residential need and well related growth on land to the east of Claydon Road provides a sustainable growth option. Indeed, the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report states support for exploring options that would see increased growth in the rural area relative to the existing strategy.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 31	Quote from NPPF para 9. With 129 active applications on the Housing Register preferring Cropredy as their housing location (Cropredy Parish Profile September 2021 CDC Housing Register, 7th July 2021), the LPR should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to meet local development needs now and over the plan period. A range of options for growth across the District on a variety of sized sites provides flexibility that the market and the Local Plan requires to ensure the Plan delivers its' housing requirement. Larger strategic residential allocations provide continued housing growth over the whole of the plan period whereas smaller and medium-sized residential allocations ensure housing delivery can come forward sooner during the early stages of the plan period, immediately addressing existing housing supply shortfall. We therefore support a combined approach to ensure rural housing needs are met.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 32	Whilst there may be some merit in developing a rural settlement hierarchy, this may have the adverse effect of limiting the provision of new services and facilities from being established via enabling residential development. Additionally, a weighting system based on accessibility to urban centres may inadvertently create unsustainable travel patterns and restrict settlements from developing into more sustainable environments and the potential for 20-minute neighbourhoods. It is therefore considered that any rural village development policy should have sufficient flexibility to enable sustainable development proposals that address local need and provide community benefits to come forward. New housing in rural areas ensures that communities stay vibrant and viable, supports the delivery of new services and facilities and improves the sustainability of villages for existing and new residents.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Settlement	consider that settlement boundaries hinder sustainable growth on edge of settlement locations and often result in over development within the settlements. It is therefore recommended that the Council's current approach is continued to facilitate sustainable growth patterns and address housing need
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 33	consider that a flexible approach in relation to the rural economy is undertaken and that development proposals are assessed on a site based approach, balancing the benefits of the proposals against any unmitigated harm. Therefore, a combination of the suggested options is preferred.
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Option 34	considered that the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside landscape character of the whole district provides sufficient flexibility to enable sustainable development to come forward without additional onerous policy which could delay and prevent sustainable growth
LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Whilst local communities can be encouraged to develop Neighbourhood Plans, experience across the country has demonstrated that Neighbourhood Plan preparation can often be divisive and prevent sustainable development proposals from coming forward that would otherwise provide community benefit and address local housing need. It is therefore recommended that Cherwell District Council takes the lead and identifies a wide-range of large, medium and small residential allocations across the District to ensure consistent compliance in terms of Cherwell's house supply to address the quantum of development required over the plan period. A range of options and variation of sizes of sites provides flexibility that the new Local Plan, and the market requires.

LPR-B-600	Carter Jones for Obsidian Strategic	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the east of Claydon Road, Cropredy	Land to the east of Claydon Road, Cropredy is promoted for housing / mixed use. Update to HELAA388.
LPR-B-601	Carole Mullett	LPR-A-152	Object. To build closer to this fantastic place and swallow it up into Banbury would be a travesty. The Council need to preserve this way of life, a rural vibrant village with amazing community spirit, and understand the great importance of this for generations to come. Any further development would mean Hanwell no longer exists. Already Hanwell notices a higher footfall from recent developments to the north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Flytipping has become an issue and has had to be raised with the current developers and traffic through the village is at an all time high. The Oxfordshire strategic vision includes the desire to leave the natural environment in a better state than we found it, with a happier and healthier population and acknowledges that most of our villages retain their traditional character. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community.
LPR-B-601	Carole Mullett	LPR-A-214	Object. To build closer to this fantastic place and swallow it up into Banbury would be a travesty. The Council need to preserve this way of life, a rural vibrant village with amazing community spirit, and understand the great importance of this for generations to come. Any further development would mean Hanwell no longer exists. Already Hanwell notices a higher footfall from recent developments to the north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Flytipping has become an issue and has had to be raised with the current developers and traffic through the village is at an all time high. The Oxfordshire strategic vision includes the desire to leave the natural environment in a better state than we found it, with a happier and healthier population and acknowledges that most of our villages retain their traditional character. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community.
LPR-B-601	Carole Mullett	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury and protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-601	Carole Mullett	Option 19	Development is most appropriate to the East or South of Banbury where there is lesser prospect of incursion on neighbouring villages.
LPR-B-601	Carole Mullett	Hanwell	Hanwell is a designated conservation area. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its Conservation Areas. In line with English Heritage guidance (2005b) Conservation Area Management Proposals are to be published as part of the process of area designation or review. Their aim is to provide guidance through policy statements to assist in the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area. There are two major threats to the character and appearance of Hanwell. The first is the erosion of open space and rural character by unsympathetic infill housing and urban additions and the second is the cumulative impact of numerous alterations to the traditional but unlisted buildings within the area. Hanwell has little remaining scope for infill housing although past developments within the village have generally been of a high quality The land around the boundary to the north and south is important to the character of the village, providing the setting for the Conservation Area, and as such should be protected from any unsympathetic development
LPR-B-601	Carole Mullett	LPR-A-154	No objection to development of which would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages.
LPR-B-601	Carole Mullett	LPR-A-047	No objection to development of which would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages.
LPR-B-602	Graham Mullett	LPR-A-152	Object. To build closer to this fantastic place and swallow it up into Banbury would be a travesty. The Council need to preserve this way of life, a rural vibrant village with amazing community spirit, and understand the great importance of this for generations to come. Any further development would mean Hanwell no longer exists. Already Hanwell notices a higher footfall from recent developments to the north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Flytipping has become an issue and has had to be raised with the current developers and traffic through the village is at an all time high. The Oxfordshire strategic vision includes the desire to leave the natural environment in a better state than we found it, with a happier and healthier population and acknowledges that most of our villages retain their traditional character. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community.
LPR-B-602	Graham Mullett	LPR-A-214	Object. To build closer to this fantastic place and swallow it up into Banbury would be a travesty. The Council need to preserve this way of life, a rural vibrant village with amazing community spirit, and understand the great importance of this for generations to come. Any further development would mean Hanwell no longer exists. Already Hanwell notices a higher footfall from recent developments to the north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Flytipping has become an issue and has had to be raised with the current developers and traffic through the village is at an all time high. The Oxfordshire strategic vision includes the desire to leave the natural environment in a better state than we found it, with a happier and healthier population and acknowledges that most of our villages retain their traditional character. Further development between Hanwell and Banbury would permanently and irrevocably destroy the character of the village and damage the mental health of its current residents who chose to live there for the character and community feel of a rural settlement. Development of what is currently active agricultural land would go against KO5, KO9 and KO15. Development of the proposed sites would be akin to coalescence and would ride roughshod over views you know to be held by the local community.
LPR-B-602	Graham Mullett	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury and protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.

LPR-B-602	Graham Mullett	Option 19	Development is most appropriate to the East or South of Banbury where there is lesser prospect of incursion on neighbouring villages.
LPR-B-602	Graham Mullett	Hanwell	Hanwell is a designated conservation area. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its Conservation Areas. In line with English Heritage guidance (2005b) Conservation Area Management Proposals are to be published as part of the process of area designation or review. Their aim is to provide guidance through policy statements to assist in the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area. There are two major threats to the character and appearance of Hanwell. The first is the erosion of open space and rural character by unsympathetic infill housing and urban additions and the second is the cumulative impact of numerous alterations to the traditional but unlisted buildings within the area. Hanwell has little remaining scope for infill housing although past developments within the village have generally been of a high quality. The land around the boundary to the north and south is important to the character of the village, providing the setting for the Conservation Area, and as such should be protected from any unsympathetic development.
LPR-B-602	Graham Mullett	LPR-A-154	No objection to development of which would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages.
LPR-B-602	Graham Mullett	LPR-A-047	No objection to development of which would allow some expansion to the north of Banbury without encroaching upon any local villages.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 3	A combination of all of the above options
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units, or, reduce the 10 cut off to a lower level.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Retrofitting of historic buildings must be addressed. Policy must be more flexible, to allow current and future owners of historic buildings to address their current and future needs in terms of insulation, heating and lighting. Without the flexibility to permit this, older buildings will progressively become unsaleable to 21st century buyers facing a climate emergency, regardless of status and aesthetic appeal, and will cease to be viable, leaving (among other things) a significant stock of family-sized homes unoccupied and in a state of neglect.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 11	Neither. Await COP26 guidance.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Assessment of natural capital in developments will become the norm, but is complex and open to distortion of the real needs of a locality so that (for example) urban centres which need new housing provision find that need trumped by commercial or policy considerations which displace new housing to the edges of settlements. Policy should include safeguards which cater for the needs of such localities.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 14	Seek opportunities to integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. Minimum provision/minimum standards leaves the beneficiary too often with a LAP which is too small to be of any use or interest to the intended users. Need should be quantified and the evidence base for minimum standards should be clarified
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites and seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. These approaches need base evidence but existing outdoor provision should be safeguarded
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	A Community Orchard has been established in a section of a field (the "Gravel Pit field") owned by the Parish Council at the junction of Mill Lane and Crowcastle Lane. The Parish Council requests that the Orchard together with the remaining section of the field is designated as a Local Green Space (total area 1 ¼ acres). The local and historical significance of the field is indicated by the name, and relates directly to the historic quarrying activity in the parish, and a survey undertaken recently on the wildflowers to be found in the field shows that it is rich in many wildflower species not found in cultivated areas of land, as it has not been subject to modern farming practices.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Do you agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach to support the Local Plan Review? and should the approach be different for the rural areas, for example focusing on low carbon technology rather than a reduction in the need to travel?- combined in relation to transport connectivity. Ref (c): This requires public transport based on systematic review of a whole area
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 16	Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development. Many other LPA's have such a policy, Cherwell District Council should also.



LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	Car dependency must be reduced everywhere and this can only be achieved through connectivity of alternative means of travel. Public transport needs overview concepts and maybe shorter but connecting routes, and above all not just what developers choose to put in their planning applications for S106 monies. There must be a systematic review, of a whole area. It is frustrating that transport policies devised at County level can undermine efforts at District level to produce a tailored response with regard to transport impact. Harm caused to a locality and historic assets by overall traffic volume/load: There is especial need to consider the impact of traffic load through a historic Conservation Area, not just rural countryside.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Car dependency must be reduced everywhere and this can only be achieved through connectivity of alternative means of travel. Public transport needs overview concepts and maybe shorter but connecting routes, and above all not just what developers choose to put in their planning applications for S106 monies. There must be a systematic review, of a whole area. It is frustrating that transport policies devised at County level can undermine efforts at District level to produce a tailored response with regard to transport impact. Harm caused to a locality and historic assets by overall traffic volume/load: There is especial need to consider the impact of traffic load through a historic Conservation Area, not just rural countryside.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 29	The original vision of building on brownfield land was extremely seductive, but that vision has been hijacked by the heritage designations. Further expansion of Heyford Park thus seems very unlikely without encroachment onto greenfield sites, which should be strongly resisted in such a topographically challenging location. The Parish Council believes the current transport vision for Heyford Park should be challenged, promoting as it does a regular bus service to Bicester alone which would have serious consequences for Kirtlington, as it fails to recognise the strong transport movements Heyford Park residents make to Oxford and to the west. The categorisation of roads in the area around Heyford Park needs serious reconsideration, particularly with the B430 upgraded to an A road and the removal of constraints on the use by HGVs of the Weston on the Green junction onto the A34.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. The relationship with the Draft Oxfordshire Plan is key. This poses an obvious difficulty for smaller authorities such as Parish Councils in second-guessing the scale and proportion of the allocation of predicted/required housing development to the Districts, in as much as the allocation of new homes is set at County level, the number of those new homes is not stated, and the distribution/location is set at District (LPA) level. Kirtlington Parish Council suggests that many smaller authorities will feel a certain dissatisfaction with the consultation process, and a degree of disenfranchisement, the more so if unlike Kirtlington PC they are not already benefiting from the support of a Neighbourhood Plan.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. The Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan has relevant policy, e.g. Policies PD1, PD2 (Category A and Category B villages), and Development Policies D1-4. One of the core underlying principles is that development must be proportionate to the size of the village. At LPA level however there must be a mechanism to prevent speculative developers taking advantage of the system.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	LPR-A-043	Both sites have been the subject of previous planning applications. The applications at Corner Farm (14/01531/OUT and 14/02139/OUT) were both dismissed at appeal, and the Parish Council welcomed those PINS decisions. The applications at the site east of the Heyford Road (17/01688/OUT, resubmission of 17/00539/OUT) were supported by the Parish Council as the most appropriate but were not supported by the LPA (refusal of permission for 17/01688/OUT was issued on 10th August 2017).
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	LPR-A-261	Both sites have been the subject of previous planning applications. The applications at Corner Farm (14/01531/OUT and 14/02139/OUT) were both dismissed at appeal, and the Parish Council welcomed those PINS decisions. The applications at the site east of the Heyford Road (17/01688/OUT, resubmission of 17/00539/OUT) were supported by the Parish Council as the most appropriate but were not supported by the LPA (refusal of permission for 17/01688/OUT was issued on 10th August 2017).
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 32	Kirtlington is currently a Category A village. Give additional weight to the availability of certain services and facilities (which do you think are the most important?). Give additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking. It is important to give equal weight to both – they are not mutually exclusive. It must be recognised that if there is no access to urban centres by public transport then a rural settlement cannot reasonably have additional development. Further, any such hierarchy should be reviewed at least every 5 years, to take into account changes in services and facilities.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals.
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance. There must be a rigorous and robust definition, which is stronger than the current approach. The historical and natural environment must be protected for future generations
LPR-B-603	Kirtlington Parish Council	Parish Profile - Kirtlington	Concerns that the description appears to direct development to the west side of the village, on the presumption that this is less sensitive than the registered park and garden on the east. Development within the park/conservation area may not be wholly inappropriate, if it can be demonstrated on a site by site basis that the effects of development will not be significantly adverse in landscape and visual terms. The description seems to suggest that there are "fewer constraints to the west", though there is no recognition of the importance of the historic route of the Woodstock Way (the route now of Oxford Close and continuing along Hatch Way) and its link to Crowcastle Lane, and the way in which this route is still a tangible influence on the linear settlement pattern of the village.

LPR-B-604	Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd for East West Rail Co.	Question - Transport & Connectivity	<p>Aims to deliver a net zero-carbon railway, in line with existing and developing net zero carbon policy, legislation and commitments at a global, national, and local level. To accelerate the modal shift to public and active transport, EWR Co has taken a proactive approach to environmental considerations and put them at the core of the project. Key component of the station and infrastructure enhancements proposed by EWR Co is the integration and development of multi-modal improvements to encourage sustainable travel patterns to and from the station from key locations such as town centres and significant development areas, through new cycle and walking routes, bike storage capacity at stations and improved public transport interchanges. EWR Co will promote and prioritise both active and sustainable transport modes, and will continue working with other organisations, including bus operators to improve facilities, and EWR Co are keen to work with local stakeholders to promote an integrated planning approach.</p> <p>Welcomes the references to East West Rail in Cherwell District Council's Community Involvement Paper 2, particularly in relation to planning for sustainable travel, improving connectivity, and aiming for a net zero transport network. Welcomes the recognition of support in the Cherwell Local Plan for East West Rail and the role it will play in providing a sustainable new travel option as part of the de-carbonisation agenda. Improvements are being delivered in stages. EWR Co recognises and welcomes reference to East West Rail and the delivery of East West Rail Phase 1 (Oxford to Bicester) in the Developing Our Options paper (paras 5.13.3 and 6.3.32). Connection Stage 1 (CS1) phase 1 is already in operation and has improved the link between Oxford and Bicester. Connection Stage 1 Phase 1 scheme completed in December 2016 and was delivered jointly by Network Rail and CRCL. Connection Stage 1 Phase 2 Infrastructure and Service Improvements EWR Connection Stage 1 Phase 2 is currently under construction, with works due for completion in 2024. These works will enable the introduction of two trains per hour in each direction between Oxford and Milton Keynes, plus provide additional freight capacity. Consent for the next stage, Connection Stage 2, has not yet been applied for. The aim of Connection Stage 2 is to upgrade the existing railway between Oxford and Bedford, with works going beyond those for which Network Rail obtained a Transport and Works Act Order in 2020, and so therefore necessitating the need for a new, separate consent. Connection Stage 2 will include further enhancements to the railway between Oxford and Bicester, as well as to other parts of the railway through to Bedford. To meet the EWR service frequency of four trains per hour, it will be necessary to carry out upgrades to some of the stations between Oxford and Bicester to improve passenger capacity. The proposed changes would provide people living, working, and visiting the area around Oxford and Bicester with fast and reliable train services to Bletchley, Bedford, Cambridge, and stations in between- as well as better connectivity to the wider regional railway network. Options to expand the parking facilities at Oxford Parkway and Bicester Station together with options to encourage access to the stations via sustainable modes such as walking and cycling, and access to the Oxford Parkway Park and Ride facility. Proposals currently being explored by EWR Co at Bicester London Road level crossing Considering the significant increase in future daily peak hour road traffic as well as the increase in operational safety risk, EWR Co recommended that Bicester (London Road) level crossing should be closed. Due to increased line speed and frequency of EWR train services at the level crossing, the barrier downtime could be up to 50 minutes of each hour, which could be deemed as almost closed. This would result in a significant increase in daily peak hour traffic at the crossing. Following completion of Stage 3, two passenger trains per hour will run from Oxford to Cambridge via Bedford and Bletchley.</p>
LPR-B-605	David Lock Associates for L&Q Estates Ltd	Question - Local Green Spaces	<p>Object to the proposed extent of the Local Green Space as set out under LPR-125 Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site. The land falls under L&amp;Q Estates control and is part of a longstanding development allocation under Strategic Development: Bicester 13 (re-adopted) of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1. It remains a key site required to meet the Council's housing delivery objectives. The extent of the proposed Local Green Space undermines and conflicts with adopted policy and cannot be supported in its current form. Not against the principle of a Local Green Space that covers the boundary of the Local Wildlife Site, L&amp;Q Estates cannot support the proposed extent which encroaches on land which has no existing environmental or open space designation and is instead allocated for housing. I attach Constraints Plan and would draw your attention to the larger area being proposed as a Local Green Space which extends onto land immediately north of Gavray Drive. There is no reason why the Local Green Space should be larger than the Local Wildlife Site. Importantly, the submitted Gavray Drive planning application proposes no built development within the Local Wildlife Site or the wider Conservation Target Area and the application is submitted with long term management proposals for the land. L&amp;Q Estates are committed to ensuring a management organisation is in place funded by the development. To include the additional land would conflict with the adopted Local Plan Policy Bicester 13 and undermine the wider site's ability to deliver the homes allocated and which underpins the Council's 5 year housing land supply. The application proposes up to 250 homes across the wider Policy Bicester 13 allocation. This is 50 dwellings lower than the 300 as set out in the policy but reflects the constraints on the site and the desire to avoid development in the LWS and CTA. The proposed extent of the Local Green Space LPR-125 Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife would further reduce the land available for built development and reduce the site's ability to deliver even 250 homes.</p>
LPR-B-605	David Lock Associates for L&Q Estates Ltd	Option 23	<p>L&amp;Q Estates have submitted a planning application to Cherwell District Council covering the entire Bicester 13 allocation of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 (21/03558/OUT). The application is the culmination of over a year of constructive work with CDC and Oxfordshire County Council through a formal preapplication process and regular meetings with a dedicated ecology stakeholder group made up of interested parties from the local community. Though we would anticipate that the application will be determined in advance of further stages of the Local Plan, we advise you of this progress so that it can continue to be reflected and retained as a housing allocation</p>

LPR-B-605	David Lock Associates for L&Q Estates Ltd	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	Object to the proposed extent of the Local Green Space as set out under LPR-A-125 Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site. The land falls under L&Q Estates control and is part of a longstanding development allocation under Strategic Development: Bicester 13 (re-adopted) of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1. It remains a key site required to meet the Council's housing delivery objectives. The extent of the proposed Local Green Space undermines and conflicts with adopted policy and cannot be supported in its current form. Not against the principle of a Local Green Space that covers the boundary of the Local Wildlife Site, L&Q Estates cannot support the proposed extent which encroaches on land which has no existing environmental or open space designation and is instead allocated for housing. I attach Constraints Plan and would draw your attention to the larger area being proposed as a Local Green Space which extends onto land immediately north of Gavray Drive. There is no reason why the Local Green Space should be larger than the Local Wildlife Site. Importantly, the submitted Gavray Drive planning application proposes no built development within the Local Wildlife Site or the wider Conservation Target Area and the application is submitted with long term management proposals for the land. L&Q Estates are committed to ensuring a management organisation is in place funded by the development. To include the additional land would conflict with the adopted Local Plan Policy Bicester 13 and undermine the wider site's ability to deliver the homes allocated and which underpins the Council's 5 year housing land supply. The application proposes up to 250 homes across the wider Policy Bicester 13 allocation. This is 50 dwellings lower than the 300 as set out in the policy but reflects the constraints on the site and the desire to avoid development in the LWS and CTA. The proposed extent of the Local Green Space LPR-A-125 Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife would further reduce the land available for built development and reduce the site's ability to deliver even 250 homes.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 1	Broadly support the suggested vision and welcome the recognition that Cherwell's "position within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and its excellent links provide significant opportunities for a post Covid-19 recovery". The vision goes on to state that "we continue to support a sustainable, flexible economy that is vibrant, inclusive with good transport links and sound infrastructure...The economy has grown to provide more diverse employment for our increasing population and reduce the need for our residents to travel outside the District for work". The commitment to economic growth supported; providing a variety of new jobs is critical to Cherwell's recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic. The Local Plan Review must ensure that sufficient employment land is provided within the district, in the right places to meet Cherwell's employment needs (including the growing and substantial need for logistics floorspace) and to support the future growth ambitions of the wider Oxford-Cambridge Arc area. The vision should support the creation of a diverse range of jobs (including entry level opportunities and both skilled and non-skilled jobs) within the district and recognise the existing strengths of the area and its excellent connectivity to the strategic highway network. Covid-19 pandemic has demonstrated the importance of planning policy that is flexible enough to accommodate needs not originally anticipated and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. It is imperative that this approach, which the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 82 requires, is reflected within the suggested Vision and throughout the Local Plan Review. On the need for flexibility, it is essential that the Local Plan Review takes account of current market trends but also anticipates potential new ones so far as possible; the scale of growth in logistics and warehousing needs was not anticipated or provided for in the adopted Plan and, as a consequence, there is a significant policy void in this regard at present.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 2	Welcomes key objectives KO 1 and KO 2. Allocating sufficient land to meet employment needs, raising the value of the local economy and supporting the growth of all sectors is vital to achieving future growth ambitions, raising standards of living and improving skills within the district. Supporting a range of sectors and allocating sufficient employment land will also create a sustainable and strong local economy and reduce the need for out-commuting. The Key Objectives should support the creation of a diverse range of jobs, including entry level roles and unskilled jobs, and recognise Cherwell's vital role in supporting economic recovery at a local, regional and national level. Cherwell's strategic location between London and Birmingham and its excellent road connections mean that it is very well placed to do this. The Key Objectives should aim to facilitate economic growth by building upon the district's existing strengths, including its excellent transport links and accessibility to major markets. Key Objective KO 23 should be amended as follows in relation to paragraph 83 of the NPPF (new text in italic): "Focus development in Cherwell's sustainable and most accessible locations, recognising the specific locational requirements of certain uses, and making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and the setting of its towns and villages". Sufficient provision should be made for new homes via the Local Plan Review. The delivery of new, high quality homes that meet the needs of the local population and the those who it is anticipated will relocate to the area to access new jobs being created must go hand-in-hand with the delivery of employment floorspace.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 3	A combination of the different options.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 4	The Local Plan Review should allocate sites for offices (Use Class E(g)(i)), research and development (Use Class E(g)(ii)); light industry (Use Class E(g)(iii)), general industry (Use Class B2) and distribution (Use Class B8), as well as mixed use sites (including general industry, distribution, light industry and other potentially compatible uses). A mix of employment sites is vital to achieving a sustainable and balanced economy and providing a diverse range of jobs within the district. Notwithstanding this, it is imperative that the Local Plan Review addresses the substantial and growing demand for logistics (Use Class B8) floorspace. The unprecedented demand for logistics floorspace, and supply shortage, is well documented and has been exacerbated by the Covid19 pandemic. The Local Plan Review must contain suitable and sufficient site allocations, as well as criteria-based policies to ensure that anticipated needs are addressed and that the plan is capable of rapidly responding to changes in economic circumstances. Are there any other employment policies we should include in the plan? The Local Plan Review must include sufficient land allocations to address the current and likely need for employment floorspace within the district. To ensure that the plan is capable of addressing current and future needs for employment floorspace and of rapidly adapting to changing economic circumstances, it is also vital that it includes criteria-based policies to allow suitable employment development to be delivered on unallocated sites should there be a demonstrable need for it.

LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Question - Supporting Employment	Employment land should be provided at and in proximity to the main urban centres (including on the edges of Bicester and Banbury); significant transport interchanges; on previously developed land (including in less sustainable locations); and at or adjacent to the larger villages. This approach will facilitate sustainable economic growth across the district; reduce the need to travel; support the rural economy; and ensure that employment development is highly accessible to Bicester residents. It will also enable the district to capitalise on its location in the Arc. The NPPF (paragraph 82) states that planning policies should set a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth. Plans should set criteria or identify strategic sites to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs. Planning policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated; enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances; and recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. The most sustainable sites for development must be identified and allocated through the Local Plan Review process. The Local Plan Review must be cognisant of the locational requirements of certain sectors and address the substantial and growing need for logistics floorspace. Takeup of logistics floorspace is at an unprecedented level, whilst availability is at a record low. This has resulted in a significant under supply of high-quality logistics warehouses at a national, regional and local level. Fast and efficient access to the strategic highway network is a fundamental requirement of logistics operators and must be recognised in the planmaking process. CDC needs to bring forward a policy which is sufficiently flexible to provide a positive but robust policy framework for the assessment of planning applications which come forward on non allocated sites to meet demands which were not anticipated at the time of the Review's preparation.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 10	High quality and sustainable design is central to Albion Land's ethos as a responsible developer and is reflected across their development portfolio. The emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050 includes a preferred policy option for sustainable design and construction, energy and water efficiency requirements to be included within that Plan. The Cherwell Local Plan Review must not repeat policy from the Oxfordshire Plan or any other national planning policy or guidance or legislation, and nor should it conflict or undermine their objectives. Given the emerging Oxfordshire Plan's preferred policy approach, and the intended timescales for its adoption, it is not necessary for any further sustainable construction standards to be set out within the Cherwell Local Plan Review. Should any additional policies be introduced, these must provide sufficient flexibility for alternative proposals, including future technological advancements, to be accepted (where justified) and ensure that development will not become unviable. Albion Land would strongly recommend the inclusion of a criteria that allows for viability to be taken into account in the application of any sustainable construction standards to ensure that the delivery of much-needed development is not stifled or blocked.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 12	The proposed policy approach should allow for a range of mitigation measures in recognition of the unique characteristics of development sites and proposals. Each of the aforementioned options will enhance local biodiversity and are therefore acceptable. The policy approach must not be overly prescriptive. It should recognise that the most appropriate form of mitigation may vary depending on the specific site circumstances. For example, in some cases it may not be possible or appropriate to provide biodiversity net gain close to the application site or within the Target Areas. Secure contributions should therefore be an acceptable solution.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 13	The Cherwell Local Plan Review should not require major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment. This is not necessary or relevant to the determination of planning applications. Applications for major developments are already often required to submit Environmental Impact Assessments; ecological survey work and impact appraisals; arboricultural assessments and landscape strategies, as well as Biodiversity Net Gain calculations. These reports and assessments already assess the impact of development on the natural environment and the Biodiversity Net Gain that will be achieved. The preparation of a Natural Capital Assessment will result in the duplication of work and unnecessarily convolute the planning process. It is not clear why they are required or how it would assist the decision-making process.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Policies within the Local Plan Review should be consistent with the principles of national planning policy and guidance. However, it is important that the Cherwell Local Plan does not repeat the policies of the NPPF or any other guidance or legislation. The Cherwell Local Plan Review should recognise that development can play an important role in protecting and enhancing the natural environment
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Significant positive weight should be given to development proposals that reflect design excellence. Detailed design guidance should be set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance or Design Codes rather than the Local Plan Review. Notwithstanding this, Design Codes must not be overly prescriptive and should enable different solutions to come forward within a single design framework. Design Codes must not stifle innovation or prevent development from responding to different site constraints or enduser requirements. Any design policies must also be tested in terms of their potential impact on the viability (and therefore the deliverability) of development.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods will not be appropriate in all locations or for all uses. Some employment uses are not compatible with residential development and/or require immediate access to the strategic highway network. A 'one size fits all' approach is not appropriate.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Broadly supports the proposed transport and connectivity approach and agree that that it is unlikely to be possible everywhere. The proposed approach must be cognisant of the specific locational requirements and compatibility of different uses. This means that it will not always be possible to reduce the need to travel. In such instances other sustainable transport measures such as sustainable freight, electric parking, public transport, and walking and cycling infrastructure should be promoted. Creating a diverse range of new jobs within Cherwell will reduce the need to travel within and outside of the district. It is therefore imperative that the Local Plan Review supports economic growth (through sufficient site allocations and criteria based policy) and the provision of high quality transport infrastructure. The Local Plan Review should support the rural economy by improving transport infrastructure to and within the rural areas.

LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 22	The growth strategy for Bicester must be based on a robust site assessment process, which identifies the most sustainable locations (or locations that can be made sustainable) for development across the whole of the district. Development should not be limited at Bicester. The town comprises one of the district's main settlements and is well connected to existing transport infrastructure. The Local Plan Review must ensure that the district's anticipated employment needs are planned for. Limiting development at Bicester would put significant pressure on the rest of the district (including within the rural areas and on the edge of other settlements) to accommodate Cherwell's development needs
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 23	The growth strategy for Bicester should not be predetermined and must be based on a robust site assessment process, which identifies the most sustainable locations (or locations that can be made sustainable) for development across the district
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 30	The Local Plan Review must identify sufficient land to address Cherwell's anticipated and future development needs and be able to respond rapidly to changes in economic circumstances. Growth must be directed to the most sustainable and accessible locations, which may be outside of existing settlements. The Local Plan Review must be cognisant of the specific locational requirements of employment uses, which require fast and efficient access to the highway network. Such sites may be limited to locations outside of settlement boundaries. Local Plan Review plan should not prohibit development beyond settlement boundaries as stated within NPPF (paras 83 and 84). The plan should include sufficient site allocations to address Cherwell's employment needs and include a criteria-based policy, which allows development to be delivered beyond any settlement boundaries should there be a demonstrable need for it and its rural location. This will provide sufficient flexibility to enable the plan to rapidly respond to changing economic circumstances.
LPR-B-606	Quod for Albion Land	Option 33	Use a combination of above. It is imperative that sufficient sites are allocated within the Local Plan Review to meet Cherwell's anticipated and future development needs. However, criteria-based policies are also required to ensure that the plan is flexible and able to respond rapidly to changing circumstances, including meeting any unforeseen needs. The criteria-based policies are also necessary to provide sufficient contingency in the event that the site allocations are not delivered or are delayed.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the options.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Banbury needs a good library. This could be situated in the old Marks & Spencers unit in Castle Quay. Both floors could be used. There could be community space, a cafe and even a piano. Also could incorporate an art gallery.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? Should introduce separation distances.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Housing Policies	New homes need to be more environmentally friendly. Gas boilers must not be installed. Solar panels should standard not extra. Electric car charging points should be installed as standard.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Install solar panels and electric car charging points in all new properties as standard.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Green Belt	Keep all Green Belt Do not use any for building
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements.

LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Keep all Green spaces and trees. Plant more trees and shrubs.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Need more public transport at an affordable price. Reduce the number of cars and volume of traffic.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Transport Policies	Free public transport.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 19	No further development. The present infrastructure cannot cope eg roads, hospitals medical facilities, schools etc.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church. All historic aspects of Banbury should be protected.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission? We need a good modern library in the town centre
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Make sure that none of the green spaces are developed. We need more.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Free or cheaper public transport.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 32	Give more weight to these services: Primary School, Secondary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy and Regular Bus services. More weight to public transport. Define settlement boundaries and must keep green spaces.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 33	Combination of options.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-607	Janet Ross	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We must consider the environment at all costs. We cannot continue to pollute the air.
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	General	Welcome the publication of Paper 2, which provides a clear, ample and helpful narrative about the Council's perceived options for housing development in the Bourtons. The exercise is complicated by the fact that it must, in its final form, conform to the overall planning strategy adopted by Oxfordshire County Council which will include housing targets delegated to Cherwell for the county. We understand CDC will not know or be able to publish these targets until 2nd quarter 2022, which makes the CDC timetable challenging. A parish council from such a small parish as the Bourtons is even more resource-poor than CDC Planning. From the consultation schedule, it sounds like there may be an equally narrow window for responses to the final proposals next summer. The call for sites has seen a torrent of housing proposals, mostly orchestrated by the major surveying firms who stand to profit handsomely. The constraints on responses from local council taxpayers contrast with the developer responses. CDC is endeavouring to construct a coherent plan at a time when central government itself is in the process of moving the goalposts. Considerable concern was expressed when the previous Secretary of State with responsibility for housing confirmed a top-down, target-driven approach, which would probably have had the effect of increasing the pace of house-building in Oxfordshire. Jenrick's replacement, Michael Gove, is seemingly sharply changing course. It would appear that the government White Paper, 'Planning for the Future', is nothing more than work in progress as reported very recently in the national press. Housing needs for Oxfordshire, as mandated by central government, will not increase – although this may not become clear until next year when CDC's plan is due to be finalised. Figures shown on page 18 of the options document show that the planned figures for 2011 – 30 determined a target of 3031 homes and by 2021, 2,541 had been delivered. Therefore in 50% of the plan term, 87% of the target number were delivered with only 13% still required with 50% of the Plan term left to run. We appreciate of course that 'delivered' may include homes where planning permission has been granted but not actually built.

LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Option 18	Development in Banbury should be so limited. We were particularly concerned to note the possibility raised in the document that Little Bourton, Hanwell and others – might become absorbed into Banbury: ‘coalescence’ is the word used. We trust CDC would not countenance such a wanton destruction of the villages in your care.
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Option 19	Bourtons rejects ‘sites to the north of the town’. We reject ‘sites to the east of the town’. The Cherwell valley cannot sustain further damage to its natural beauty from development. Furthermore, we are already seeing traffic from the A361 using Cropredy and Great Bourton as a preferred route into Banbury and any further development will only serve to increase this traffic
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Option 21	We believe this area can and should provide much of the town’s new housing needs for the foreseeable future. Support the progressive repurposing of brownfield sites within the town. Some of the buildings, with all their embedded carbon, may be readily repurposed; as may the many now redundant retail premises in the centre
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Any development in the time period under consideration must embrace the need to reduce car use, in a town that is already choked with traffic. We further note that such development carries the additional benefit of allowing residents to access all the town centre’s facilities without the need for a car.
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Option 30	We believe emphatically that development must be limited to preserve the character of rural Cherwell.
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Option 32	The existing hierarchy of villages, and the resultant protections from untrammelled development of ‘Category B’ villages such as the Bourtons, is a very solid basis for decisionmaking, and the bias should be to preserve it. Settlement boundaries should be defined. The extant approach is simple, clear, and respectful of the villages’ character and history. The lack of resources available to a small council like the Bourtons, and the profound and inequitable asymmetry between those resources, and the time and money that landowners, developers and their agents are prepared to risk on potentially lucrative development proposals. Any help would be welcome, and in that respect, the very short timescales for response to these consultations is a hindrance not a help – while we acknowledge the external pressures conditioning CDC’s timetable.
LPR-B-608	The Bourtons Parish Council	Bourtons	The Bourtons have recognised and approved, where and when housing development is appropriate and necessary to sustain what few amenities we have here, namely the church, the village hall and two public houses. In the past, The Bourtons have approved modest developments which we believed supported the rural environment to which our residents agreed and which would add to the two communities in a positive way and did not breach the extension of our village boundaries to any degree. Recognising the local need for further housing and a need to provide further affordable housing opportunities, in 2018 we approved a development of 33 houses of mixed stock and affordable housing in Garners Field, which was increased to 43 houses by the planning officer under the need for ‘economic use of development land’. The Parish Council had no route to objection to this increase. South View field had already been identified for a possible development site for 80 houses in the CDC housing plan and it was understood that the agreement to the Garners Field site would eliminate the South View field as a potential housing development site. Currently there are 7 houses under construction in Great Bourton. Permission has been granted for a further 3 houses in Great Bourton, which will also serve high end purchasers. Our parish has recently seen something akin to a feeding frenzy. Remarkably, such is the enthusiasm to exploit the parish, that one agricultural land parcel has been subject to two separate submissions, each claiming a different owner for the land. This is typical of the cavalier approach to reality that these submissions betray: these sites on greenfield land are ‘adjacent’ to an ‘urban’ site; the ‘excellent linkages’ to Banbury is one way of describing an inadequate bus service; the village has ‘extensive services and facilities’ – which is one way of describing a village with no shop, no school, no doctor’s surgery, and no employers. The submissions are from surveyors and land-owners who actually know the area, so ought to know how inaccurate their characterisations are. This number of applications is not however surprising, given the huge profits to be made from shifting land from agriculture use to housing development. We are surprised to see that Land Parcel 2783 has been included on the list since if this site was developed it would risk the coalescence of the villages of Bourton and Cropredy, contrary to Cherwell’s planning policy. We urge CDC to perpetuate the categorisation of our villages which has prevailed hitherto and prevent development outside the existing village boundaries. These small villages have adorned the Cherwell landscape for many hundreds of years and are intrinsic to the area’s character. To expand them by building several hundred more houses, would be to defile and denature the villages. Once the character of a rural parish has gone, through inappropriate and excessive development. It would be an act of vandalism that should not be contemplated by CDC. We intend to construct a Vision Statement for the Bourtons Parish which we anticipate will contain some features one would normally see in a Neighbourhood Plan. We look forward to receiving the housing targets delegated to Cherwell for the county as a whole and a deadline date for submitting our comments before the next stage of CDCs decision making. We would appreciate notification of any deadline changes which may result from revised government legislation in order to amend our strategy accordingly.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 1	Vision (No.10) - Residents living in rural, historically farming communities are seeing their environment increasingly degraded by building on greenfields and by increased transport on unsuitable rural roads through the heart of their communities. Flood risks are increasing as available greenfield land that traditionally has absorbed heavy rainfall is reduced. No. 4 Local experience in Fritwell is that available housing is often meeting the needs of London, Birmingham and elsewhere, and local prices are pushed beyond the means of many local families. To achieve 4.7 No.1 referring to climate action and sustainable energy targets, CDC planners should be acting now and that all new building should be equipped with renewable energy systems, high level of insulation etc. Strongly support No.14 relating to rural bus services and digital connectivity.

LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 2	KO 1 - Support for housing and employment should be for meeting local needs, rather than aspirational targets for continued growth, an unsustainable concept when considered alongside environmental and climate change targets. KO 5 - Support for food production and effective management of the natural environment is essential for local food production and sustainable living. Farming should be encouraged and supported above housing growth and warehousing in rural areas. KO 10:19 - Strongly supported. Small-scale community zero-carbon energy systems (e.g. ground-source heating) should be considered for rural villages. KO 20-31 - Generally supported. Important to maintain the mixed communities traditionally associated with farming areas. Coalescence between villages should be avoided and Cherwell's category A village concept should be modified to take into account the considerable difference in size of villages, facilities connectivity (e.g. local transport, digital etc.) and their ability to properly absorb any increases.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington with some at larger villages. Significant transport interchanges- Transport routes should be a significant factor but locations avoided that are likely to produce increasing traffic and HGV's using unsuitable narrow rural roads.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). Increasing B2 and B8 does not generally benefit local communities or provide significant employment opportunities. Many warehouses already built around Bicester are not yet occupied and the workforce for logistics is being massively reduced by increased automation.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Supporting	The preference would be for development that supports higher-wage employment and training rather than leisure, retail, and hospitality. The aspiration of local "green" jobs, research, and new technology to be generated by the eco-development in Bicester have not been realised.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 5	Support retail by limiting out-of-town shopping centres that encourage more car use and disadvantages the traders left in the town centres. Residents, including those from rural areas, benefit from encouraging larger stores alongside smaller shops and local traders
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	Encourage smaller, independent traders by reducing business rates and allowing residents attractive alternative choices to the larger chain stores and online experiences. Improve Banbury weekly market. Encourage more markets including specialist markets e.g., crafts, food, local artists, antiques and second hand, eco or re-cycled etc.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 6	Cherwell should support the standard method (adjusted) trajectory for overall number of new homes. Increase percentage of homes for young families and bungalows for disabled and/or elderly.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures. Strongly agree with the statement in 5.4.11 to "seek social rented homes over other types of affordable housing such as affordable rent or intermediate housing, noting that a social rented home is the only truly affordable housing option for many lowincome households in the district." Discourage buy-to-let. Bring in proper standards and rent control for all lettings and increase rights for all tenants, including life-time occupation.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	Housing density should be increased to minimise development spread. Increasing number of storeys in some family-oriented dwellings to maximise living space and include garaging / accommodation for vehicles below living space; has the potential to reduce parking congestion and protect living spaces from inevitable flooding risk in some build areas.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes but basic accessibility should be on all new-build to enable adaptations to be easily introduced when required e.g., width of doors and staircases.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Travelling Communities	On some properties targeted for elderly/disabled include ground floor bathroom facilities. Some nominated areas with facilities and appropriate level of support and policing for travellers to remain for limited periods of time before they move on (otherwise they are not travellers, they are settlers and should be treated as regular residents).
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	Alternative methods of construction should be actively encouraged, particularly if it supports the climate change agenda. Modular homes constructed off-site was one of the aspirations in early discussions about the Bicester ecocodevelopment. It was hoped that a large-scale construction firm would be attracted by the local market and good transport links to the wider area.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Oxfordshire should be an exemplar local authority.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Some relaxation of the rules affecting the lower grade II listed buildings is needed if residents are to respond to the new energy and insulation requirements of the climate change agenda.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 11	Mix of identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation and use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation. All renewable energy options need to consider the maintenance, renewal and real disposal costs (we are storing up significant problems in disposal of composite wind turbine blades for example). There are a substantial number of options out there that need to be evaluated but resilient systems tend to be smaller and localised rather than huge with potential for significant and catastrophic failure with extensive and wider ranging consequences (e.g., centralised infrastructure systems easily targeted by sabotage or prone to single points of failure etc.) Resilient systems are distributed systems.



LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Passive housing technologies with heat recovery systems – modular in design to eliminate increased costs for bespoke builds. Electric Vehicle Charging points standard, Solar standard possibly new Solar such as Perovskite. Localised energy storage to level out storage of renewable energy generation (possibly Hydrogen storage) and consideration in rural for pooled community systems such as community heating and power.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	All rural communities should have an analysis of their rural aesthetic and an objective assignment of Green Belt areas even if they are “mini” or even “micro” protected green areas. Analysis should always consult communities for local knowledge.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 12	Yes – in the order of priority suggested. However net neutral should not be the target developers should be held to a higher standard to produce nett gains in biodiversity and carbon offset projects.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Heavy emphasis on measures to protect pollinators should be prioritised.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 14	Seek opportunities to integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 15	For Rural communities such as ours, public transport or effective transport provision is key to enable access to these facilities.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	Nominated sites for local greenspaces.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Support the MCNP viewpoint.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Support the MCNP viewpoint.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Support the MCNP viewpoint.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Support the MCNP viewpoint.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 16	Blend of provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing) and provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure. Digital infrastructure will always evolve. Future proofing in our view is folly – no entity can know what the future will bring. Robust design within known technology frameworks is the best we can hope for.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	Rural areas are in increasing danger of being marginalised by poorly designed traffic systems that effectively increase congestion and reduce access. Point in question for Fritwell will be two proposed warehousing schemes that because of increased traffic volumes will make it more difficult to move West, East and South from the village forcing routes North.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy?. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are?
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Access to dental surgeries, medical centres and hospitals is rarely considered for rural communities. New conurbations and build schemes may significantly impact the ability of Emergency Services to respond to issues in rural areas.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. What happened to Central Governments “Levelling Up” agenda. There are Northern communities that would benefit from a “Bicester Village”/“Great Wolf Resort” and additional housing and business stimulation to reduce the haemorrhaging of young people moving south to pursue careers and hollowing out villages and towns in the north.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 23	Reiterate: “Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages”.

LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 24	Consider the use of an article 4 direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential with stimulus to encourage businesses to remain in town.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 25	Facilitate such developments through a criteria-based policy.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Fritwell Parish Council strongly support the protection and enhancement of the important Gavray Meadows, Langford Fields and the Brook. It is a critically important wildlife habitat, and an important wetland environment and constitutes the only remaining connection to nature Bicester residents can enjoy locally
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	A regular public transport service.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 29	Heyford park should be constrained to the existing local plan. Expansion would conjoin local villages, further remove habitat and wildlife corridors, and irreparably damage the rural aesthetic of surrounding villages.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 30	Prefer to consolidate our efforts with colleagues in the MCNP.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 31	Fritwell supports MCNP consolidated viewpoint.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 32	Fritwell supports MCNP consolidated viewpoint.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 33	Fritwell supports MCNP consolidated viewpoint.
LPR-B-609	Fritwell Parish Council	Option 34	Fritwell supports MCNP consolidated viewpoint.
LPR-B-610	Edgars for Bicester Motion	Option 3	Bicester Motion encourages further opportunities at or in the vicinity of the main urban centres. Commercial opportunities at Bicester Motion are well connected to the transport network, assist in providing a viable future for heritage assets, and act as a catalyst of economic investment in Bicester
LPR-B-610	Edgars for Bicester Motion	Question - Supporting Employment	The consultation paper does not go on to raise consultation questions regarding the type of support, or provide indications of how such support may be worded or provided. This is opened. Bicester Motion would encourage further support of employment and commercial opportunities in order to make the best use of land and viable reuse of heritage assets. In particular, employment and commercial related local policies should encourage and allow for sites to have flexibility on the precise type of tenant/user wherever is possible, to maximise commercial opportunities and therefore maximise on the viable future of heritage assets. Bicester Motion recognises its important local role to Bicester, and welcomes any further discussion required with Cherwell District Council in relation to how planning policy may support it and other commercial opportunities for the area. Cherwell District Council may wish to consider how commercial and employment policies can specifically support the provision of research and development into 'green' technologies. This would naturally lead on from Vision 7.
LPR-B-610	Edgars for Bicester Motion	Option 22	Bicester Motion recognises the sustainable nature and the economic draw of the settlement of Bicester. The Local Plan Paper correctly draws on the role of Bicester at the northern section of the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine, and draws upon the Oxfordshire LEP Investment Plan (2020) in terms of the wider opportunities, including in attracting Bicester Motion related investment. Additional employment and economic growth should be promoted as per the above item (1)'Further Major Urban Extension...' as Bicester can progress further still in economic and employment terms. Employment and economic development are best delivered in the most sustainable and accessible locations, of which further utilisation of the Bicester Motion site can provide. Furthermore, the investment in Bicester economic future, through sites such as Bicester Motion, can act as a catalyst for wider investment and greater footfall in the settlement and surrounding area. The greater the number and variety of opportunities at Bicester that can be supported the better, where development is in line with the other policies of the plan. Bicester Motion welcomes Bicester to be a node of growth within the forthcoming Oxfordshire Plan, and welcomes Cherwell District Council to further the support made in any emerging Local Plan for economic provisions in Bicester.
LPR-B-610	Edgars for Bicester Motion	Option 23	Further economic investment and employment opportunities can be advanced and supported to the north of the town. Bicester Motion is an established classleading site, and one which has potential to further deliver for Bicester, and offer an even greater range of economic, social and environment provisions, whilst also promoting and securing the viable use of heritage assets. Bicester Motion remind and support to Cherwell District Council the previously submitted Land at former Elm Farm Quarry (LPRA 132) for recreation and leisure development, which is located directly north of Bicester. Bicester Motion restates that additional land should be allocated as part of Policy Bicester 8 to include land at Elm Farm Quarry. This will support Bicester Motion in the delivery of their vision, which is to secure a long-term sustainable future for their site and to provide opportunities for jobs, apprentices and training. Bicester Motion welcome any dialogue with Cherwell District Council regarding this site submission.
LPR-B-610	Edgars for Bicester Motion	Option 25	Bicester Motion recognise that Cherwell have specifically mentioned the role and background of the Bicester Motion site at page 82 of the Local Plan Review Paper, and as sitting alongside Bicester Village as two key destinations within Bicester. Bicester Motion welcomes there to be dialogue between Cherwell District Council and Bicester Motion on the formatting of any policy support for community and cultural facilities, and the ways in which the Bicester Motion site could contribute to this. Bicester Motion restates the consideration that the Council seek to update its Tourism Development Strategy (2008) in order to fully capture the value of Bicester as a destination, and with particular regard for delivering post COVID19 recovery. Bicester Motion is all about classleading experiences being offered, and it wishes to further its draw as a destination in this region and beyond

LPR-B-610	Edgars for Bicester Motion	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	Bicester Motion is a key custodian of a variety of Heritage Assets (including Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments) at the Bicester Motion site, and as well as being sited within a Conservation Area, however, is a core contributor to the local economy. Bicester Motion would wish to be informed of any potential change to any onsite heritage assets if they were proposed in the Local Plan. Any designations above and beyond the existing could have the potential to alter the activities or visions of Bicester Motion. Bicester Motion would suggest in the context of the range of Listed Buildings, the Scheduled Monument, and the position within the Conservation Area, that additional protection is not required. The Local Plan Review paper explores a consideration as to whether there is a need to develop a policy that protects some of the features associated with Bicester's military history. Bicester Motion considers that insufficient information has been presented in the Local Plan review paper on this matter to understand 1) what types of protection are being suggested (if any), 2) what the parameters of such protection would entail and 3) whether this would be set in the context of the current economic and social role of the Bicester Motion site. Bicester Motion would welcome direct communication with Cherwell District Council on any policy or policy direction that may potentially impact on its operations. There appears no text in the connectivity section relating to the interplay of the Bicester Motion to Bicester Town Centre. Bicester Motion welcome any discussion with Cherwell District Council on promoting better links to the site.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 1	The suggested vision is generally good, there are several issues about it. Some of those will relate to the recent and current developments in Banbury. It is clear that we must not allow the centralised views of the three towns to override those of us who live in the rural areas, and like it that way. We must strictly control development in the rural areas, and not plan to just triple size of a small village. The plan must include for the provision of more nature areas and parks, so that those stuck in the towns have some where to go, rather than just finding more housing and industry. There is a clear need to split into two areas. The south area would contain Bicester and Kidlington, while the north would contain Banbury and be extended by including the Chipping Norton area from West Oxfordshire. Regarding the East-West route, this should be limited to the rail route only. There is no need for a major road route along that direction, other than the extension of the route from Oxford to Aylesbury, Leighton Buzzard and Bedford, thus getting the A34 linked to the A5, M1 and A1. You seem to have missed about the health and care of our people. It is essential, with the expanded population, that we ensure that the Horton is maintained and redeveloped. We need to ensure that the Oxford based structure fully recognise the needs that are required to be provided for us.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 2	Given that the current population is 150,000, with an expectation to grow to 170,000 by 2043 and to 180,000 by 2050 (based on 4.2 Cherwell Today), we should be expecting to need to build accommodation for another 30,000 people, which would equate to about 12,000 new houses, or 400 per year. Over the last 10 years we have been exceeding that by a factor of 3 and we already have 8000 houses with permission to build and another 8500 in allocated areas. On that basis, we DO NOT need to allocate any more space for accommodation. From 5.4.4, Oxfordshire has a need for 101,580, 123,390 or 152,790 new houses, depending which trajectory is used. In itself this is worrying since it is making assumptions about how the county will grow. Regarding Cherwell, it would suggest a range of 20,000 to 35,000 new houses, which is very different from the plan in 4.2 and needs to be explained.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 3	If by Employment Land you are referring to industrial rather than retail/leisure/housing, then it is clear that these areas need easy access to transport. On that basis they should be located in the urban centres and near to transport interchanges. On the other hand, retail, leisure and housing, generally, need to be located in urban areas, with a small amount being allowed into the rural areas where it is actually needed, and not just because it could.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 4	Employment should support all general and light industries and distribution. In a majority rural area there is no need for a heavy industry, though there may have been some in the past with the iron works around Banbury.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Supporting	We must ensure that other employment options are strongly controlled and not allow the development of new functions which do not directly provide a service business to the area. I would regard both the Soho and the Great Wolf developments falling into the that area
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 5	It is essential to ensure that town centres become, once again, the centre of the town. There is a need for it to be supported and developed for both retail, leisure and accommodation, with parking and transportation. The spread of off-centre shopping parks must not be allowed where there is the ability to provide that functionality within the town centres. Specifically in Banbury, there were areas in Castle Street and Lower Cherwell Street that were previously identified as being available for extending the town centre, yet it was allowed for the Banbury Gateway to be built at the end of an industrial area, thus taking away two major and two smaller retail units from the centre, which has reduced it to charity and coffee shops. We must provide centres with a sufficient range of functions and with easy access by bus, train and car, and for lorry access for goods.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	We must ensure that our centres support both retail and leisure services to the town and the areas around it, while providing accommodation for local residents, who could be provided with flats above retail units. This would ensure that the centre does not die in the evening and overnight, and would help to minimise crime.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Supporting our Town	Designs should be based on traditional styles and not on solid blocks of concrete. Off-site areas should only be used to support the centre and for on-line deliveries.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 6	One of the issues with accommodation is that builders prefer to build high value rather than affordable housing, thus tending to force new owners to move away from their location. We must ensure that all housing, in areas of at least 10 to 20 houses, must include at least 20% affordable houses. For single and smaller blocks, we must support the use of self-builds.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 7	The provision of rental accommodation rather than ownership, perhaps via a buy-in scheme, must be maintained. It must ensure that we supply sufficient Social Rent to cover the needs of our people.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 8	New houses tend to be smaller than current houses, and frequently may break legal requirements. This has the impact of forcing new owners to have to consider either reducing what they own or to acquire larger houses than they might need. We need to ensure that all houses are within the national space standard, and preferable larger.

LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Separation Distances	We should ensure that the spacing between houses and flats is sufficient to ensure that there no issues between them.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 9	Where possible, we must ensure that the majority of new housing is accessible to older or disabled people.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Housing Policies	We need to support and advise on the use of modular building designs and zero-energy designs, since that can deliver houses faster and more cost-effective. We should also ensure that the design of new housing does not become similar, preferring to have different designs and layouts within the same estate. This will enable the estate to be less estate-like.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 10	Standards for construction must be set the central government standard or higher. There is no case where we should allow these standards to be lower.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	We must ensure that historic buildings are maintained in such a way that we can apply more modern technologies to them.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 11	Renewal energy, at a centralised location, should be located in a few places. With new building, we should be ensuring that solar, wind and air or ground sources are used, along with battery packs.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We must ensure that our activities do not contribute to climate change, and ensure that we use electric vehicles.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Green Belt	We need to ensure that we maintain green belts around the towns to ensure that we do not just spread building along roads.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 12	When having need to impact on the natural environment, we must ensure that we develop corresponding facilities near to the location and by including it within a controlled conservation area.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 13	We must ensure that we maintain and develop the natural capital of our area and ensure that new developments are required to improve on it. We need to ensure that all new developments do not impact on our biodiversity and the natural environment, and preferably that they we enhance them
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	We need to ensure that all new developments do not impact on our biodiversity and the natural environment, and preferably that they we enhance them.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 14	Ensure that all new housing includes support for new children's play areas and parks.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 15	Outdoor sports and parks must be developed to match the needs of the population.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Local Green Spaces	We must ensure that we develop and maintain Local Green Spaces. These need to include Ancient Routeways to ensure that these are not lost during developments.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	We must ensure that historic environment is maintained and enhanced
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Ensure that we develop plans to ensure that new developments fit in with the current environment and do not impose something which is not in place.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Depends on how you define a 20-minute neighbour – does it purely cover walk or cycling, or is it supposed to cover car or bus transportation. In the first case it would be suitable in urban areas but totally impossible in rural areas
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Transport & Connectivity	While it is possible to provide good and easy transportation between the towns and to our cities, we must not forget that 30% of our population does not live in urban areas, and like it that way. We must ensure that we can provide transportation to enable them to travel. The concept of reducing their need to travel is a false concept.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 16	We must ensure that all new and existing developments have access to a digital infrastructure. It is not sufficient to assume that mobile coverage is enough, in my house I cannot pick up a mobile signal.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Transport Policies	We need to ensure that we can develop transport policies which will provide the services that we need, are cost effective, support electric vehicles and provide changing facilities.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 17	We need to ensure that on-going plans are suitable for the current conditions and can be adjusted in the future if needed.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 18	You have already merged Bodicote into Banbury, and extensions into other villages must be stopped.

LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 19	If it is allowed that will convert Banbury from a small town into a large one after growing several times. While that might be a need for the far future it is not one which we need now. We must ensure that developments in Banbury are within the current plans, with minimal extensions outside, and we need to ensure that we reuse existing areas as they become available. Developments to the east of the A361 at the M40 junction must be stopped.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Within the town centre we need to ensure that we support the existing properties around South Bar, Horsefair and North Bar.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 20	We need to redevelop the town centre to ensure that retains its traditional concept of retail, which must be extended to include more leisure, with accommodation only being allowed above retail and leisure areas. Having accommodation present will enable to town centre to be become safer, especially overnight, and minimise crime.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 21	Banbury Canalside, to the west of the canal, should be developed as being residential along with leisure facilities, and the existing commercial businesses there should have been relocated to the area now used for Banbury Gateway, with the buildings there should have located in Bolton Road
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	These need to be developed and enhanced, and there needs to be a way to integrate them with the town centre.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	The issue is not about reducing car trips, since that could only be dealt with the provision of more bus transportation, given that this is a rural area, What is needed is a way to provide a better access to the M40 from the south and west side of Banbury. Ermont Way should have been extended to run below the Thorpe Way area and then onwards to meet the A4260 between Bodicote and Adderbury, effectively creating a boundary line to the Longford Park development. This will remove the majority of traffic now passing through the town centre
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 30	Development should be limited so that rural areas do not get overcome by developments and transportation that the area cannot support.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 31	New development must only be done where there is an agreed for it, which must be managed at the parish level.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 32	Settlement boundaries must be placed to ensure that the rural areas do not become more urban.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 33	The rural economy must be directed in a way that supports the needs of the rural people, and conserves and enhances the landscape. This must be managed at the parish level.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Option 34	We must ensure that the historic and natural environments are conserved and enhanced.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	We must ensure that Neighbourhood Planning is driven locally, and must not be driven externally.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	Question - Development Management Policies	Milcombe is now reaching a point where it cannot take any more developments unless it gets more services, like a school and more shops. One has to ask why Milcombe is flagged with 6 housing plots, which will triple the size of the village, while South Newington only has one, which actually reasonable, along with the one than is planned for Barfords and the none that Wigginton is getting. There really is no need for another large village between Bloxham and Hook Norton. Developments around Bloxham need to minimised, with no developments along any of the connection routes to South Newington, Barfords, Milton, Tadmerton or Banbury. Bloxham is turning into a large village which is growing along those connections, while ignoring space that is available to the south of Ells Lane and the west of the A361, and the area between the housings on Milton Road and The Ridgeway. This would enable Bloxham to be forming a more centralised structure rather than just extending towards its neighbours.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	LPR-A-116	Object.
LPR-B-611	Chris Hill	LPR-A-185	Object.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 1	Supports the suggested Vision for the plan. With Cherwell positioned within the Oxford- Cambridge Arc, the College agrees that there are significant opportunities for a post COVID-19 recovery within the District that delivers a healthier, more prosperous, resilient and sustainable future for all communities. The College supports statement 6. In addition, supports statement 8 and 9. The College supports the opportunities for maintaining the settlement of Bicester as an attractive, vibrant, retail, cultural and social centres for communities and visitors. We consider that further growth within and around Bicester should be supported, as it remains well placed to accommodate further expansion and growth due to the relatively unconstrained nature of the town in terms of landscape sensitivity and lack of Green Belt designation. It is settlement that has significant potential to become an economic hub of economic growth and a vital strategic interchange as part of wider development and connectivity across the Oxford-Cambridge Arc.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 2	Broadly supports the key objectives as set out within the Plan. Supports the objective KO1, KO2 and KO3. The College considers that key objective KO20 is important, to ensure that the housing needs of all sectors of Cherwell's communities is met, as required by national policy (NPPF, paragraph 60). The College supports the key objective KO28 and KO29.

LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 3	Bicester should be a focus for employment land, to assist in delivering jobs needed in Cherwell, which is also a significant transport interchange. The plan should explore opportunities to capitalise on the District's proximity to Oxford and location on the Oxford-Cambridge Arc as well as the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine. The Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine was identified within the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). The SEP prioritises growth in three areas along the spine for growth potential in population, employment and housing. Bicester is identified as one of these areas. With this in mind, within the local plan, the Council should identify the types of employment floorspace required and appropriate locations for this with particular regard to accessibility. The location of Bicester on the knowledge spine and Oxford-Cambridge Arc presents the opportunity for Bicester to be a hub of economic growth at both a regional and national level. The local plan should look to capitalise on this by allocating sites for economic development with a view to attracting high skilled jobs and workers. In addition, the location in relation to strategic road and rail infrastructure should also be utilised in relation to opportunities for logistics development and employment. Our client site north and east of Little Chesterton is a highly accessible location directly adjacent to the A41 and approximately 1.4km from junction 9 of the M40 which provides immediate access to the strategic highway network. The A41 is a sustainable transport corridor between Bicester and Oxford with regular bus services (an existing bus stop is approximately 700m from the site). The greenfield site would be a suitable location for providing employment on a key sustainable corridor between Oxford and Bicester. Previously developed land should be considered, however only where such PDL are located within sustainable locations. However as sustainable PDL sites are finite, then sustainable greenfield sites should also be considered as appropriate locations for employment land.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 4	When identifying sites for employment land, that the Council should provide a mix (Option 3 above), to support the economic needs within the District including general industry and distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). The plan should explore opportunities to capitalise on the District's proximity to Oxford and location on the Oxford-Cambridge Arc as well as the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine. The Local Plan should include a policy which support the creation of employment opportunities for innovative and high-tech businesses. Such businesses will not only support the wider economic needs across Oxfordshire but will support the Council's objective of creating a sustainable, flexible economy that is vibrant and inclusive.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 6	Supports policies which ensures that affordable housing provision can be provided across the District to assist the housing needs for different groups across communities, as required by national policy (NPPF, paragraph 62). Any percentage level that the Council chose to take forward within the Local Plan will need to be supported by a robust evidence base which clearly justifies why such a level(s) is considered appropriate.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 7	Any policy regarding affordable housing tenure should align to national policy requirements. The NPPF states at paragraph 72 that local planning authorities should support the development of entry-level exception sites, suitable for first time buyers, unless the need for such homes is already being met within the authority's area. As indicated at paragraph 5.4.12 of the Plan, earlier this year the Government introduced a new type of affordable tenure called First Homes, of which a minimum of 25% of affordable homes secured through developer contributions should be First Homes, ringfenced for first time buyers.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 8	The national described space standards are optional standards, therefore if the Council were to include the application of the minimum room standards this would only be appropriate if there is clear evidence that this would not be detrimental to overall housing supply in an area where there is a proven shortfall. If the Council were to introduce a policy requiring minimum separation distances between residential properties, then this policy will need to be supported by clear evidence to support such an approach.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 9	If the Council were to introduce accessibility standards, then this policy will need to be supported by clear evidence to support such an approach in addition to the mandatory requirements of Building Regulations.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 10	Sustainable construction should be considered in light of the latest Building Regulations, and any future updates to those Regulations. Earlier this year the Government published the outcomes of the Future Homes Standard consultation which sought views on changes to Part L and F of the Building Regulations to improve energy efficiency of new homes. The Future Homes Standard will come into effect in 2025, with changes to Part L expected to come into force in 2022, with further legislation expected to be introduced in 2024. The College considers that the Oxfordshire Plan provides an opportunity to set out the broad policy objectives for overall sustainability across all authorities within Oxfordshire. The College considers that any policy must ensure flexibility and will be dependent on the extent of any works in retrofitting existing building stock, balanced against the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by the heritage assets setting.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 12	The College considers that all the above options should be considered which will be dependent on a site-by-site basis. For example, a site that is unable to secure biodiversity net gain (BNG) or compensatory measures on site but is also unable to secure it close to the site, should consider other options, such as providing BNG or compensatory measure towards Conservation Target Area, or to provide contributions to local environmental bodies.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 13	The College supports the principle and value of natural capital, we are aware that this is not required by national policy. On this basis, if the Council were to introduce a policy requiring major developments to provide natural capital assessments, then such policy should be supported by robust evidence which clearly defines the intentions of the policy, explains the methodology for such an assessment including how it will be measured (i.e. what metric will be used) and how such an approach would be consistent with national policy

LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 15	University College supports the opportunities for achieving good design and considers that any policy should be considered in light of national policy, in particular the NPPF's emphasis (paragraph 126 of the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places which is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The College supports the principle of '20-minute neighbourhoods' that most people's daily needs, can be met within a short walk or cycle of no more than 20-minutes. We consider that a settlement such as Bicester is an appropriate location for such neighbourhoods, as a way of improving access to services and ensuring that both new and existing community's benefit. Supports the proposed transport and connectivity approach, with the emphasis on reducing the need to travel and encouraging active travel (walking, cycling, wheelchair accessibility), and moving away from the use of the private car. Paragraph 5.12.2 of the Plan refers to County's Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which is currently under review, that sets out the transport strategy for the county including area strategies for Bicester and Banbury. We consider that the Council should capitalise on the opportunity presented through transport improvements including improved highway connectivity, which can offer improved public transport and cycle connectivity by allocating development sites at significant transport intersections such as the settlement of Bicester.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 16	Supports the opportunities to provide digital connections and for developments to be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs, in particular the opportunities that this can create in supporting high tech and innovative businesses.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 17	Supports the principle of preparing a new IDP however await further details on the methodology before passing any further comment. We do however consider that the new IDP should be considered in light of the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy, to ensure it is aligned to what infrastructure is identified across Oxfordshire to 2050. We consider that the IDP will need to be prepared by place and look at areas by catchment dependent on the type of infrastructure required i.e. education facilities may be considered across a catchment, while highway improvements are more likely to be relevant to a place.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 22	Further growth within and around Bicester should be supported. In paragraph 6.3.1 of the Plan, Bicester is Cherwell's second largest town, well connected to Oxford by road and rail. As identified within the Oxfordshire LEP Investment Plan, "there is significant potential for Bicester to become a vital strategic interchange for EastWest Rail and the Oxford-London Marylebone line, as part of the wider development and connectivity across the Oxford-Cambridge Arc." Cherwell is located on the Oxfordshire knowledge spine which is positioned north/south across Oxfordshire connecting Didcot, Oxford and Bicester. The Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine was identified within the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). The SEP prioritises growth in three areas along the spine for growth potential in population, employment and housing. Bicester is identified as one of these areas. In paragraph 6.3.5 of the Plan, Bicester and its immediate surrounding area also feature heavily in economic strategies, which is identified in the Local Industrial Strategy as a Living Labs Testbed which includes an Eco Zone and Corporate HQ Hub at Bicester Business Park. The Oxfordshire LEP Investment Plan identifies potential for wider regeneration under the umbrella of the Bicester Garden Town Scheme to transform Bicester from a traditional Oxfordshire County Market Town into a dynamic and vibrant economy drawing on attractions such as Bicester Village and Bicester Motion. Despite recent substantial allocations and development, Bicester remains well placed to accommodate further expansion and growth. This is by reason of the relatively unconstrained nature of the town in terms of landscape sensitivity and lack of Green Belt designation. The location of Bicester on the knowledge spine and Oxford-Cambridge Arc presents the opportunity for Bicester to be a hub of economic growth at both a regional and national level. The local plan should look to capitalise on this by allocating sites for economic development with a view to attracting high skilled jobs and workers. The location in relation to strategic road and rail infrastructure should also be utilised in relation to opportunities for logistics development and employment. Economic growth should be support and complimented by new housing development in order that those at the new employment opportunities created in Bicester can live in close proximity to their places of work. This has the potential to create sustainable communities and ensure that local services and facilities are supported. The College considers that further major urban extensions at Bicester will assist in supporting the growth of this settlement, as an economic hub. University College owns land to the north and east of Little Chesterton which we consider is a suitable and deliverable location for further growth to the southwest of Bicester.
LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 23	We consider that further development should be located at this sustainable settlement. In particular we consider that further greenfield sites will assist in supporting the future growth of this settlement and consider that a combination of sites around Bicester should be considered for allocation within the Local Plan. Our client owns land to the north and east of Little Chesterton. This site would be suitable for economic and or residential development and is also of a scale to support community services/facilities to support the new and existing community. The local plan review should consider the benefits of allocating this site and other similar sites to support the further growth and prosperity of Bicester. Land to the north and east of Little Chesterton is in a highly accessible location directly adjacent to the A41 and approximately 1.4km from junction 9 of the M40 which provides immediate access to the strategic highway network. The A41 is a sustainable transport corridor between Bicester and Oxford with regular bus services (an existing bus stop is approximately 700m from the site). The proximity to the strategic road and rail infrastructure network provides potential for Use Class B8 storage and distribution development, such as logistics space, for which there is increasing need. The site would also be suitable for research and design employment development including laboratory provision. There is an identified a need to encourage and facilitate higher skilled/higher wage jobs within Cherwell, and this site offers the opportunity to deliver this type of development on the key sustainable corridor between Oxford and Bicester. The site would be suitable for residential development and would be of a suitable scale to support community services/facilities which would support the new and existing community. If delivered in conjunction with the neighbouring land which is being promoted, this would be of an even larger scale and offer the potential for further infrastructure delivery. This site is ideally located to capitalise on this strategic opportunity to support employment growth and development as well as residential development of high-quality homes which would support the economic growth of Bicester, supporting its location within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and the Oxfordshire knowledge spine.

LPR-B-612	Barton Willmore for University College Oxford	Option 25	As identified at paragraph 6.3.30 - 6.3.32 of the Plan, there are a number of key challenges for Bicester's transport network which need to be addressed, however we consider that new development opportunities could assist in supporting infrastructure improvements to support the growth of this settlement.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 1	Bullet 6 of the draft Vision implies that the Council is looking to increase self-sufficiency, with an aim to reduce out-commuting from the District. This is a commendable objective and it is considered that there is considerable scope to improve self-sufficiency, particularly within the villages. Given the economic pull of Oxford, a certain level of out-commuting is inevitable and thus, the Vision must have a clear focus on ensuring journeys between Oxford and Cherwell are sustainable. As such, the Vision must acknowledge this important relationship with Oxford and deliver growth in areas with truly sustainable links to the city. Church Commissioners for England consider that the village of Islip in particular, provides significant potential for strategic development with truly sustainable links to Oxford as the village is: situated on the train line between Oxford Parkway and Bicester and benefits from an existing station; located within a 3minute train ride to Oxford Parkway, 7 minutes to Bicester and 11 minutes to Oxford city; located within a 35 minute cycle ride of Oxford city centre; capable of delivering improved bus services between Islip and destinations; and capable of delivering strategic employment development adjacent to the A34.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 2	The Church Commissioners for England broadly agree with the objectives as drafted. While Objective KO7 seeks to support Cherwell's 'urban centres', there is no objective which seeks to increase self-sufficiency/ economic prosperity in the villages. Coupled with increased digital connectivity, supporting development capable of improving services and facilities in villages will better enable residents to meet their day to day needs without relying on journeys by private car. This objective would seemingly conflict with KO31 and KO16 as well as other objectives relevant to addressing climate change. In addition, some of the more sustainably located villages (such as Islip, which is on the train line and adjacent to the A34 corridor) are capable of delivering employment floorspace and their potential contribution to Cherwell's economy should not be so easily dismissed at this early stage of the plan making process.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 3	A combination of sites will likely lead to the most sustainable form of development. It is considered that Islip is a sustainable location for employment development, and under the Call for Sites the Commissioners has identified a c. 6ha employment site immediately adjacent to the A34 which could provide a mixture of different employment uses framed by a high quality landscaped area which responds to the surrounding environment. The site represents a unique opportunity for the village and the wider area, providing local jobs in a sustainable location, less than a mile from Islip train station. Located within the Church Commissioner's land ownership it would also be possible to provide new cycle and footpath links between the employment area, the train station and the wider village. This land has the ability to support Oxfordshire's aspirations to move towards more sustainable freight and goods delivery, and has the potential to improve system efficiency and effectiveness, allowing greater uptake of lower carbon transport choices. In particular, the site is located within close proximity to the A34 as a relevant strategic transport corridor and the proposed facilities will be easily accessed by numerous sustainable transport modes.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 4	A mixture of options. Within the Church Commissioners' Call for Sites submission, land at Islip is capable of delivering a strategic mixed use development including c. 6ha of employment land adjacent to the A34. It is considered that the employment element can come forward without impacting on the amenity of either existing or future residents, yet will be well integrated with the village through the provision of new cycle and footpath links between the employment area, the train station and the wider village
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	Cherwell's villages should be supported by providing development capable of increasing self-sufficiency which will allow residents to meet the majority of their day to day needs within the village itself and reduce the need to travel by private car. Coupled with improved digital connectivity within these areas, it is considered that this could significantly assist in meeting climate change objectives.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 6	The proposed level of affordable housing sought by CDC should be supported by a viability assessment and without this evidence based information it is difficult to comment on what rates of affordable housing which should be pursued on different sizes of sites and in different locations. The requirement for 25% of affordable housing provision to be First Homes will need to be assessed in terms of viability. Simply rolling forward the previous percentage or increasing percentages without adequate viability evidence cannot be supported.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 7	The tenure split of affordable housing pursued must be grounded in viability evidence. The Government requirement for 25% of the affordable housing provision to be First Homes must be adequately factored into this viability assessment.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 8	It is considered that the any emerging policy relating to space standards be consistent with and follow national guidance. In particular, the policies will need to recognise that there can be feasibility and/or viability constraints associated with new development. A policy that requires design and construction standards of new development to be higher than national standards could prevent sustainable development from coming forward.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Separation Distances	The Commissioners would not support such a prescriptive and onerous policy. Separation distances should be guided by design and decided on a site by site basis.



LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 9	The Commissioners consider that emerging policy relating to accessibility standards should be consistent with and follow national guidance. In particular, the policy needs to recognise that there can be feasibility or viability constraints associated with new development. A policy that requires design and construction standards of new development to be higher than national standards could prevent sustainable and viable development from coming forward.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Housing Policies	There should be a policy which recognises that there will be situations where future opportunities arise for additional new development over and above that identified in the development plan for the area. This policy should set out the circumstances where such opportunities will be acceptable. This should include new build housing on suitable previously developed or greenfield sites, as well as conversions to accommodate new uses, the expansion or replacement of existing buildings, along with proposals including for example live/work units, community facilities, leisure, specialist living accommodation, small scale retailing, employment, infrastructure and other economic generating uses. This policy should apply to new development proposals within existing built-up areas or outside the built-up area but which are well-related to a settlement. The built-up area is contained within the main body of existing built development of a settlement or as defined in a neighbourhood plan. When assessing whether a site is well-related, the physical and visual relationship of the site to the existing built-up area of the settlement will be a key consideration.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 10	While it is recognised that it is important for the emerging plans to identify ways to reduce carbon emissions from new major development, there is a significant risk to viability and deliverability if the standards pursued are significantly higher than national standards. As such, it is the Commissioners' view that the emerging policy should be consistent with and follow national guidance. It is considered that Cherwell should not seek higher building standards than are to be prescribed within the Oxfordshire Plan as this could significantly impact the viability of future development within this area of Oxfordshire. It is considered that CDC follow guidance on sustainable design and construction to building regulations and the Future Homes and Future Buildings Standards.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Green Belt	It is inevitable that there will need to be some Green Belt release in order to meet the housing requirements of both the county as a whole and the district of Cherwell. It is imperative that a review of the Green Belt should be undertaken as part of the evidence base for the Oxfordshire Plan which will in turn feed into Cherwell's Local Plan. The need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account. Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should first give consideration to land which has been previously developed and/or is well-served by public transport. It is considered that further exceptional circumstances would exist to support Green Belt release at sustainable locations in the Green Belt within Cherwell. Islip, as an existing and established village in the Green Belt with a railway station on the high speed railway line and regular bus services to Oxford and Bicester, meets the requirements of a sustainable village. Given the extent of the Commissioners' land holding in Islip and the fact that the land is largely within a single ownership, there are significant opportunities to improve and enhance the natural and built environment and meet the aspirations of the preferred policy in terms of providing access, opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation and landscape enhancement in the Green Belt. The development provides opportunity to create defensible Green Belt boundaries in this location for its long term protection. The land should be released from the Green Belt to meet Cherwell's housing need. Whilst it is acknowledged that it is the Council's expectation that any new countywide strategic matters relating to the Oxford Green Belt will be addressed by the Oxfordshire Plan, it is important to note that as approximately 13.8% of Cherwell now lies within the Oxford Green Belt, it will also be vital for Cherwell Council as part of this emerging Local Plan to consider future policies in respect of supporting the vitality of settlements that are currently washed over by Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Notwithstanding this, should no strategic release be forthcoming, it is considered that some moderate development could still occur in the villages washed over by Green Belt (such as Islip) without having an adverse impact on Green Belt policy. Moderate development in villages washed over by Green Belt can still serve these five purposes set out in NPPF and therefore a policy setting out the development opportunities for such villages would be considered beneficial as this would enable the villages which are currently constrained to support small scale development commensurate with the size of the settlement in order to support growth and maintain existing services and facilities. Since the adoption of the Local Plan in July 2015 there have been improvements to rail infrastructure in Cherwell. This has included a new station at Islip (previously a rail halt) and this should be noted in terms of the sustainability associated with future growth in the village of Islip. Further detail on this in a specific local plan policy may be beneficial in providing clarity to both developers, landowners, residents and other stakeholders of where and when such development would be supported in these settlements.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 13	Natural Capital mapping which has been undertaken is at a scale which is unreadable and makes it extremely difficult to make any meaningful comments on any proposed policy relating to it. The supporting Natural Capital Report appears to assign scores across the whole of Oxfordshire, but it is not clear what impact this will have on a site by site basis or what areas have been afforded what score. It is also wholly unclear as to if / how this information will be applied to the site search process. Without the benefit of a transparent evidence base, the Church Commissioners cannot support any policy relating to Natural Capital.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 15	The provision of sports pitches should be driven by need i.e. a new development should not be required to provide new pitches as a consequence of an arbitrary calculation if an offsite contribution to upgrade existing pitches in the immediate locality would result in a better facilities for an area overall. The Authority should take account of existing pitch provision within the local area when requesting contributions from developers and an audit of existing provision would also be beneficial.

LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	A site's context and its constraints can have a significant impact on the design of any future proposals for new development. As such a 'one size fit all' approach to design within the Local Plan would not be supported. Design should be considered through supplementary planning documents or, for strategic scale development, through the preparation of site specific design codes.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Supportive of the principle of 20 minute neighbourhoods and consider that the Local Plan could considerably improve services and facilities in sustainably located villages such as Islip. Islip is a very sustainable village, benefitting from an existing train station, a good bus service and is located circa 35 minutes cycle from Oxford. The existing village also has a number of key facilities including a primary school, doctors, shop etc. However, given the extent of the Church Commissioners land holding, it is considered that the site provides a rare opportunity to create a 20 minute neighbourhood. Indeed, it is considered that development at Islip could meet the key principles of 20 minute neighbourhoods. Agree with the proposed hierarchy as set out on page 59 of the consultation document.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Transport & Connectivity	There is significant opportunity to reduce the need to travel in sustainably located villages such as Islip. Supporting development capable of improving services and facilities as well as digital connectivity within the village will mean residents will be capable of meeting more of their day to day needs within the village, thereby reducing the need to travel. In addition, the village benefits from an existing train station, with journey time to Oxford Parkway being just 3 minutes and is located within a 35 minute cycle of Oxford city centre. Where residents do need to travel, this can be done via <u>active and sustainable means</u> .
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 16	Church Commissioners agree that digital connectivity will be an important factor and future proofing development sites would appear a reasonable approach.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Transport Policies	Agree with the range of policies and documents identified. Strongly support the principle of sustainable travel and that new development should be primarily designed to enable movement by active travel and sustainable transport modes, and that sites are well connected to surrounding sustainable transport networks. In this regard, it is requested that the Council give due consideration to Islip as a location for growth. The significant opportunity the villages' train station (which is centrally located and walkable for the whole village) brings has been overlooked. This village is highly connected being just a 3-minute train ride from Oxford Parkway, 7 minutes from Bicester, 11 minutes from Oxford and under an hour to London Marylebone. As discussed elsewhere, Oxford is within a 35 minute cycle ride and there is significant opportunity to enhance bus services. Sustainable travel will be crucial for reducing carbon emissions in Cherwell and thus it is considered that new development at Islip will reduce the need to travel, will enable movement by active travel and will provide genuine opportunity for sustainable travel.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 30	There are over 90 villages and hamlets located in the rural areas of the district. In total, approximately 31% of the District's population live outside the main urban areas. It important for housing to be supported in the rural areas with appropriate policies prepared to accommodate this. The 2015 local plan directed most of the development to Bicester and Banbury, with limited planned growth in rural areas. We therefore support the option to direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. Appropriately sized development in the villages may help to meet needs not only within the village itself but also within neighbouring rural communities. Church Commissioners object to a blanket approach to rural areas as clearly the major dispersal of growth across a wide range of villages would be inconsistent with the Plan strategy and could lead to less sustainable forms of development. Islip is a logical place to accommodate greater levels of growth which will also benefit existing residents by providing an enhanced level of services and facilities, reducing the need to travel and allowing the village to become more self-sufficient. It is clear from the Islip Parish Profile that housing need in this village is significant and the Plan must seek to meet both this existing local need as well as looking to the future. The Profile demonstrates that there are currently 130 live applications on the housing register which state Islip as their preference. To deliver this many affordable homes at rate of 35%, will require a housing development of c. 380 dwellings. However, with the requirement for 25% of affordable provision to be First Homes from December 2021, this figure is likely to sit nearer to 500 dwellings. This high level of need cannot be ignored and sites capable of delivering development to meet this need must be identified through the Local Plan.

LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 31	Sites within sustainable villages such as Islip should be identified and allocated through the Local Plan, with communities consulted with as part of the Local Plan process. This should particularly be the case where a larger scale of development would be appropriate. Indeed, the 2015 Local Plan did not make specific allocations for development, with these intended to be included within a 'part 2 local plan. Most of the developments over the current plan period have come forward via the 'market' as speculative developments. This means that it has been more challenging to coordinate infrastructure improvements and supporting services. To support future growth we would support the allocation of specific sites as part of the Local Plan Review. Providing a Parish level figure with no further guidance at the Local Plan stage is likely to lead to significant delay with delivery in the rural areas. It is also noted that Parish areas are relatively large compared to village boundaries and this approach could therefore lead to less sustainable forms of development. A key concern would also be the selection of a number of smaller sites through neighbourhood plans which may not provide the key benefits of development that many of these areas desperately need, such as affordable housing. As such, were this approach pursued, it is likely only to be suitable for small scale development (c.1-20 units). Our client would support future allocations in the rural area and in particular the village of Islip. On that basis, we would like to take this opportunity to promote land in and around Islip for future residential development. Islip village contains a number of services and facilities including a Primary School, a GP Surgery as well as restaurants and a village shop. The village also has access to several bus stops, some which include the H5 route to Bicester and the John Radcliffe Hospital. There is now also Islip Rail Station which provides service to Oxford and London Marylebone. It is considered to be a sustainable settlement in the rural area of the district. We take this opportunity to promote the Commissioners' significant landholding around the village of Islip which was submitted by Lichfields under the Call for Sites process in September 2020. Two further Call for Sites submissions are being made to the Council on behalf of the Church Commissioners in relation to smaller development opportunities within the village at: 1) Land at Manor Farm, Lower Street, Islip, and, 2) Farmstead at Manor Farm. The Sites are located within the built up area of Islip Village and are approximately 0.1ha and 1.37ha in size respectively. The site at Lower Street is situated adjacent to existing residential properties including Northcote to the immediate northeast. Manor Farm Farmstead is located off North Street. The sites are both approximately 300m from the centre of Islip village which, contains a number of services and facilities including a Primary School, a GP Surgery as well as restaurants and a village hall and shop. The sites are also located in close proximity to a bus stop which is serviced by the H5 route to Bicester and the John Radcliffe Hospital. They are located within 650m and 400m respectively of Islip Rail Station which provides services to Oxford and London Marylebone. The site at Lower Street is a small plot which currently houses an unused Dutch barn with access to the site being directly off Lower Street; whereby an existing field gate is located. The Site is surrounded by residential development to the north, northeast and northwest, with agricultural land to the southeast and a wooded area to the south. Manor Farm is a farm steading which currently consists of a range of traditional and modern agricultural buildings. Is it located adjacent to existing residential development to the west and south with a tree covered area to the east and agricultural fields (with the train station beyond) to the north. Based on the surrounding uses, the sites are considered to be situated within the built up area of Islip. The Sites are sat immediately adjacent to existing residential development, and due to existing buildings being located on the site, along with the existing access / highway network and the site sizes, it is considered that the sites would be suitable and capable of accommodating a residential development. It is anticipated that the site at Lower Street would accommodate a single, new build, detached dwelling (2 storey in height built of stone) with associated garden amenity space and off-street parking spaces or garage, to complement the existing built up character of the village in this location, with the farm stead accommodating a mixture of new build and conversion properties.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 32	Opportunity for sustainable and active travel goes to the heart the Local Plan and the Church Commissioners strongly support the provision of additional weight to accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling. Such an assessment should consider the potential for the reasonable further enhancement of these services. With regard to weight given to the availability of certain services and facilities, this is in part supported although if a village is highly sustainable in transport terms (such as Islip), additional housing growth will in turn support new and/or enhanced services within the village to the benefit of existing and future residents. As such, it is only considered that weighting should be applied certain services and facilities such as schools, GP surgery, supermarket and village hall/community meeting places.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Support the inclusion of settlement boundaries if it provides the much needed flexibility required to meet the objectively assessed development needs and demands identified for the entire district, not just the three main settlements. Settlement boundaries help identify the area within which development proposals would be considered acceptable, subject to complying with other policies contained in the Development Plan. They seek to prevent development from gradually extending into the surrounding countryside but reflect the boundary of previously allocated land and the main built form of the settlement as established within the Local Plan responding to natural physical boundaries. However, the use of such boundaries should not seek to stifle meeting identified development needs.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 33	Support the allocation of specific sites within the rural area. Welcome further discussion with the Council as to the potential of the Commissioners' land holding in Islip to support the economic aspirations of the Plan. In the meantime, we would direct the reader of our Call for Sites submission which includes provision of a Masterplan demonstrating where this employment land could be located.
LPR-B-613	Lichfields for the Church Commissioners for England	Option 34	Policy ESD13 of the adopted Local Plan is broadly supported and we would consider that a similarly worded policy within the emerging plan would be sufficient.

LPR-B-614	Savills for the Church Commissioners for England	Call for Sites Promotion - Farmstead at Manor Farm, North Street, Islip	Farmstead at Manor Farm, North Street, Islip is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-614	Savills for the Church Commissioners for England	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Manor Farm, Lower Street, Islip	Land at Manor Farm, Lower Street, Islip is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 1	Rosconn Strategic Land (RSL) generally support the vision but would suggest in the next iteration of the Plan, more detail is set out, as some of the aspirations are too vague in providing a clearer vision of how the District will have progressed during the Plan period. RSL would suggest the current vision could benefit from explicitly stating the end of the Plan period (2040). Further detail could be provided in Vision 4 for example, which states there will be a choice of energy efficient, well designed market and affordable homes to meet the district's needs. Once the level of market and affordable housing is set through the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan process, this numerical requirement should be included within the vision. Another example where further detail can be added is Vision 14 which sets out how rural communities will have realised their full potential through new technologies, small business growth and improved transport and service provision to complement existing services. Detail should be provided on how growth will have been successfully promoted, whilst given the recognition later in the Plan about the loss of services and facilities in rural settlements, the vision should be more explicit in how growth will help to maintain and improve the vitality and viability of existing services and facilities. These amendments will assist in providing a clearer understanding of the actions that must be undertaken to have achieved the vision by 2040.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 2	RSL generally support the 31 identified Key Objectives, the number could be rationalised to provide greater clarity. For example, KO 26 supports access to green and blue infrastructure to benefit physical and mental health. This is partially repeated through KO 28 which supports access to all types of services, facilities and infrastructure including green and blue infrastructure. Another example is KO 27 which seeks to ensure new development maintains or enhances the local distinctiveness of Cherwell's settlements, whilst KO 30 also seeks to create more sustainable communities by providing high quality, locally distinctive and well-designed environments. RSL note KO 7 seeks to support Cherwell's urban centres by maintaining and enhancing their vitality, viability, distinctiveness and safety, where beneficial through redevelopment and renewal. RSL note the equivalent Key Objective 31 for the rural communities. RSL consider the scope of this Key Objective should be expanded to refer to the provision of both new market and affordable housing to help meet both the identified need of rural communities and enhance or maintain the vitality the most sustainable rural centres and villages, as advised by Paragraphs 78 and 79 of the NPPF. RSL would suggest an equivalent Key Objective is included to align with the Plan vision of ensuring the districts rural communities realise their full potential.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 3	A combination of all of the above options. RSL do not consider that any one single option sufficient in accommodating all of the required employment land to meet the Plan's various objectives of supporting economic growth, both within the larger settlements of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington but also the rural areas. As identified within the Economic Needs Assessment (2021), the future requirements within the District include a range of different types, sizes and locationally different employment premises not a single requirement. Focusing new employment land into one location option is unlikely to meet the different types of need which will occur during the Plan period. This view is repeated in the summary of the Stakeholder Engagement as part of the Economic Needs Assessment. This research found that there is a healthy demand for small office provision in the rural locations, and that the different locations within the District such as Bicester, Banbury and the rural locations reflect significantly different markets (paragraph 5.2.1). There is a small rural economy across Cherwell comprising small and micro businesses, significant proportion of which are either linked to the rural economy or are a long-term occupier of a rural site and would not want to relocate to a more urban location. Within the Economic Needs Assessment, the rural commercial market in Cherwell is very small with only availability of secondary industrial units or storage units outside the key commercial centres in Cherwell District namely Kidlington, Bicester and Banbury. It is important that sufficient future supply is provided to the rural market to enable rural diversification and local employment opportunities especially within close proximity to the most sustainable villages which benefit from larger local populations.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 6	Any modification of the percentage requirement of affordable housing within the District would be wholly contingent on viability, which would need to be assessed along with the impact of other standards and contributions sought from new housing within the Local Plan and Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. This viability evidence would need to demonstrate that any policy requirements would not cumulatively have a negative impact on the delivery of much-needed homes. RSL consider that until such standards and viability evidence have been prepared, the current levels of affordable housing within the District on a strategic level have been demonstrated to be deliverable and thus would be an appropriate option to continue.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 8	RSL recognise in line with the NPPG (Paragraph: 002) Local Planning Authorities have the ability to prescribe the optional nationally described space standards (NDSS) to development. This guidance sets out that local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine the need for additional standards within their area, having considered the costs of doing so with reference to its Local Plan viability assessment (Paragraph: 003). At this stage it is not possible to comment on the evidence or prejudge the results of the viability assessment. However, it would be wholly contingent on viability and the deliverability of the standards proposed in conjunction with other contributions and requirements sought.

LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 10	RSL recognise the contribution that Sustainable Design and Construction can make towards Oxfordshire's efforts to achieve net zero carbon. The Government has maintained local planning authority powers to set local energy efficiency standards for new homes granted through the Planning and Energy Act 2008, paragraph 154 b) of the NPPF states that local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards. It has not yet been confirmed what future Building Regulation standards will emerge from national policy as set out in the last White Paper consultation, although this may be available during the Plan's preparation. The direction of travel from National Government is already to progressively set higher levels of energy efficiency standards for new homes through Building Regulations towards the shared goal of net zero. The preferred policy approach set out in the Plan is to define a separate Oxfordshirewide definition of net zero carbon and design, which would exceed standards set nationally. RSL do not have an objection in principle to this approach, however it would be wholly contingent on viability and the deliverability of the standards proposed. Any policy requirement would need to demonstrate that it would not have a negative impact on the delivery of much needed homes and jobs. RSL do not consider that setting further standards through the Oxfordshire Plan is the most suitable option, as the Cherwell Local Plan will be most suited to assess the viability and impact of these standards within its area. RSL either consider Option 3 more appropriate, or Option 2 as, until such standards and viability evidence have been prepared, the Future Homes and Future Building Standards are the most appropriate options to reach the net zero goal.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 13	RSL support the principles behind protecting and enhancing the natural environment within Cherwell. Using a 'natural capital' approach could be used to evaluate the impact of development proposals on the natural and ecological environment through the development management process. We question whether these assessments would duplicate existing application requirements and national policies. National guidance as set out in paragraphs 179 and 180 of the NPPF already seeks to promote net gains through both the local plan and planning application process. The Government are now in the process of legislating Biodiversity Net Gain through the Environment Bill. RSL consider Option 3 is more appropriate.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	RSL support the principles set out in 20-Minute Neighbourhoods which seek to ensure places are well-designed and sustainable, and RSL do not have any objection if these principles are incorporated into the Local Plan. RSL would comment that the 20-Minute Neighbourhood principles must be implemented proportionately. This is especially important when assessing the rural areas which often face a different set of challenges than those within urban areas. A further distinction can be made between larger and smaller villages within the District. The '20 Minute Neighbourhood' (TCPA, 2021) report sets out two different approaches to meet these principles, either through using market towns as a complete and compact 20minute neighbourhood to allow people from nearby villages to travel there, or to create a network of villages that collectively provide what most people need for their daily lives, joined by active travel arrangements. Latter is consistent with NPPF Paragraph 79 which recognises that development in one village may help support services in a separate village nearby. This is relevant to Cherwell District where 31% of the population reside in the rural villages and areas. There is a significant variation in sustainability of different villages in the District and we note this is intended to be reviewed further as part of an update in village categorisation. The most sustainable settlements, such as Category A villages within the current Local Plan, can play an important role in meeting the principles of the 20minute Neighbourhood. These villages can act as hubs for surrounding rural hinterlands, reducing the requirement for residents to travel further afield to Cherwell's market towns to access their daily needs. An example of this is Hook Norton village with a range of services, schools, employment opportunities and social and green infrastructure. Adderbury has access to a range of services and easy access to Banbury which is in close proximity.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Question - Transport & Connectivity	RSL support the Transport Hierarchy. It is important to consider settlement sustainability which will influence the requirement for residents to travel to meet their day to day needs. Recognition needs to be given to changing habits over the plan period, such as the increased trend of homeworking which will have an increasing impact on individual travel patterns. It is important that any approach to assessing connectivity recognises the different circumstances between the rural and urban areas. This is in line with NPPF paragraph 105 which recognises that opportunity to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. RSL consider rather than taking a simplistic view of reducing travel, a more holistic approach to environmental challenges should be taken. This should include the acknowledgement of rapid improvements in low carbon technology (i.e. electric vehicles), increasing opportunities for homeworking and of maintaining and improving services and facilities in rural areas.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 29	Upper Heyford is recognised as a heritage asset of national importance due to its status as the best preserved Cold War airbase in the UK. The existing protections afforded to the airbase include a Conservation Area designation and individual listings. The area is very sensitive to the impact of development, including any potential further development above that which is committed within the existing 2,350 dwelling mixed used commitments and allocation within the Local Plan to 2031. A significant element of this commitment is through permission 18/00825/HYBRID for a 1,175 mixed used scheme, that was approved subject to legal agreements despite an unresolved objection from Historic England due to the required demolition of existing historic structures and cumulative impacts of the proposals. It is unclear whether directing further growth above that which has already been committed could be realised without placing further unacceptable pressure on Upper Heyford and its wider setting. Heyford Park is identified as a potential location for future development in the Oxfordshire Plan across all five options, including supporting the rural communities. RSL would question how effective the role Heyford Park could play in meeting the housing needs of the rural communities would be, both within Cherwell and Oxfordshire. The housing need arising within the rural communities will be spread out across the geographic boundary of the District. Directing a disproportionate level of housing to a single location, even if that location is within the technical definition of the 'rural area' would not support services and amenities within existing villages that are functionally separate to it. Within the existing Local Plan Heyford Park was expected to deliver 30% affordable housing, against a level of 35% within remaining rural areas. If this reduced provision was continued and Heyford Park was used to meet the wider rural housing requirement, then it needs to be recognised that a reduced level of affordable housing would be delivered within the rural areas through the Plan. Option 2 is more appropriate.

LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 30	Option 2 and directing proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet the wider district needs. The Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Spatial Strategy Options chapter does not currently identify a preferred spatial strategy, but instead sets out 5 spatial options which will be explored to deliver 'good' housing and economic growth, along with a wider range of improvements. The supporting text to the spatial strategy chapter recognises that there are no easy options that will deliver all Plan growth in a sustainable manner, and it is anticipated that a mix of the 5 strategies will be required. It is undesirable for the Cherwell Plan to be overreliant on a single spatial direction which could endanger its success. In any event RSL would agree with the supporting text that it is unlikely that any one single option could accommodate the level of growth required to meet the area's economic aspirations and housing needs in full. A disproportionate focus on any single growth option is likely to result in a Plan that is vulnerable to non-delivery and will lack the flexibility to respond to changing circumstances. A balanced approach to the eventual spatial strategy is therefore considered most appropriate and is supported by NPPF Paragraph 68, which states planning policies should set out a sufficient supply and mix of sites. Furthermore, as rural sites are typically smaller and have lower infrastructure requirements, they can support the early delivery of market and affordable housing within the Plan period as well as diversifying the forward supply of housing land to support the existing and any proposed strategic sites within the Plan. An important consideration for choosing the level of development in the rural areas, is what role new development can play in helping to meet current economic, social and environmental needs of existing communities. New development can therefore be an important mechanism in securing new infrastructure such as public open space or biodiversity improvements through onsite provision or via S106 contributions. It is equally important to recognise the contribution new development has in maintaining the viability and of existing services and facilities. It is important to recognise the rural nature of the District which currently constitutes 31% of the population, and the different set of opportunities and challenges these areas face. Many of these rural areas are relatively affluent with high house prices. New developments which include the provision of affordable housing within these more affluent settlements will provide people, such as key workers, existing older residents looking to downsize locally and younger people with links to these communities, opportunities to access affordable housing to meet their needs. Whilst affordability is not an issue isolated to rural communities, it can be improved through receiving proportionally more development which in turn can assist in reducing current inequalities in access to housing. This unmet need can be seen in the latest District Housing Register figures which has been broken down to individual villages within the Parish Information Sheets. For example, there are currently 1,680 active applications on the Housing Register, of these 259 have indicated a preference for Adderbury and 106 in Hook Norton villages. This need is unlikely to be met if a restrictive approach is taken that limits development in rural areas. The allocation and delivery of open market schemes will not only help reduce the number of individuals who have to rely on the housing register to access properties, but also subsidises the delivery of onsite affordable homes delivered as part of S106 agreements.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 31	NDP's can play an important role in identifying, shaping and bringing forward preferred locations for growth. It should however, be recognised that it will not always be the case that local communities wish to take on the role of allocating sites through NDP's. The process can often be long, potentially controversial locally and individual communities may not always have the resources to prepare NDP's in a timely fashion. Option 3 is most appropriate.
LPR-B-615	Rosconn Strategic Land	Option 32	Any review of village categorisation takes into account the likely changing preferences and lifestyles over the plan period. The way people live today will not be the same in a post COVID19 environment, nor be the same at the end of the Plan period of 2040. As such in respect to the weighting of certain services and facilities, RSL consider services which are typically enduring and socially important should be weighted higher. Primary schools are examples of this, as they act as important social hubs of the local community, and due to their nature, a large number of daily trips are centred around them. Additional weighting should also be given to village shops, as those which have been retained have often, or have the ability to, diversify and take on a multifunctional role through providing additional services such as post offices and/or certain bank facilities to serve the local communities and retain their viability. A holistic approach should be considered within the settlement hierarchy, other characteristics such as the existing population should also be taken into consideration. Not only does population act as a strong indicator to the level of services and facilities which will remain viable, but it also serves as a useful indicator of the ability of the settlement to absorb further growth in a sustainable manner. When considering the weight attributed to accessibility of settlements to the urban centre, additional weighting should be given to public transport. It is unlikely that more than a handful of rural settlements will be within practical walking distance of the urban centres, whilst movement through cycling will be more influenced by a range of factors including distance, topography, weather etc. Additional weighting should be attributed to public transport such as regular hourly bus services. Such frequent services can provide realistic and sustainable access to the urban centres, along with the significant level of amenities that are located within them and can be assessed on a more consistent basis between settlements. Settlements such as Hook Norton which has an hourly bus service to Banbury within 30 minutes and Chipping Norton in just over 20 minutes, and Adderbury which similarly has an hourly service that can reach the centre of Banbury in approximately 20 minutes, whilst also reaching Oxford City Centre in approximately 1 hour; provide realistic and attractive alternatives to using private cars. Any methodology to be subject to a consultation to provide an opportunity to test the robustness of the chosen hierarchy and outcomes it gives, before it is then used to direct growth.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 6	The rate of affordable housing provision of residential developments of 10 or more dwellings should be based upon and justified by, evidenced affordable housing need across the District. PPG highlights those policies must be justified and informed by evidenced collected by the Council and is clear that policy makers should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area by identifying housing needs of specific groups. PPG is clear that strategic policy-making authorities should ascertain the need for affordable housing by assessing past trends and current estimates before providing a list of issues and factors which should be considered. The questions posed in option 6 cannot be answered without comprehensive evidence and information identifying the affordable need alongside viability assessments demonstrating that proposed policy requirements are deliverable.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 7	The options forwarded in relation to affordable housing tenure cannot be answered without comprehensive evidence demonstrating what the need is across Cherwell.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 8	The most appropriate mechanism to deliver good housing quality and deliver appropriate space standards is the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS). In this regard, Gladman consider that Option 8(2) would be the most appropriate policy requirement

LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 9	The most appropriate mechanism to ensure housing accessibility is through the relevant building standards. Notwithstanding this, if the Council were to introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of homes on new developments they must be justified through clearly evidenced needs considering the standards set out in national policy alongside considering the proposed requirements through a viability assessment.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 10	The most appropriate mechanism to ensure housing accessibility is through the relevant building standards. Notwithstanding this, if the Council were to introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of homes on new developments they must be justified through clearly evidenced needs considering the standards set out in national policy alongside considering the proposed requirements through a viability assessment.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Question - Green Belt	Paragraph 141 of the Framework highlights that exceptional circumstances must exist to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries with the strategic authority demonstrating that they have fully examined all options for meeting identified development need before concluding Green Belt release is needed. Paragraph 143 highlighted that when defining Green Belt boundaries, Councils should ensure consistency with the Local Plan spatial strategy for meeting sustainable development need. Therefore, the Council should consider whether the release of Green Belt land to cater for new development growth would promote sustainable development to meet needs where they arise. In this instance, the approach taken in the recently adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan which removed land from the Green Belt adjacent Oxford City to meet a proportion of Oxford City's unmet housing need, to meet need closely related to where it arises.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 12	A flexible approach should be applied where biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures cannot be achieved on site to ensure that the most appropriate response is delivered. Indeed, the most appropriate mechanism is likely to differ on a site by site basis and the council should not restrict the policy response to one option.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Kidlington	Kidlington is an area which features across the spatial options within the Oxfordshire Plan. This would likely to result in the need to release land from the Green Belt. Gladman's comments in section 4.6 of this representation are reiterated in that the Council must fully examined all options for meeting identified development need before concluding Green Belt release is needed. However, consideration must be given to the most sustainable spatial strategy for delivering new development within the Local Plan. If the evidence base proposes that Kidlington is a key sustainable location for development then the site allocation and green belt assessments must account for this, spatial strategies should not be driven by the need to avoid Green Belt release.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 31	The Council should not defer the allocation of rural housing sites to the neighbourhood planning process and instead look to ensure certainty in delivering identified needs through allocating specific development sites in the Local Plan. The emerging Local Plan should provide a minimum housing requirement figure or indicative growth figure for neighbourhood areas.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Option 32	The current sustainability and connectivity should be acknowledged in the development of a settlement hierarchy and allocation of new development growth, the Council must consider how new development can help to sustain the vitality and sustainability of settlements. This may include ensure balanced demographic profiles in rural settlements and enabling younger people to continue to live or move to rural settlements alongside supporting current services and facilities. CPRE highlight that unaffordability, poor transport links and connectivity are significant reasons as to why many younger people do not and cannot live in rural settlements and town fringes <sup>10</sup> . Directing new residential growth at appropriate scales to these settlements may counteract such issues retaining the younger population and safeguarding future vitality and sustainability of these settlements and their services and facilities. Gladman highlight Arncott as a location which should be considered for future development to support the future sustainability of the settlement and take advantage of the employment opportunities which exist at the logistics, freight and distribution interchange at Arncott, alongside other facilities.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Gladman do not consider the use of settlement boundaries the most appropriate tool if these preclude otherwise sustainable developments from coming forward to bolster the supply of housing. The Framework is clear that sustainable development should proceed without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The use of settlement limits is likely to arbitrarily restrict such development from coming forward and this does not accord with the positive approach to growth required. Gladman therefore object to the use of settlement boundaries if these preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward; a positive approach is required to bolster the supply of housing as required by the Framework.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Question - Development Management Policies	Any policy requirement must be fully justified through evidence demonstrating identified need that is met by the policy provision.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Tadmarton Road, Bloxham A	Land off Tadmarton Road, Bloxham A is promoted for housing.

LPR-B-616	Gladman	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Tadmarton Road, Bloxham B	Land off Tadmarton Road, Bloxham B is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-616	Gladman	Call for Sites Promotion - Gladman land interests in Arccott	Gladman propose several of their land interests in Arccott for housing. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-617	Clare O'Hara	Option 30	Development must meet wider district needs and not be unsustainable or at the expense of local needs. As a resident of Adderbury, I am concerned that the 12 sites and over 100 hectares that have been proposed for development would be impossible for the local area to sustain. Adderbury is a small village- one small shop, one recently opened cafe, a hairdresser and pubs are the sole village amenities and there are no further commercial sites available to expand the centre. Unlike the surrounding villages, Adderbury does not have a doctor, dentist and a parade of shops to support villagers. Further development is unsustainable as it would not only harm the local character and landscape but place unsustainable pressure on very limited infrastructure and create unsustainable congestion when a large residential population need to travel by car to the surrounding villages or Banbury to access basic amenities. Where proposed development does not meet a local need, and would create long term sustainability problems we cannot proceed, but must seek sites where wider district needs can be met without creating unsustainable future issues.
LPR-B-617	Clare O'Hara	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	I am keen to see Neighbourhood Plans taken into consideration, and local parish knowledge made use of.
LPR-B-618	Acorus for Philip Hazell	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the north of Inkerman Farm	Land to the north of Inkerman Farm, Souldern is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-618	Anne Brooks	Sustainability Appraisal	The interim sustainability report is clear on its main conclusions that I would concur with The need for alternatives plans to be considered. The need for more work on air quality impact and health The impact on travel The impact on water waste and in particular flood risk which I am particularly concerned about as we are already subject to wide scale periodic flooding which impacts travel and also the difficulty of flood mitigation to older properties within the flood plain areas of Islip. The need for maintaining green areas
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 1	Cherwell cannot be considered separate to Oxford city, and without considering the full impact of flooding and waste issues on lthe entire flow of water through the county, local rivers, flood management in conservation housing areas and further development within Oxford city
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 3	A combination of all the above.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes. Have to consider needs of changing age demographic when considering accessibility.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Housing Policies	Policy in relation to sustainable materials.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Separation Distances	Wide paths provided for pedestrians and cyclists.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Training of builders etc, making all new developments in an are put decent percentage of profits and manpower towards retrofitting.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Needs to be creative, not just solar farms.



LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Policies on climate change have to be integrated. Flood risk still major issue for low lying county and air quality in an area with major trunk roads and transport links. Changes to what home owners can do in conservation areas to be more sustainable and help for low income families with double glazing etc.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Green Belt	Accessibility and equality of provision eg in large areas of social housing. Changing use re types of activity eg swimming, running, cycling.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Local Green Spaces	East and South of Islip and river ray
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Low level, mixed age and needs neighbourhoods with local services.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - 20-Minute neighbourhoods	20 minute neighbourhoods is urban areas and even in rural areas but to a lesser degree, not all amenities/shops in the area.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Must look at flow and impact in all of area not just small local areas. Must improve A34 as a priority if proposed new developments are to be workable. More public transport options and safer bike routes or mixed walk/ car/ ride safe options in rural areas. Lower prices on electric vehicles and safer bike would encourage to drive less. routes
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Transport Policies	Transport policies must consider data from police and emergency services and total number of hours in a working year spent in traffic jams by average worker. Must involve schools and university and hospitals as major road users. Should offer incentives for more rail freight and lorries using roads put of peak commuting times.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	All developers who make proposals must be asked to contribute to infrastructure. Government funding pledges sought for major infrastructure changes. Must consider impact on air quality and flooding.
LPR-B-619	Anne Brooks	Question - Development Management Policies	Where local people know traffic flows, land use past and present and flooding patterns. Flooding of river Ray makes church commissioners proposals for Islip untenable and. It will affect all housing in current conservation area and infrastructure as extent of flooding has not been considered properly or fully.
LPR-B-620	Daniel Hill	Question - Local Green Spaces	Greenfield land surrounding Nethercote, Banbury is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-621	Geoff Scamans	Question - Local Green Spaces	Land to the north of Cropredy and south of Cropredy Marina, Cropredy is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-622	Mark and Susan Gammond	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Crowmarsh Farm, Bicester Road, Bucknell	Land at Crowmarsh Farm, Bicester Road, Bucknell is promoted for mixed development.
LPR-B-623	Yvonne Dixon	Question - Local Green Spaces	Langford Community Orchard, off Dunlin Court, Bicester and Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site, Gavray Drive, Bicester are proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-624	WildlifeneWSgavray meadows	Question - Local Green Spaces	Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site, Gavray Drive, Bicester is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-625	Patricia Clissold	LPR-A-204	Community Action Group Grassroots Bicester set up the Langford Community Orchard Group (LCOG) in 2011 to take on the orchard project. In August 2012, it was given permission by Bicester Town Council (BTC) to manage the site with ongoing reviews. Site is in the midst of Bicester and next to Claypits Allotments. Every one residing in Langford can walk to the Orchard easily. It is bike and wheelchair accessible from a tarmac footpath, 129/5/10. It is very popular with all locals and is valuable greenspace for recreation and meeting people. Site provides free fruit such as apples, pears, raspberries, blackberries and rhubarb.

LPR-B-626	Dean Cox	LPR-A-175	Object. The proposal is totally disproportionate and unsympathetic to both the village itself and the surrounding rural area. The development would be wholly inappropriate for the Conservation Village of Wardington. These fields jut out from the existing village boundary into the open farmland of the Cherwell valley. Such development would dramatically change the character of this historic village. It would also be visible from across the valley including the Registered Historic Battlefield of Cropredy Bridge, adversely impacting on the surrounding countryside. The proposal is unsustainable: Wardington does not have services or facilities to support anything other than minor development or infill within the existing village boundary. As a satellite village Wardington is, and remains, an unsuitable candidate to accommodate district local development needs
LPR-B-626	Dean Cox	LPR-A-034	Object. Whilst I appreciate there may be a need for some further development around Banbury for such purposes, I believe the District Council should think long and hard about allowing further expansion on greenfield sites to the east of the M40 and now also to the east of the A361. I feel development should not jump over those natural boundaries particularly this could set a dangerous precedent for further continued growth of Banbury into open countryside to the east of the M40 in future years.
LPR-B-627	Neil and Jane Earl	LPR-A-175	Object. Development would be completely out of scale compared to the size of the current village. This will cause a huge amount of extra traffic on narrow country roads. The nearest doctor's surgery is in Cropredy and they could not take on the extra number of patients. There are a lack of services in the village, no school, no shop. I moved to Wardington two and a half years ago with my Mum to be closer to my sister and her family who live just up the road in the village. The state of the road from the A361 into the village past the garden centre and antiques shop is very poor, very narrow and although some potholes have been filled the whole road needs to be resurfaced. The road is also very uneven and when using the road there is insufficient space for two vehicles to pass. This road as it is currently could not cope with any extra traffic. Wardington is a conservation village and extra housing which would destroy the character of the village (map of village submitted).
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 2	The Motor Fuel Group Ltd own the Banbury Oil Depot. The site is located within the strategic allocation Planning Policy BAN1 Canalside of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 2 2011 2031 (Adopted July 2015). The site is subject of an outline planning application. This redevelopment opportunity could achieve a significant provision for residential accommodation in the town centre. This representation is associated with the promotion of this site. The 'health' of Town Centres and Town Centre population is intertwined. This needs to be reflected in both plan and policy making. KO7 - Add after last sentence - <i>Acknowledge the importance of residential led mixed-use developments in town centre developments as a regeneration tool</i> . KO23 does not go far enough. The following additional KO is requested. <i>As a means to facilitate town centre regeneration, focus development on brownfield Town Centre sites, and acknowledge the importance of residential led mixed-use developments in Town Centre developments as a regeneration tool.</i>
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. As the Country comes out of the pandemic, the planning system, now more than ever, needs to grasp the changing role of the town centre and the implications for plan and policy making. To ensure the viability of town centres, it is essential that planning policy moves away from the outdated approach of protecting retail use within town centre. It is essential that residential and community uses should be encouraged in town centres. Residential uses are particularly important in generating and maintaining the night time economy. Regeneration and the 'health' of town centres can no longer be maintained and improved by focusing on the retail function of Town Centre alone. This approach is supported in the 'High Streets and Town Centres in 2030'. A fundamental change is required to the focus on the retail function of town centres, and requires intervention by local authorities on planning policies and the rebalancing of planning decisions in order to respond to the structural economic changes required to assist the survival of viable town centres. The Committee considers at paragraph 98, that 'planning is crucial to high street and town centre transformation'.
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	The Council's Town Centre and Retail Study (TCRS) concluded that there are a number of areas within the town centre that needs regeneration and that these areas should be brought forward in a holistic manner. The allocation site, Canalside, is included within the areas that need regeneration. The TCRS states that even though the retail offer has grown in Banbury over the last 10 years, the focus has been on largely unremarkable mass-market brands that typifies the archetypal 'clone' town. With changing consumer habits, the purchasing on-line, and the more popular out of centre shopping centres, many of the Town Centre shops are failing and facing huge viability challenges. The TCRS has identified 6 sites that represent key regeneration opportunities. Site 1 – Canalside (BAN1 Strategic allocation) is included in this list. The TCRS further describes the site and confirms its suitability for residential development. Town Centre policy should acknowledge the role that residential development can play in regeneration. Planning policy should encourage residential development on Brownfield sites within Town Centres. The Local Plan should allocate Town Centre sites that are suitable for residential mixed-use development, that will assist in Town Centre regeneration. In line with government direction, to ensure the most effective use of land through housing densities, there must be scope for tall buildings in appropriate town centre and other locations, such as transport hubs, around bus and train stations. Development plans should define what would constitute a tall building, this may simply be a building that is taller than those around it. Suggested planning tall buildings policy wording – (wording taken from National Design Guide 2021) 'As a means to facilitate town centre regeneration, residential development on Brownfield Town Centre sites will be supported. In appropriate locations, well designed tall buildings can play a positive urban design role in the built form, and can act as landmarks, making a positive contribution to views, as well as increasing housing density'. The focus on the protection of retail use over residential use does not reflect the changing character of town centres and the need, for the role of town centres to change as included in the 'High Streets and Town Centres in 2030' reports (2019 Governments Report). Banbury 7 policy needs amending to reflect the changes to the Use Class that cover Use Class E. Use Class E covers, as well as retail, financial and professional services, indoor sports and recreation use, medical or health services, creche or day nursery, other uses that can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to residential amenity; offices, research and development, and industrial processes.
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)

LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?.
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Question - Separation Distances	Separation distances this could compromise the design process and the effective use of land. Embedded effective design elements can mitigate amenity issues such as, massing, overlooking and privacy.
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 14	Seek opportunities to integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.. Planning policies that set the requirement of developments to provide public open space, including play areas, within settlements such as Banbury, should differentiate between those developments on the edge of the settlements and those, often on brownfield sites, within the town centre. Brownfield sites within town centres and brownfield regeneration sites are the most locationally sustainable in terms of access by sustainable modes of travel, walking and cycling to everyday facilities and employment. Town centres and brownfield sites, particularly, apartment developments will normally have access to private outside space in the form of a balcony. The town centre location will mean that such sites will probably have access to the wider network of green spaces within the town. The proposed residential led development of the Banbury Oil Depot, as well as each apartment having private outside space in terms of balconies, as well as the river side walk and an area of green space, is within walking and cycling distance of the following public open spaces; Bankside Country Park (8minute walk, 2 minute cycle), Bridge Street Park (5 minute walk, 1 minute cycle), and Spiceball Country Park (12 minute walk, 3 minute cycle). Development within town centres and Brownfield regeneration sites, where it is least likely to attract families, should have lower open space and play area standards, to reflect 'urban living'. This would facilitate the more efficient use of land and maximise the developable area and housing delivery in these sustainable locations. Offsites contributions could be used to improve existing open space network, to mitigate for a lower open space provision.
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes, only in the urban areas of Banbury and Bicester.
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 18	There should be a separate planning policy prioritises development on brownfield sites in Town Centre location, such as the redevelopment of the Banbury Oil Depot.
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. As the Country comes out of the pandemic, the planning system, now more than ever, needs to grasp the changing role of the Town Centre and the implications for plan and policy making. The Committee considers that high streets and town centres will experience 'largescale structural change' which will require intervention by local authorities. Intervention will by necessity include adjustment to planning policies and the rebalancing of planning decisions in order to respond to the structural economic change to town centres. The Committee considers (98) that 'planning is crucial to high street and town centre transformation'. Planning policy must move away from the outdated approach of protecting retail use within Town Centre. Regeneration and the 'health' of Town Centres can no longer be maintained and improved by focusing on the retail function of Town Centre.

LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area.. The TCRS goes on to explain the significance that the redevelopment of the strategic allocation BAN1 could make to the regeneration of Banbury Town Centres. The development of the Banbury Oil Depot is a critical site within the allocation, as it will facilitate improved connectivity between the town centre and the railway station. Site 1 Banbury Canalside -The site comprises a substantial area, extending to approximately 25.9 ha between Banbury Town Centre and Banbury Railway Station. Most of the site is currently dominated by the Tramway Industrial Estate, as well as a pay to visit surface level car park. The area is allocated for the delivery of new homes, retail, office and leisure uses, as well as new footbridges over the railway line, river and canal, and multistorey car parks to helping to improve access to the town's railway station. The retail and other main town centre uses are directed towards the northern part of the site. It should be noted that the eastern part of that site benefits from outline planning permission for a residential scheme (18/00293/OUT). Overall, we support the delivery of residential uses on this site; and the delivery of improved connectivity between the railway station and the town centre is strongly encouraged. We would, however, heavily caution against any significant further retail expansion in this location (including the northern part of the site). It is noted that given the scale of this site and the extent of new housing it is likely to result in the need for increased community uses such as primary care services and potentially additional education provision. The sustainable location, in terms of access to the town centre, leisure facilities and employment sites further justifies the allocation of the Banbury Oil Depot as a Brownfield site and the wider Canalside allocation
LPR-B-628	Framptons for Motor Fuel Group	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Prioritising residential development on brownfield site development in town centres.
LPR-B-629	Alexandra Stapley	LPR-A-104	Object. The area is home to deer and foxes along with abundant bird life, particularly geese from the nearby lake. The land is prone to flooding and more houses would exacerbate this. Also light and air pollution due to increased road journeys. Clifton is a small community with just a pub, it simply does not have the infrastructure to support a large number of extra dwellings. There is a narrow bridleway leading to the site, this is part of a dedicated walking track (The Clifton Loop part of the Deddington Circular Walk).
LPR-B-630	Nexus Planning for Lone Star Land	Option 1	Option 1 is to focus growth at the main urban centres in the District of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. This would concentrate development around already sustainable transport nodes, would strengthen the existing role of settlements and locate new homes alongside existing and future employment opportunities. These settlements are not all equal. as Kidlington is wholly constrained by being surrounding by Green Belt (as well as surrounded by areas at higher risk of flooding and sensitive ecological sites), 'exceptional circumstances' would be needed to remove land from the Green Belt (in accordance with NPPF), which must show there are no other reasonable options available for meeting the need for development. Given that only a relatively small area of Cherwell District lies in the Green Belt (approximately 13.8%), which excludes areas surrounding the largest settlements of Banbury and Bicester, it is uncertain what a justified case of 'exceptional circumstances' would be. Indeed the Cherwell Green Belt Study provides an assessment of harm to the Green Belt for the release of sites and parcels of land around surrounding Kidlington, where all but two would have a moderate or high level of harm. The potential for future growth at Kidlington is therefore considered very limited. Banbury is also greatly constrained for additional employment development. The current Local Plan details Banbury's landscape sensitivity and that the town "is severely stretched with considerable infrastructure challenges to resolve". Given Bicester's Garden Town status and fewer constraints than Kidlington and Banbury for employment development, it must be preferred as the continued location for the greatest amount of growth in the District. This is recognised by the Oxon Plan's Regulation 18 (Part 2) consultation which suggests Bicester be included in a new higher tier of settlement ('bigger towns').
LPR-B-630	Nexus Planning for Lone Star Land	Option 2	The Consultation shows Bicester to be dissected by three sustainable transport corridors – the A41 as it connects to the M40 motorway and Oxford (via A34), the railway line with regular services between London Marylebone and Birmingham, and rail connections from Bicester Village to Oxford. This accessibility is enhanced further with bus routes NS5 and S5 Gold with a 15 minute service between Bicester town centre, along the A41 (passing the Site with bus stops within walking distance at the park & ride facility), and Oxford. Unlike any other location in Cherwell, Bicester will be on the new East West Rail connection between Oxford and Milton Keynes and ultimately Cambridge. As a sustainable transport interchange, Bicester is unrivalled within the District – thus major employment growth to the south of Bicester (including the Site), on the A41 corridor and accessible to the park & ride, which would reinforce the strengths of the town's current and improving transport infrastructure, should continue.
LPR-B-630	Nexus Planning for Lone Star Land	Option 3	NPPF encourages as much use as possible of previously developed land, this must be in the context of other objectives of sustainable development. These include that significant development should be focussed on locations (such as the Site) that limit the need to travel and offer a genuine choice of transport modes (NPPF paragraph 105), with benefits being to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. To locate significant development in on sites simply because they have been previously developed, without proper regard to delivering a sustainable transport strategy or other sustainable objectives, would not be an appropriate or justified approach to for the emerging Local Plan to take.

LPR-B-630	Nexus Planning for Lone Star Land	Option 4	The need to support the vitality of rural areas and their communities through some development is recognised, but these inherently are often the least sustainable locations across Cherwell with limited public transport and poor accessibility to local services/facilities. Whilst some employment growth to support this option may come forwards, this should be very limited and not disproportionate to the more sustainable spatial approaches of focussing development around existing main urban areas and transport interchanges. An important scenario overlooked by the Consultation, but one included in the last Oxon Plan consultation, is the importance of strengthening existing successful business locations. Indeed, Bicester is considered by the Oxon Plan to be a 'key business location' that plays an important role in Oxfordshire's 'innovation ecosystem'. The town also anchors the northern end of the 'knowledge spine' and through its Garden Town status provides very significant opportunities to help realise the ambition of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. This is a role the Council is committed to, seeking to attract more high-tech, knowledge-based industries to Bicester, through ensuring there is sufficient employment land to meet their locational requirements. The principle of locating employment growth at Bicester, as an existing business location, to build on its economic strengths and opportunities, should continue as a justified and sound approach to development. In order for additional employment land to be suitably responsive to the evolving needs of businesses, the allocation of employment land should provide for a broad and flexible range of employment generating uses.
LPR-B-630	Nexus Planning for Lone Star Land	Question - Supporting Employment	The emerging Local Plan will need to be consistent with the Oxford-Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework as that will continue to progress and gain weight. Thus the opportunity for growth and future development at Bicester must be seen in this wider context, beyond just the confines of the District. Such a constraint to economic growth should be addressed: the Framework requires planning policies to create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt, to support economic growth and productivity. The Government's vision for the OxfordCambridge Arc is aligned to the Framework (as it must be): to make the most of the Arc's economic potential by planning for growth to make the Arc an even more attractive place to live, work and do business. The Oxford-Cambridge Arc is defined as a 'national economic priority area' by Government, with the potential to be one of the most prosperous, innovative and sustainable economic areas in the world. To enable the County's economic performance to continue, the Council's new Local Plan should support the Oxon Plan in delivering at least sufficient homes to support the OGNA's 'Business as Usual' economic trajectory, if not the 'Transformational' scenario if the ambition of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc is to be achieved. As housing supply should follow this prosperity led trajectory of economic growth (as well as to deal with chronic issues of affordability), so should the provision and amount of employment land that is needed. In Oxfordshire, much economic activity is centred on its science and business parks, but the OGNA identifies many of these to be at capacity, as well as a there being a strong market for other industrial space. Using labour demand figures and past completions on at least a 'Business as Usual' trajectory (so to not constrain or limit economic growth consistent with national policy), the OGNA is clear that a very significant amount of additional employment land is needed of up to 807 hectares. This is so to meet the challenges of a growing population and ensure that across Oxfordshire standards of prosperity and wellbeing continue to improve with greater reach across its communities. Greater assessment is needed to understand whether allocated sites within the Economic Needs Assessment are still deliverable and/or whether they are now better suited for other uses (such as housing) if development on them is still preferred. Such sites to be considered further should include 'South East Bicester', with 40ha of employment land that so far has not come forward, which may be because of its poorer accessibility to the strategic highway network.
LPR-B-631	Nexus Planning for Lone Star Land	Option 23	Bicester is identified by the Consultation to be one of the fastest growing places in Oxfordshire, with the significant housing and employment growth over the last 20 years set to continue. Where significant additional employment land across Cherwell is needed, it is clear that Bicester is the most sustainable location for that. In terms of where at Bicester is most appropriate, it is land to the south of the town (including the Site) that should be preferred. The existing context of how employment has expanded southwards along the A41 (as far as the Alchester Scheduled Monument that limits further development to the east of the A41), then identify the Site to the west of the A41 (as the next parcel of land) that is unconstrained by the Scheduled Monument. The site is located adjacent to the A41, able to provide direct access onto the strategic road network. The sensitive setting of Chesterton Conservation Area and Grade II listed Chesterton Lodge (and other listed buildings) to the north is recognised. Distance of separation, reinforcement of the already strong treed screen along the Site's northern boundary, and new planting closest to the built form. Together this approach would ensure the character, heritage and setting of Chesterton is preserved. The landscape buffer would also provide a substantial area of new public open space and habitat for wildlife, with opportunities for recreation, sport and biodiversity to secure health, amenity and wellbeing benefits for local residents and future employees. The open space would connect Chesterton Recreation Space and public footpaths through the Site to the parkland south of Vendee Drive, providing a far wider/more extensive network of green infrastructure. Within the Site, the Illustrative Framework Masterplan addresses the Grade II listed bridge that crosses the Gagle Brook. As well as protecting its physical structure, its setting would be maintained by incorporating it within a network of walking/cycling routes across the Site. Site's location is demonstrated to be where major employment growth at Bicester is most sustainable; and whilst assessment work for how such development could come forward is currently high level, it shows how sensitive constraints can be addressed and significant benefits delivered(masterplans and layouts submitted). A coherent location to expand the network of key employment areas from Oxford along major transport corridors. Able to help address areas of deprivation within Bicester, providing a broader range of employment opportunities within reach.
LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Crockwell House Farm, Great Bourton	Land at Crockwell House Farm, Great Bourton is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 1	Option 5 would seek to address existing issues of isolation and rural deprivation by redirecting growth away from main settlements to where it could best address such inequalities; this approach is being taken in the current South Oxfordshire Plan with the Berinsfield Garden Village. It is likely that as farming practices continues to evolve, in response to climate change and policy changes around environmental stewardship, the process of farm diversification will lead to new innovations in the rural economy that will themselves support limited residential growth in rural areas.

LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 1	<p>Generally supportive of the draft vision and agree with its ambition at points 1) and 2) to meet climate action targets and ensure energy production is sustainable whilst delivering new, high energy efficient developments. The team considers these aims can be achieved through the delivery of future development within rural areas, where buildings can be built to the highest standards and incorporate energy efficient measures. Supportive of point 3) of the vision: "Neighbourhoods are sustainable, and well-functioning responding positively to their local social and natural context and seek to address the challenges of our growing and ageing communities." With regard to this, it is acknowledged at paragraph 6.68 of the consultation paper that the existing village classification system used in the adopted local plan has led to some villages losing key services and facilities. This is supported by the HIA, stating that many rural areas do not contain key services and facilities to support their existing communities, and concludes that the emerging local plan should support those living in rural areas and provide improved access to employment, healthcare, greenspace, recreation, arts and culture which could provide health benefits. Supporting the growth of rural areas is needed for point 3) of the vision to succeed, so long as that growth is planned sustainably and is reflective of existing built form. By supporting rural growth and affording growth within Category B Satellite Villages both services and facilities can be improved, reducing the need to travel and supporting the vitality of settlements. Point 14 of the vision states: "Our rural communities are realising their full potential making the most of new technologies, supported by small business growth and transport services more responsive to their needs. New rural models of transport and service provision complement existing services for a more sustainable and wellconnected (including digital) rural living. Our villages are places where communities thrive, as well as benefitting from being well connected to our towns, and major employment and service centres." It is encouraging to see this forms part of the Council's draft vision, which in turn could help rural communities reach their full potential in order to be sustainable neighbourhoods. Great Bourton is very well connected to Banbury and is accessible by an 11minute bus journey. Access to this service is limited. If the spatial strategy is limited in terms of how much growth can be attributed toward rural areas, then those settlements will become unsustainable, resulting in less services and facilities. It is paramount that the final vision supports a level of sustainable rural growth, which would lead to these areas having greater access to key services and facilities and be better connected to towns, and major employment and service centres. Cherwell's rural areas represent nearly a third (31%) of the District's population. There are over 90 villages and hamlets set in their surrounding landscapes. Neglecting the rural areas in the emerging strategy will simply cause stagnation and hinder a large proportion of the District population.</p>
LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 2	<p>KO1 - supports this key objective and believes there is sufficient land in rural areas to help meet it. Overall, notwithstanding the steady decline in growth of rural areas currently being received, should Neighbourhood Plans not deliver the need for housing in rural communities, it is clear that the sustainability of rural villages is likely to worsen over the next 15 years. It is common that villages have a tendency to have older people, a growing affordability gap between local incomes and house prices and can lack certain housing types/ tenures especially smaller market and affordable homes. These issues can be addressed by the emerging Local Plan. KO4 - supports as this would help support the growth of development within rural areas by becoming digitally connected with the wider area, creating a sense of community, and reducing their reliability on services that would otherwise be found outside the bounds of rural settlements. This enhances the selfsufficiency of rural areas, whilst reducing the rate of unsustainable travel and the output of carbon emissions. Rural exception sites providing affordable housing for local people can be difficult to deliver within rural areas due to the unavailability and high 'hope' values of suitable land. Well planned and appropriate development could increase housing choice, including affordable housing and shared ownership homes and increase support for key local services and facilities. There is no adopted policy that aims to achieve coverage of superfast broadband. A policy should be proposed within the emerging strategy that helps increase the connectivity of the District and in particular the 'Rural Area'. Local Plan Review can utilise the benefits of widespread connectivity by factoring in the services that are now available to settlement within the rural area. KO5 - supports and considers the delivery of sustainable rural developments can help achieve this, which in turn would ensure those settlements become more self-sufficient, increasing their vitality. This objective acknowledges support for local food production. There is opportunity for the growth of rural areas to enhance local food productivity, which would not only help grow and enhance the rural economy but would also create less reliance on the private vehicle which again contributes toward a reduction in carbon emissions, helping meet the net zero carbon agenda. KO10 - supports and welcomes the opportunity for new developments in rural areas to meet sustainable construction standards to support carbon neutrality. KO11 - delivery of rural development would support this objective by allowing settlements to become more selfsufficient, therefore reducing the rate of commuting and the output of carbon emissions. KO16 - delivery of rural growth would help meet this objective insofar that as with the growth of these areas, their level of sustainability increases, allowing them to become more selfsufficient and increase the vitality of services and facilities locally. This ties in with key objective 5, which seeks to support local food production. If rural settlements become more sustainable, then this will reduce the need for residents to commute to access their everyday needs, reducing the reliance of the private vehicle and carbon emission output. The lack of public transport options, particularly in the rural areas, was a reoccurring theme. It is encouraging to see that the evidence based provided outlines the struggles rural communities have in terms of active travel and highway standards. Great Bourton does require further development to reduce the need for private car and improve the provision for public services. Allowing sustainable growth that is proportionate to the size of settlements in these areas will help facilitate and secure their sustainability in the future, reducing the need to travel to other more urban areas for travel. It will also enable the Category B villages to be able to support other settlements nearby.</p>

LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 16	The team believes that providing a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing) would be transformational and innovative, helping best deliver the aims of this option by requiring all developments to at least consider connecting digitally to the wider area. This would particularly be advantageous for rural areas insofar that it would allow persons to work from home easily, an increasingly popular trend since COVID1. Moreover, becoming digitally connected enhances social cohesion and is environmentally beneficial, reducing the reliance on the private vehicle to access the 'everyday' needs. It is encouraging to see that the Council is focussing on addressing the issues of climate change in a pragmatic manner. Greater connectivity will discourage travelling and making otherwise unnecessary journeys. The Local Plan should maximise the opportunities for digital connections to access key services and facilities, In adopting a more considerate approach towards the role of rural settlements, the Local Plan will play a longstanding role towards addressing the issues of climate change helping to achieve a carbon neutral and resilient future for the whole District.
LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 19	It is welcoming that point 3) considers focusing development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury/Bicester. This provides greater flexibility in allowing other settlements "well connected" to these towns to grow. Only concern relates specifically to the words "well connected" to Banbury or Bicester, as this insinuates that infrastructure provision is being considered in situ, without considering how villages may fair during the lifetime of the plan.
LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 22	It is welcoming that point 3) considers focusing development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury/Bicester. This provides greater flexibility in allowing other settlements "well connected" to these towns to grow. Only concern relates specifically to the words "well connected" to Banbury or Bicester, as this insinuates that infrastructure provision is being considered in situ, without considering how villages may fair during the lifetime of the plan.
LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 30	The team posit that point 2) would provide greater flexibility for proposals to come forward that could help raise the economic prospects and vitality within a settlement, which in turn will help increase the sustainability of those settlements, allowing them to become self-sufficient whilst helping to tackle climate change. Point 2) ties in with the transformational change in which the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 proposes to help meet a higher housing need over the emerging plan period. Rural areas would be able to accommodate a certain amount of growth to help achieve this higher housing need number, helping remove barriers of affordability and sustainability.Paragraph 6.6.6 of the consultation document considers that since the adoption of the Local Plan, the rural housing need requirement has been met. It is clear from the Council's lack of 5-year housing land supply that further housing needs to be delivered within the emerging local plan period. Conclusions of the HIA and SA are clear that the level of growth in rural areas has not improved its sustainability, and more should be done to ensure vitality of these settlements are secured in perpetuity. Allocating small-scale growth that is proportionate to the settlement size results in those settlements (and others in close proximity) becoming more self-sufficient, which in turns creates considerable economic social and environmental benefits as described above. Great Bourton is recognised as a Category B village in the current Cherwell Local plan. 'Category B' villages are considered to be satellite villages that are associated with larger service centres. Increasing development in these villages would help to support the role of service villages.
LPR-B-631	Ridge and Partners for March Projects	Option 31	Our preference that a combination of the first two points listed is pursued, otherwise. It is clear from the Oxfordshire 2050 consultation that OCC would prefer to adopt a transformational trajectory for projected housing need, in order to achieve transformational change. This would provide the optimum amount of development including 152,790 homes to enable transformational infrastructure throughout the plan's lifetime and beyond. The client team are generally supportive of the transformational approach as it will enable rural villages to be more self-sustaining through growth and connectivity.Paragraph 6.6.6 of the consultation document considers that since the adoption of the Local Plan, the rural housing need requirement has been met. However, it is clear from the Council's lack of 5-year housing land supply that further housing needs to be delivered within the emerging local plan period. Conclusions of the HIA and SA are clear that the level of growth in rural areas has not improved its sustainability, and more should be done to ensure vitality of these settlements are secured in perpetuity. Allocating smallscale growth that is proportionate to the settlement size results in those settlements (and others in close proximity) becoming more self-sufficient, which in turns creates considerable economic, social and environmental benefits as described above. Great Bourton is recognised as a Category B village in the current Cherwell Local plan. 'Category B' villages are considered to be satellite villages that are associated with larger service centres. Increasing development in these villages would help to support the role of service villages.
LPR-B-632	Tessa Sparks	LPR-A-107	Object. This is an area of great beauty that is respected and protected by the residence of Sibford Gower. Development would destroy the natural beauty, fauna and flora that is a continuation of the outstanding natural beauty. The villagers and parish council have worked tirelessly to safeguard our village and its surrounds to protect it for the future. If we do not take a stand to protect the flora including our trees, fauna of wildlife, birds etc, and brooks there will be nothing left for future generations. There are wild deer as well as other wildlife around our villages and any development will impact them negatively. We have an abundance of butterflies, and other insects, all protected by community's respect for nature. We maintain a dark sky village, care for the ancient hedgerows and mature trees. Destroying this will be catastrophic. Development would double the population of our village. Our roads are narrow and would not cope with the increased traffic or sustain commuters or cycleways and there are very few pavements. The infrastructure would not support increasing the population, we have one village shop and a small village school. We must protect village life. As a nation we must provide more housing, however these developments would be more successful, better serviced, and succinctly integrated attached to a town or a city.
LPR-B-633	J D Cox	LPR-A-175	Object. This proposal is totally unacceptable. Such inappropriate building would be irreversibly detrimental to the existing village and the surrounding countryside. Wardington is a small historic conservation village and its character would be ruined by significant growth from modern development such as this. Not only is the proposal out of scale to the existing village, but the land areas do not even "fit in" with the existing village layout. The majority of their boundaries face onto more countryside, not existing built up areas. No services within the village making such expansion unsustainable. I appreciate new housing has to go somewhere. I understand the current Cherwell policy does not currently favour expansion of villages such as Wardington. I see no justification as to why this should change when there are much more appropriate sites elsewhere.

LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, mainly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 4	Mixture of all options.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 8	Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Question - Green Belt	Keep the beautiful fields clear of new developments- clear the countryside protected
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements.
LPR-B-634	Jonathan Medwin	Adderbury	Sites around Adderbury would increase traffic, noise, pollution. Adderbury is very busy atm and would only become busier. Protect its uniqueness and beautiful surroundings please. Too many new houses equals more traffic and noise and pollution, the infrastructure won't cope.
LPR-B-635	Department for Education	General	The department notes significant population growth is expected in Cherwell; the consultation document predicts an additional 20,000 people living in the district by 2043, on top of 16% population growth over the last 20 years. With housing and employment fuelling this growth, there will be significant additional pressure on social infrastructure such as education facilities. NPPF advises that local planning authorities (LPAs) should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of communities and that LPAs should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools to widen choice in education (para 94). The department supports the principle of Cherwell District Council safeguarding land for the provision of new schools to meet government planning policy objectives as set out in paragraph 94 of the NPPF. Local authorities should seek to safeguard land for any future expansion of new schools where demand indicates this might be necessary, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance and DfE guidance on securing developer contributions for education. The Council should have regard to the Joint Policy Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Education on Planning for Schools Development (2011) which sets out the government's commitment to support the development of statefunded schools and their delivery through the planning system. DfE encourages close working with local authorities during all stages of planning policy development to help guide the development of new school infrastructure and to meet the predicted demand for primary and secondary school places. Please add the department to your list of relevant organisations with which you engage in preparation of the plan. Under the 'local authority presumption route' the local authority is responsible for finding the site, providing the capital and managing the build process. When the department delivers the school, the local authority is less involved but may provide support, including a site. Either route can deliver schools on land that has been provided as a developer contribution. The department has published further general information on opening free schools as well as specifically in relation to opening free schools in garden communities. One of the tests of soundness is that a Local Plan is 'effective', meaning the plan should be deliverable over its period. In this context and with specific regard to planning for schools, there is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the additional school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments. The department notes that Cherwell District Council is preparing a CIL charging schedule. Welcome the reference in paragraph 5.13.5 to CIL being used to capture contributions from smaller sites which currently do not make any direct contributions to funding infrastructure. Supports the use of Section 106 planning obligations for any developments that have a demonstrable impact on education facilities, requiring mitigation to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Developer contributions in these circumstances should be appropriately ring-fenced for education, as achieved through a Section 106 agreement. The Council should set out education infrastructure requirements for the plan period within an Infrastructure Funding Statement. Where additional need for school places will be generated by housing growth, the statement should identify the anticipated CIL and Section 106 funding towards this infrastructure. The statement should be reviewed annually to report on the amount of funding received via developer contributions and how it has been used, providing transparency to all stakeholders. Reference within the Local Plan's policies or supporting text to explain that developer contributions may be secured retrospectively, when it has been necessary to forward fund infrastructure projects in advance of anticipated housing growth. At this early stage of the emerging Local Plan site allocations have not yet been drafted. The next version of the Local Plan should seek to identify specific sites (existing or new) which can deliver the school places needed to support growth, based on the latest evidence of identified need and demand in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The site allocations and associated safeguarding policies should also seek to clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including when they should be delivered to support housing growth, the minimum site area required, any preferred site characteristics, and any requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion of schools where need and demand indicates this might be necessary. Establishing these requirements within the plan is particularly important for securing sites at an appropriate value when additional land or standalone sites for schools need to be purchased, as DfE 'Basic Need' funding allocations do not factor in the costs of site acquisition. 13. The



LPR-B-635	Department for Education	Option 1	Welcomes references in the plan's vision to invest in education infrastructure; reduce inequality and social exclusion, increase education, training and skills; and promote net zero carbon developments.
LPR-B-635	Department for Education	Option 2	Welcomes references in the plan's key objectives to invest in education infrastructure; reduce inequality and social exclusion, increase education, training and skills; and promote net zero carbon developments.
LPR-B-635	Department for Education	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Recommend that policies are not inflexibly linked to a single standard or assessment methodology, and instead allow equivalent standards to be demonstrated and creative solutions delivered where appropriate. There may be opportunities for strategic planning of biodiversity net gain on existing education sites, to facilitate new school development and also new housing
LPR-B-635	Department for Education	Option 17	Supports the proposal to consider social and environmental benefits of infrastructure schemes and the contribution they make to climate action, healthy placeshaping and a sustainable economy. We welcome this, as it should be recognised that school development provides a significant investment in social infrastructure and can deliver these benefits. The department would be particularly interested in responding to any update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan/Infrastructure Funding Statement, viability assessment or other evidence relevant to education which may be used to inform local planning policies and CIL charging schedules. As such, please add the department to the database for future consultations on relevant plans and proposals.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 1	The vision values the environment, the economy and the rural feel of the district. It takes into account the need for more housing, the type of housing as well as the importance of environmentally friendly construction. For our village, protection from overdevelopment and the prevention of the loss of our community is important. The vision should align with current population trends which show lower growth than projections based on the 2018 growth figures (ONS). Emphasis should be on preserving the environment versus further large scale housing land allocations. The vision is right to promote connection of the towns (where housing and employment land allocation should be prioritised where this can be justified) to the surrounding rural villages by upgrading public transport and active accessibility (cycle and foot) options. We would like to see a stronger vision on building back woodland and biodiversity across the region, which has one of the lowest county tree covers at 9% of land area in Oxfordshire.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 2	KO4 – key to people being able to work from home. K10 – net zero carbon new development are key to energy efficiency but must be within reach for all householders. The vast roof areas of the large scale distribution buildings around Bicester should use either solar energy generation or living roof covers as a matter of policy; links with KO11. KO13 – The issue of water pollution is cause for serious concern. The dumping of raw waste into the water system is unacceptable. The major water companies need to be brought under control AND housing developments or entertainment centres should not be permitted in areas where water management is substandard or under significant stress. Natural mitigation measures should be prioritised; links to KO14, KO15. KO19 – we support the pragmatic application of measures to upgrade energy efficiency without destroying the key historic elements of the dwellings or the context in which they are placed. KO21 – Affordable housing has been a key issue for a number of years in Cherwell but developers don't seem so keen on building them. Affordable housing does not abrogate the responsibility to build to high standards, including design standards. KO25 – to protect and enhance the historic and natural environment is key to the legacy of Cherwell. Without this as an objective, the district runs the risk of becoming a suburban, bland, urban landscape. Bespoke solutions should be possible where the cheaper and more familiar and standard 'urban' elements are out of place in a historic setting or where these might endanger protected trees or landscapes. KO27 – Cherwell has seen significantly large scale of housing development which has a conventional 'sameness' of design with no local distinctiveness mirrors that seen in any one of many other regions around the UK. The risk of losing regional distinctiveness is high and should be addressed with developers. KO29 – Supporting infrastructure has not kept pace with the housing increases in our region. More must be done to address water/sewage management, domestic connectivity (increasingly 3phase supplies will be needed for electric boiler installations and increasing EV charging at home), better local transport options. KO30 – In the Bicester area, there should be more emphasis on establishing local green space site allocations.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington & Mostly on previously developed land, including in less sustainable locations – enhance urban centres but use previously developed land as a priority. Protect the rural environment. Significant transport interchanges are frequently distant from areas of housing and therefore do not necessarily provide good accessibility for workers. Employment land in villages has to be managed carefully. In our village, a previous light industrial site has remained poorly connected to the village over the last 30 years.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above - reviewing each site on a case by case basis is essential to avoid out-of-town cultural and social deserts.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Supporting EMPloyment	It is important to support local employment so that people can live and work in their community. A benefit to this could be a reduced level of local carbon emission. A major problem for our village is the creation of employment and leisure sites that do not take into account or respect the traffic impact. We are dealing with the village being used as a rat run, with lorries and HGVs using the rural road on a regular basis. Planning policy needs to move toward a view that the cumulative effect of permissions must be considered when approving an application.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	Accessibility for local communities from surrounding areas and villages is a key concern – retail and other services should be readily accessible using affordable green transport options. Local distinctiveness should recognise the value of locally made produce, providing outlets for local products and supporting local communities.

LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	Local distinctiveness should recognise the value of locally made produce, providing outlets for local products and supporting local communities.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 6	Affordable housing should be a minimum of 35% across the board and could be higher on housing of 10 or more units. It would be useful to focus on specific affordable housing developments of under 10 that will fit into a village or small town and benefit from the infrastructure already in place. A small village will inevitably develop via the incremental addition of sizable homes and that will add to the already top heavy number of large homes which are priced out of reach for many people with local connections. No local advantage in increasing the amount of affordable housing.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 7	Keep the 2015 mix but consider first time buyers as per the: statement from government. While the range of options for Affordable Houses is very helpful there are some categories that should be included: for example, in our village we have people who wish to buy the homes they have been allocated only to find that as WOTG is in the rural area, the property is exempt from the Right to Acquire scheme. They benefit from the rural location, great local schools and 'room to run' and will establish their 'place' which may become a focal point for future generations and continue to sustain the village.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? Internal space standards should be a policy in the Local Plan and it should be a minimum requirement. The trend is towards increasing housing density and building on smaller plots. In rural areas, consideration should be made towards more external space (gardens) rather than imposing very urban densities.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	Separation distances not essential.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 9	Include accessibility standard on a proportion of new homes – planning for the future means raising the bar on expectations for accessibility and meeting the needs of an aging population. Clamp down on permitted development rights and enforce breaches diligently.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	Clamp down on permitted development rights and enforce breaches diligently.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government? National Government construction standards may be adequate but enforcement is poor. Cherwell should set their own standards and enforce them properly.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Historic buildings can benefit from key standardised retrofitted upgrades (boilers, heating solutions, energy consumption) while preserving the original fabric of the building. Where more radical measures are proposed that would result in loss of the original historic fabric or setting of a building, these should be balanced carefully with the need for preservation and should not be enforced using a top-down policy which may not be the best solution. <u>We support bespoke solutions for these cases.</u>
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation and Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?. New sites for renewable solar and wind energy generation can be identified. There should be a good evidencebased criteria policy for their selection. There should be a policy on installing energy generation to expansive commercial roofs, or if not possible then green roof coverings. The expansion of very large commercial buildings in rural environments necessitates the use of these areas for climate mitigation.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	Settlement bridges the Green belt boundary with roughly half of the village inside the green belt and the other outside. This has artificially pushed development ever onwards on land that is not constrained, taking housing further from the village centre. There are small village sites inside the green belt that could be developed and would be supported within the Neighbourhood Plan and we would encourage review of these sites for the benefit of the village.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 12	Prefer a policy stating that if biodiversity net gain or acceptable compensatory methods cannot be achieved on site, then the development is not viable.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Policies on building woodland (agroforestry, buffer zones and native tree planting on small sites to build biodiversity corridors), protecting ancient pathways.

LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 14	Seek opportunities to integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.. Play facilities should involve all ages not just younger children -although they are very important.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites & Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements – housing development should have outdoor sports provision as part of the strategic plan. Local solutions for smaller communities and developments are very important. We don't agree that Option 3 is a fair option as smaller communities will lose out on local provision. If children can walk to a play area, it makes more sense than driving – awareness of carbon emissions is key.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	Weston on the Green has very little designated green space – the amount of 'village green' has been reduced to very small discontinuous parcels of land. Development pressure on land in and immediately around the village makes green space designation difficult in a very competitive climate. We have several LGS's within the District designated through neighbourhood plans. The Weston on the Green Parish Council has identified one parcel of land which has been submitted as a potential housing site allocation that we feel meets the criteria of a Local Green Space and we already know has <u>the overwhelming support of the village.</u>
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Welcome the protection of ancient routeways as Weston sits on the junction of some major pathways linking important sites in the south and north of the country. A key consideration in the historic environment is the pattern of dwellings in and around the village. The layout has remained largely unchanged for at least 300 years and is constantly at risk from housing development which will change this irrevocably, impacting on the historic village centre and the organic pattern of housing which spans 17th to 21st century buildings. Village landscape should be protected.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	In a rural sector it is hard to see how 'beauty' can be achieved with the high density housing. It is at odds with a village environment and puts biodiversity at risk by interrupting wildlife corridors and reducing 'greening'. We would like to see consideration of housing layouts that are appropriate for the context of a village. Rural landscape of the UK has ancient roots and there is a tendency toward pastiche design which mimics historic features in a 'sanitised' and more urbanised fashion. This should be resisted and some wilding should be encouraged in rural settings to preserve and enhance natural environments, which have natural beauty.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Weston on the Green is outside of an achievable 20 minute walk or cycle connection with Bicester or Kidlington for most residents.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Sustainable travel would be improved through the promotion of electric cars assisted by parish priorities to establish some charge points and continuation of grants for homeowners to put charge points in their home. The grants available still require a significant investment from the homeowner for installation. Some form of rural bus service would help our residents, but we understand that our passenger numbers are low and we would not want to implement a service which would open the flood gates for outof-scale housing development. We have looked at commuter buses, shopping buses – financial assistance would be required for both models. We would favour electric transport where possible and small vehicles for local road use.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). It is important to 'future proof' new housing developments in terms of digital infrastructure. The new housing development in our village has such connections. Rural, established communities, need to have the uplift to new technologies to keep residents able to participate in the working from home necessity and to allow all generations access to full fibre to the premises as well as full mobile connectivity. <u>Broadband and mobile phone connectivity is a major issue in our village</u>
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	Transport policies should support low emission modes of transport; manage the sustainable movement of goods in the transport network and in and around our places; and, promote and fund public transport and active travel improvements Rural communities add to carbon emissions through the predominant use of cars for travel. Our problem is how to reduce car journeys without increasing the risks that regular bus service or expanded scale public transport services direct to the village would bring to the community – that is, a view that bus service would make the village more sustainable <u>and then at risk of housing developments that the local people do not want</u>
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy?. All infrastructure should be planned with some futureproofing in place to accommodate future evolution of technology, energy use and resource. Continue to prepare the IDP to be place specific. The 'place' is a historic focus and using a catchment basis to <u>identify infrastructure may de-emphasise the historic place, changing it in the national context.</u>
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	In our local environment land and water management are the key issues.

LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. The villages around Bicester are losing their rural character and a village like Chesterton is all but ruined because of approval of major planning applications on the edges of the villages.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 24	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Flexibility to allow conversion to dwellings in Bicester Centre would reinvigorate the town community, promote a vibrant culture and support social businesses. This would also promote preservation and repair of some of the historic buildings which otherwise are at risk through lack of investment.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	There are only 2 small green spaces in Bicester (compared to eight around Kidlington). Bicester should have more green space to identify the periphery of the town settlement and contain it and identify separation from surrounding villages. This is a rural landscape and should not accept unfettered access for further building.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Rural areas need dependable bus service into Bicester – people who live in Weston on the Green can currently only access Bicester by car. Options other than road based public transport should be considered – at least in the longer term e.g. small light electric tramline for local connections.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 26	The degradation of the Green Belt around Kidlington is only for monetary gain by Oxford colleges. It has been a sham to override the Green Belt using the pretence of housing need when in fact much more than housing is being put into this area. For example, there is now a plan to create a hightech hub with housing for staff – none of this is meeting the current unmet housing need
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Villages in the area of Kidlington and Bicester should have public transport. People in the villages do not have access to shopping without the use of cars. Cutting off rural transport has been the cause of loneliness and a sense of isolation for many. Buses between Bicester and Kidlington should pass through Weston on the Green – at commuter times and for shopping. It may take time, but this option will make a difference to carbon emissions and heavy traffic on the roads, particularly if the transport is electric driven.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs rather than spread more development over rural areas. This will keep the historical sense of villages like ours but allow some managed growth. Pouring development into small rural villages ruins the villages and changes the landscape from rural and specific historical sense to a suburban sprawl.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 32	Rural settlement hierarchy has been a problem for Weston on the Green. For some reason it has been considered a Category A village (currently has no school, no public transport of any kind) and the threat of development on our boundary has been constant. Recommend giving additional weight in determination of the hierarchy to the availability of certain services and facilities such as: primary schools, services such as employment opportunities and connectivity both technological and physical. There is a catch here for rural villages – if we were to get a bus service would we be considered <u>more sustainable and thus eligible for housing developments on our border?</u>
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 33	Use a combination the above. Development sites should not be pushed on villages nor exiting rural spaces allotted to employers that have no connection to the community – Great Wolf Resort is an example of a central government push to increase tourism at the expense of a rural village.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. We need to emphasise that there is a disconnect between the type of economic ‘push’ that national government appears to be supporting and the type of district Cherwell actually is. There is a continual tension between the value of maintaining a successful rural economy and protecting our villages and the push to maximise our proximity to London thus causing a housing, population increase that is in conflict with safeguarding rural villages.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	CDC has done an excellent job of supporting WOTG Parish Council through the preparation of our Neighbourhood Plan. Only through acknowledging the legitimacy of a Neighbourhood Plan and referring to it in planning decision will more neighbourhoods realise the value of it. CDC has a terrific team supporting this work. There is much misunderstanding by the public and developers about the value and power in planning of Neighbourhood Plans. CDC could make it clearer to developers and the public at large how NPs are used in planning decisions.
LPR-B-636	Weston on the Green Parish Council	Question - Development Management Policies	The submitted list of development management policies seems comprehensive.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 1	The vision is supported and in particular point 14 relating to rural communities. The reference to new modes of transport that are more responsive to local people’s needs is supported and this should be explored further. One example of a successfully implemented new transport service is Cheshire East Council’s “gøtoo” on demand bus service specifically for the rural areas.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 2	Key Objective 7 should support both Cherwell’s urban and rural centres. Key Objective 31 should reference a mix of housing types and tenures that may be required across the varied rural communities.

LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 3	A combination of all the options is preferred. Different forms of employment will be appropriate in different locations. Since the Covid 19 pandemic there is greater scope for mixed uses and particularly shared workspaces in amongst residential areas.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above to ensure the diverse range of needs is provided for
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 6	The percentage levels of affordable housing should be retained as in the 2015 Local Plan as this has generally proved to be a deliverable level to meet local needs.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 7	The tenure split of affordable housing should be retained as in the 2015 Local Plan as this has generally proved to be a deliverable mix to meet local needs.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 11	A criteria based policy is likely to be more appropriate to allow sites that come forward to be assessed on their merits.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 12	A combination of 2 and 3 are the most appropriate and deliverable options. Where on site compensation cannot be achieved, biodiversity enhancement should take place where it will have the most beneficial impacts. It is also important that the requirements for biodiversity net gain do not undermine other sustainability objectives. Requiring compensatory measures on land that may not necessarily be available could prevent the delivery of sites that are the most sustainable when considering social, environmental and economic sustainability objectives. Requiring compensation as close as possible to a development site may prejudice future sustainable development. It is more important for strategic networks of green infrastructure and wildlife corridors to be improved and these will often be off-site. Option 2 would enable areas to be identified which have the most potential to deliver gains for biodiversity and these locations will often be along existing wildlife corridors and be related to existing green/blue infrastructure. Land is generally less likely to be suitable for development and so improvements would be less likely to prejudice future development plans. Option 3 would provide a mechanism for funding to be generated to deliver compensation in the most effective areas. Advocate for strategic off site solutions to be coordinated by Local Planning Authorities. This can result in large expanses of multi-functional Green Infrastructure that can have the most benefit for ecology, for example by repairing fragmented habitats across a wider area. Natural England have taken a similar approach in the protection and improvement of Bechstein's Bats habitat. Where development impacting the bats' habitat is proposed a holistic solution to mitigation is sought based on the habitat requirements of the species and not an arbitrary target. Preferred mitigation will be an onsite solution, others an off-site one, but more often it will be a combination of the two. It is a more flexible case by case basis and the key point is that the other aspects of sustainability are considered in the round, together with specific ecological evidence to create better outcomes for biodiversity. Support a combination of the local authority prioritising where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused, and securing contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within these priority areas. To ensure deliverability any contributions sought through S106 agreements should be based on a clear methodology which is subject to consultation in order for the costs to be transparent and factored in at an early stage.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 13	As the Environment Bill requires a biodiversity net gain of 10%, the necessary net gain assessments will need to be submitted. 3) is preferred because a separate natural capital assessment is likely to duplicate work contained in a net gain report. A natural capital assessment should therefore not normally be an additional requirement, and natural capital could also be appropriately considered through other existing required reports such as a design and access statement.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	In certain circumstances yes, and many rural settlements and clusters of settlements are well placed to be restored as 20 minute neighbourhoods. Historically many have operated as such before accommodating more commuting, but further housing growth in such locations can help to support remaining facilities and restore any lost services.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The approach should be slightly different in rural areas. It may not be possible or desirable to reduce travel beyond a certain level in rural locations in order for rural areas to maintain their vitality and connectivity. Focussing on low carbon technology may be a more appropriate aim in some rural areas. On-demand bus services are a low carbon form of travel, especially when using electric vehicles, and would be beneficial for many villages that have lost conventional bus services. Development could help to fund such solutions
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages and focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages and focus development at an existing or new settlement(s) well connected to Bicester is favoured and additionally cross-border locations outside of Cherwell's administrative area should be considered where they may offer sustainable growth opportunities connected to Bicester

LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 30	Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. The proven ability of the rural areas to deliver homes more effectively in recent years is an important factor. There is an increased demand for rural living since the pandemic. Whilst the Pandemic's longer term effects are not yet clear the shorter term impacts upon patterns of commuting and demand for housing are quite stark. Aside from the obvious impacts of the pandemic, in terms of planning for the future of rural areas fresh challenges as well as opportunities have emerged from the new context. The shift towards home working has in many places resulted in some positive impacts for rural communities in terms of supporting local businesses and reinforcing community ties. Housing affordability has rapidly worsened as former residents of more urban areas seek more space and a closerknit community without being concerned about longer commuting distances. A model form of sustainable community is the 20 minute neighbourhood. Many of Cherwell's villages are already well prepared to achieve these neighbourhoods, having naturally developed with a mix of uses within a compact area. Many of these villages require growth and rejuvenation to restore lost facilities. It can be challenging to create sustainable neighbourhoods through the repeated expansion of larger settlements, which are often encircled by infrastructure or inward looking late 20th century suburbs. Rural communities often retain their historic street patterns which modern urban designers seek to recreate in new settlements, but have lost much of their population partly due to smaller household sizes. Longestablished rural towns and villages are well suited to accommodate a larger population and help support new and existing amenities within the settlement as a whole. Biodiversity net gain requirements should also have a bearing on the spatial strategy. The Environment Bill has now been approved by Parliament and mandates a 10% net biodiversity gain. Rural areas are better able to deliver net gains alongside development which can bring forward a mix of homes with open space generating environmental, social and landscape benefits.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 31	Providing a parish level figure is the most effective way of delivering homes in locations which the community supports. The figure required is often more likely to be actually delivered due to the opportunity to shape development in a parish. In more urban areas this can be sometimes less effective, but Cherwell is a generally rural and relatively affluent district, with local communities willing and able to give up their time to be involved in the planning process. The first option of allocating sites can be less transparent for local people and risks setting up a more adversarial process.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 32	Both of these factors are important. In terms of giving additional weighting to services and facilities, high speed broadband is becoming ever more important and should be weighted as such. Primary schools in close proximity should also be given an increased weighting as they need to be close to the community they serve to a greater extent than other less regularly used services. In existing settlement hierarchies, two or more villages are acknowledged as having a strongly linked functional relationship. For example, services such as a school, shops or GP surgery may be spread across an area rather than in one centre. It is important for the settlement hierarchy to continue to acknowledge this polycentric reality in several Cherwell locations. A good example is The Sibfords which share a range of services and are sensibly grouped as a Category A village to reflect the spatial reality. The individual character of a place may depart from the conventional image of a 'service centre' but this does not necessarily make it less sustainable. Even where neighbouring settlements may have separate identities they can function as a unit and this should be encouraged through planning <u>policy to help to sustain settlements' vitality.</u>
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Option 34	The Environment Bill has been approved by Parliament and requires a 10% net biodiversity gain from developments. The current approach of conserving/enhancing the whole district can be retained but evolved to take advantage of the opportunity the Environment Bill offers. New open spaces and landscaping associated with housing developments can have a dual role in terms of both the landscape/visual benefits and biodiversity improvements. Rural areas are better equipped to deliver net gains alongside development than urban areas, partly due to the availability of land. The net gain requirement can be satisfied with landscaping as part of new development that protects the character of rural areas at the same time as benefitting biodiversity.
LPR-B-637	Land & Partners Ltd	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Providing a parish level housing requirement figure is the most effective way of delivering homes in locations which the community supports through a neighbourhood plan. The figure required is often more likely to be actually delivered due to the opportunity for local people to shape development in their parish.
LPR-B-638	Savills for Richborough Estates	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of Station Road, Launton	Land north of Station Road, Launton is promoted for mixed development. Update to HELAA179. An opportunities and constraints plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 3	A2D's view is that the main centres, including Bicester, which benefit from the strongest transport infrastructure connections, should be the main focus for future strategic employment growth. Logistics and warehousing would be best positioned close to the strategic road network. Smaller-scale employment opportunities will arise at some of the new and already established local centres.A2D also recognise a need for smallerscale employment opportunities in other locations, particularly in rural communities for agricultural related growth and a combination of all options could therefore be <u>appropriate.</u>
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 4	Option 3

LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 5	A2D's view is that to respond to people's changing needs, option 2 which seeks to maximise flexibility for uses within the town centre should be adopted. Further, there is a need to reconsider the role and function of local centres provided as part of NWB.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Question - Housing Policies	In terms of future housing provision, A2D have already made representation to the OP in support of the 'transformational rate' of housing requirement as a minimum to contribute to the wider affordable housing needs and to be consistent with the growth strategy for Oxfordshire and the Growth Deal. In terms of the level of housing required, we would encourage both the OP and the CLPR to be bold and ambitious. Bicester remains the 'right place' for sustainable future growth and the CLPR should 'overallocate' to provide flexibility and eliminate the risk of supply side constraint driving price and worsening affordability. The CLPR housing targets will be set by the Oxfordshire Plan. In our representations to the OP, A2D has disagreed with the approach of setting the LPA requirement net of 'commitments'. Firstly, commitments are ordinarily sites with planning permission: sites benefiting from an allocation are not committed. In responding to the OP, the LPA can of course decide to 'save' existing allocations to meet the requirement. The requirement assigned to the LPA should be gross, with the LPAs response being a function of completions, justified commitments (in the correct definition), saved allocations and new allocations. To do otherwise will simply reduce supply and do little to boost supply in the context of past performance of the LPAs, many of which fail to maintain housing land supply.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 6	A2D suggests that if the housing needs or requirement for the Country and the constituent LPAs are identified at the OP level (with affordability being one factor informing requirement), then the proportion of that requirement which should be affordable should also be set in the OP. The setting of the requirement per allocation/scheme and the tenure split should be determined locally, through local plans. It would be open to the OP to set a differing requirement across different parts of the OP, with for example Oxford City setting a higher percentage rate than out of the districts. There is a clear and strong affordable housing need in Cherwell and as a registered provider, A2D supports the provision of affordable housing. However, there is always a need for a flexible approach to take into account locational need and site specific circumstances.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 7	As mentioned within the CLPR, there will be a need to revisit the preferred tenure split in the CLPR given the introduction of First Homes. First Homes, which will be primarily aimed at first time buyers, will require market homes to be provided at a discount of 30%. The Government requires that 25% of all new affordable homes be provided as First Homes. There will be a need to determine how the remaining 75% of affordable homes are split to meet greatest local need. A2D's view is that the First Homes should not automatically replace existing intermediate provision, as there will remain a strong need for schemes such as shared ownership.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 8	A2D agrees that emerging policy could seek to apply a policy requirement for all new homes to meet the nationally described space standards, although again flexibility could be afforded to the market housing in exceptional circumstances.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 9	Most Local Plans have policies on accessibility and A2D would expect the CLPR to contain accessibility policies which align with Part M of the Building Regulations. This would require 10% of all new homes provided to be built to Part M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings with remaining dwellings built to Part M4(2) wheelchair accessible and adaptable.

LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 10	The OP's preferred policy approach is to include sustainable design and construction requirements for major residential and non-residential developments above those required by Government (through emerging Future Homes standards which will by 2025, require new homes to produce 75-80% less carbon emissions compared with current levels). In response, A2D's view is that there needs to be a clear policy distinction between construction and building performance standards and those that apply at the occupation phase. Unregulated energy demand at the occupation and post construction phase is a function of behaviour. The experience at NW Bicester points to the specific challenges of meeting unregulated energy demand as opposed to regulated. Scheme design can provide a platform for behavioural change but cannot guarantee that behaviour will change. The emphasis at the design stage must therefore be in providing the platform to support and encourage such lifestyle change. Policies should therefore focus on scheme design and building performance, assuming of course that a deviation from reliance upon regulation is justified. A core principle must be that the most appropriate mechanism is used. If a matter, such as building safety, is mandatory and a matter for regulation, then this should sit in Building Regulations, not planning policy. A level playing field should be the objective and building standards should in the first instance be a matter for regulation. The reason given in the OP for looking to enhanced standards (which will not be mandatory) in planning policy is, in part, a concern the building regulation standards will be too slow. Planning policy should not be used as a fallback or to remedy perceived failings in regulations. If the OP is wedded to the use of planning policy and can justify such an approach based on law, practice and procedure, a clear, consistent, and single definition and set of standards should be adopted and applied uniformly and consistency across the County. The draft OP recognises the importance of viability and the NWB experience has demonstrated the additional cost burden that will arise but which will not be recovered through revenues (nor would the OP wish that to be the case as this would add to lack of affordability across the County). The balancing of building performance through viability will result inevitably in the LPAs needing to balance competing policy aspirations to ensure deliverability. CIL is mandatory and is 'top sliced'. Building performance will therefore be at risk of being 'weighed in the planning balance' with affordable housing being the most likely variable. The PPS1 supplement remains in force in respect of NWB. This supplement is in many ways out of date, not least in respect of energy performance. The OP and CLPR must be consistent with the supplement until such time as it is withdrawn. A2D's view is that the ambitions and policy requirements for NWB should be enshrined in the OP and CLPR, which provides the opportunity to establish an up-to-date policy framework for development across the County and District to meet needs and there is no longer a justification for a higher standard or different standard to be applied at NWB. The PPS1 should be withdrawn although we recognise that this is in the gift of the Secretary of State. In short, A2D's view is that both the OP and CLPR should align with climate change policies set by Government.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 12	Supports BNG. All 3 off-site measures set out under Option 12 would be appropriate for consideration in the event that BNG or compensatory measures cannot be achieved on site. A flexible policy which allows for any of the 3 options would allow greatest flexibility to achieve BNG in varying circumstances.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 13	A2D appreciates the benefit of utilising Natural Capital on a district-wide level in plan-making, where it might inform future spatial policies and growth. However, we are unclear as to how a requirement for a Natural Capital Assessment in new major developments would inform the development or add value beyond the current application requirements. We would suggest Cherwell explore the need for this on an individual site basis further.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	A2D support the encouragement of sustainable travel and the concept of the '20 min neighbourhood' can play an important part in providing the platform to reduce the need to travel.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Option 17	A2D support the preparation of an updated IDP and the policy emphasis upon health and wellbeing and that scheme design can play a pivotal role in providing a platform for health and wellbeing, not just in relation to promoting active travel and health lifestyles but also addressing isolation and living standards. NWB is designated as a Healthy New Town (HNT) and there are lessons that have been learnt that can be applied to all development: should all new development be planned in the context of the HNT principles and if so, are these up to date and can they be improved upon? In response to Policy PO15 of the OP, which would appear to set out additional development standards and policy requirements for new settlements, A2D have commented that there is much benefit that a new settlement or large-scale extension such as NWB can deliver over and above small-scale development, not least the benefits of scale (e.g., in terms of energy, waste and water) and multi-phase development allowing technological solutions to evolve over time. That said, large scale development is often burdened by extra infrastructure costs that are front loaded. A carefully nuanced approach is required if a two-tier development standard is to be applied with large scale development unfairly burdened by additional costs, which in turn undermines delivery. If additional policy is necessary and justified for new settlements, then this should apply equally to large scale extensions.
LPR-B-639	Barton Willmore for A2 Dominion Developments	Bicester	From experience at North West Bicester, slower delivery is due to viability as a result of higher than normal standards and policy aspirations. There is a need to revisit PPS1 in relation to NWB but we would advise caution to the application of higher policy requirements for NWB across all policies in the OB and CLPR. There needs to be the right balance between ensuring good development that addresses climate needs; and being able to deliver much-needed new homes across all sites 'on a level playing field'.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the south east of Woodstock	Land to the south east of Woodstock is promoted for mixed uses. Update to HELAA329.



LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the north of Webbs Way, Kidlington	Land to the north of Webbs Way, Kidlington is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA168.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the west of Banbury Road, Adderbury	Land to the west of Banbury Road, Adderbury is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA007.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 1	Supports the suggested vision for Cherwell, and in particular the reference to Cherwell's position within the OxfordCambridge Arc. BSP fully support the aspiration for new developments to be built to high levels of energy efficiency, and for neighbourhoods to be sustainable and well-functioning, responding positively to local social and natural context. The opportunities at Woodstock, Oxford and Kidlington are considered to represent excellent opportunities to secure growth closely aligned with this vision. The importance of supporting rural communities, to realise their full potential (as cited under part 14) of the vision), is similarly considered an essential element of fulfilling the district's growth potential. BSP has responded to the Oxfordshire 2050 plan, highlighting a number of strategic opportunities for sustainable growth. Whilst concluding that a focus on rural communities to achieve the necessary level of growth would be ineffective in securing development at scale and pace, supporting rural communities does offer some important growth potential and could deliver economic and environmental benefits as well as social value. It is appropriate for the vision to support opportunities for moderate and small scale growth across the rural communities, including at villages and towns. Strengthening these communities is an important part of Cherwell's vision.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 2	Supportive of the draft objectives in meeting Cherwell's growth requirements for the forthcoming plan period. BSP consider that objectives K01 and K023 are critical in delivering on the needs of the district under the new Local Plan. In forming a robust foundation for the next stage of the Local Plan it is vital that the plan identifies sufficient growth capacity and flexibility to serve the district's future development needs. NPPF paragraph 22 highlights that 'strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption to anticipate and respond to long term requirements and opportunities.' The opportunities at Woodstock, Kidlington and Oxford are all consistent with these objectives, particularly K01 and K023.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 6	Support keeping the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the district). The need for affordable housing is recognised, however this should be balanced with the wider housing needs within Cherwell for a range of unit types, both market and affordable. Increasing the percentage level of affordable housing may constrain sustainable development opportunities coming forward which support Cherwell's role within the OxfordCambridge arc. As noted in the Partnering for Prosperity document published by the National Infrastructure Committee, 'without urgent action, a chronic undersupply of homes could jeopardise growth, limit access to labour and put prosperity at risk.' The Local Plan needs to be flexible enough to accommodate a range of housing coming forward which responds to local demand and therefore does not jeopardise the district's growth potential as a result, as well as taking into account site specific viability considerations.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 7	BSP consider the expectation for the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent should be maintained. Opportunities to provide increased level of social rent provision should be assessed on a site by site basis, and not prescribed at a district wide level. There needs to be sufficient flexibility in the plan to support economic growth aspirations, to address market signals in terms of affordability, to provide for rapid change and viability
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - Green Belt	It would be appropriate to consider small-scale release through the Cherwell Local Plan, not just for employment purposes but for residential development, particularly where that would be a release for mixed-use purposes, to support the local economy and help deliver needs within Cherwell for a range of unit types, both market and affordable. This opportunity is particularly important around Kidlington, where larger scale release has been made to address the Oxford unmet need but further smaller-scale sustainable opportunities remain, for example to the north and east of Begbroke. Such opportunities would help to meet Cherwell's housing and employment needs and would support the role of Kidlington in the settlement hierarchy, providing a close alignment with the overall vision and objectives. In line with the vision for Kidlington contained in the adopted Kidlington Masterplan SPD (December 2016), sustainable residential and commercial opportunities in and around Kidlington are considered essential and the only feasible way to successfully delivering the aspirations of the SPD. Notably this includes the key objectives of creating a sustainable community and strengthening Kidlington Village Centre through access to high quality homes and employment opportunities. Local policy approach in this respect needs to be clarified; exceptional circumstances do exist to address commercial and residential development needs jointly, which would be in full accordance with promoting sustainable patterns of development as described at NPPF paragraph 142. Without consideration of these important opportunities to deliver local growth at sustainable settlements surrounded by Green Belt, the plan will be unduly constrained and potentially rendered ineffective.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 10	Supports the aspiration of sustainable construction, however care must be taken to ensure that the policy does not become a further barrier to development in sustainable locations. In the context of the existing national and regional policy context, the local plan policy should be positive and look for opportunities associated with development rather than adding an unnecessary layer of policy restraint to hinder development. Consequently, BSP consider that the Cherwell Local Plan should not set further standards, but to leave this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan.

LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 12	Strongly support the aspiration for biodiversity net gain. Where this cannot be achieved on site, then BSP consider this should be prioritised within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. This will ensure that it has maximum benefit.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 13	BSP consider that imposition of a natural capital assessment is not necessary for major developments. As outlined in paragraph 81 of the NPPF, planning policies should 'be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices, and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.' The provision of natural capital is welcomed, and is already encouraged through the existing policy environment at a national level. The requirement for an additional assessment through the new local plan runs the risk of acting as a barrier to sustainable development opportunities coming forward.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Support a policy approach that provides 'a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment' as well as promoting the 'conservation and enhancement of the historic environment', as noted in the supporting text. Accordingly, this should form the basis for the heritage policy within the new Local Plan.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The importance of meeting Cherwell's growth needs during the local plan period requires a flexible and responsive approach to design and delivery. In particular, where the NPPF refers to the need to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances, adoption of design codes and additional guidance has the potential to significantly constrain the ability to respond to the latest housing and economic needs in the district. Consequently, BSP consider that the local plan can best support improvements in design by applying a policy approach which is responsive to the local context and is assessed on a site by site basis, without the need for additional design codes or guidance which may act as additional barriers to delivery.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Support the aspiration of the 20-minute neighbourhood, and consider that sustainable development opportunities that encompass many of the elements of the 20-minute neighbourhood should be prioritised. It is important however that this approach is applied in a flexible and responsive manner, reflecting the local context. Not all of the identified characteristics of the 20minute neighbourhood are necessarily required together, and equally the significant potential for active travel linkages within the district, both between centres and to Oxford City, means that there will naturally be an element of overlap between these principles.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Support the aspiration to prioritise sustainable and active travel. As noted in paragraph 5.12.7, 'the number and location of homes and jobs, together with their location will place different pressures on Cherwell's transport network.' Therefore, whilst the principle of a transport hierarchy which prioritises public transport over private car use is welcomed, it should be acknowledged that reducing the need to travel is not necessarily the sole solution in isolation. Sustainable development opportunities that enhance active travel linkages should be encouraged. This may include linkages to other employment centres or Oxford City. Restricting travel over the promotion of active travel runs the risk of constraining the district's growth potential and adequately meeting the district's housing need. The preferred approach should therefore not be based on a transport hierarchy, but a combination of key transport principles comprising reducing the need to travel, active travel, and public and community transport. Agree that a flexible approach, focussed on promotion of active travel and low carbon technology, will ensure that the growth requirements of such locations are adequately met and supported.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	The promotion of sustainable development opportunities which are able to provide active travel linkages to key services and employment locations are considered a key element of reducing car dependency in Kidlington. Opportunities at Kidlington are considered to represent a logical extension to this Category A village, being designed in such a way to integrate with the surrounding built form. The range of services and facilities within walking distance to the sites, combined with the public transport linkages, including to Oxford, strengthens the aspiration to reduce car dependency in and around Kidlington. Similarly, the employment use opportunity at Land south of Langford Locks has the potential to support the aspiration of reducing car dependency through providing job creation within the settlement of Kidlington itself.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 30	BSP consider that if additional development is required, then this should be proportionately directed to the rural areas to meet wider district needs. Rural centres within the district have an important role in meeting Cherwell's growth needs, and sustainable development opportunities with access to active travel modes should be prioritised and brought forward in the plan period
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 31	In forming the basis for a robust local plan for the district which adequately serves the needs of the district for the plan period, and beyond, the approach to rural housing development needs to be responsive to housing need and market conditions. There is no one preferred option for allocating rural development opportunities, but a variety of different approaches, including those cited, are necessary to ensure that sustainable development opportunities are adequately catered for in the local plan.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 32	The nature of rural settlements and the established linkages between settlements in the district, means that not every settlement will be able to accommodate certain services and facilities viably. Access to active travel modes and connections to the district's urban centres are considered to have a greater role in developing the rural settlement hierarchy. This includes planned as well as existing infrastructure provision.

LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - Settlement Boundaries	In developing a robust local plan which is flexible and responsive to future needs, BSP considers that settlement boundaries should not necessarily act as a barrier to sustainable development opportunities coming forward. Sensitively designed development which is contiguous to the existing settlement, is in keeping with the surrounding context and has access to sustainable transport modes should be encouraged, particularly in those locations in the district of greatest need. All of BSP's sites reflect logical extensions to existing settlements, taking into account local context and public transport connections. Settlement boundaries should therefore be flexible to take into account these opportunities. Restricting development beyond the settlement boundary heightens the risk that the district will not be able to accommodate its development needs across the duration of the plan period.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Question - Local Green Spaces	Support the principle of local green spaces, however consider such an aspiration needs to be balanced with sustainable growth requirements in the district. The provision of local green spaces needs to be appraised in the context of the adopted Kidlington Masterplan SPD (December 2016). Under Theme 2 (Creating a sustainable community), the SPD outlines the objective to 'build a sustainable community with opportunities for all and access to housing, jobs and high quality community facilities' and equally 'to deliver high quality new homes within the village which add positively to the overall character of Kidlington.' The opportunity at Webbs Way, Kidlington represents a highly sustainable site on the edge of Kidlington with capacity to provide between 70 to 100 dwellings. In this context, LPR-A-237 partially encroaches onto this opportunity. The 2017 Cherwell Green Belt Study scored this location as 'low-moderate' in terms of its contribution to Green Belt purposes. Equally, the Landscape Character Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2017) assessed the site as having a combined landscape and visual sensitivity of medium; with medium capacity for residential use, as long as development proposals are sympathetic to the Church Street Character Area and can retain positive views. Any proposal for the site would locate itself within the landscape structure, integrate with the surrounding built form, and would ultimately represent a logical extension of Kidlington in meeting the village's growth aspirations according to the Kidlington Masterplan SPD. The local green space outlined in LPR-A-237 would constrain this opportunity coming forward, contrary to the Kidlington Masterplan SPD. Equally this designation does not take into account the potential of high quality green space and landscaping that could come forward within the site masterplan, particularly publicly accessible green space.
LPR-B-640	Terrence O'Rourke for Blenheim Strategic Partners	Option 34	In light of the existing protections afforded to sensitive heritage and landscape features within the district, the provision of additional policy guidance is considered overly restrictive in this context. BSP are supportive of a careful design approach that both conserves and enhances the historic and natural environment on a site-by-site basis whilst also supporting the district's growth needs and aspirations.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden	Land north of Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden is promoted for housing. A concept plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Call for Sites Promotion - North West Bicester (east) Land north west of Lords Lane, Bicester	North West Bicester (east) Land north west of Lords Lane, Bicester is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 1	Transportation Review of Spatial Options prepared by JUBB Consulting submitted. Vision should be flexible and respond where necessary to the Oxfordshire 2050 Strategic Vision. The Vision as currently drafted presents a future image of the District to the Council are seeking achieve by 2040 and beyond. Hallam are of the view that as currently drafted the suggested Vision misses a significant opportunity to align with the agreed Strategic Vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and should be extended to present a future image of the District in 2050. Aligning the Vision for the District with the Strategic Vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan would secure a coherent planning policy framework for the District to 2050. There would be an opportunity to cross reference back to the Strategic Vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan rather than repeat similar aspects and objectives resulting in a streamlined and coherent Vision for both the County and District. Cherwell suggested Vision should be flexible to respond to any changes made to the Oxford 2050 Plan Strategic Vision prior to adoption – a principle which should be enshrined in the suggested Vision and/or draft objectives. Hallam note the initial element of the vision being to achieve climate action targets. These will need to be set out in the objectives of the plan and tested in terms of evidence base and delivery. Equally the Plan should set out the full range of targets to be met including investment in infrastructure, jobs, homes, and green space- each to be addressed alongside each other rather than priority being afforded simply to climate change. Element 6 of the Vision seeks to grow the scale and diversity of the local economy. Rightly, it seeks to reduce the need for residents to travel to work outside the district. The vision might beneficially be extended to seek to reduce the need for jobs to be filled by residents from beyond the district (which feeds into the vision in relation to new homes).

LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 2	Objectives should be aspiration to reflect the vision of the Plan and of the Oxfordshire 2050 Strategic Vision. In particular the objectives should provide a framework to delivery on the approach, aspiration and detail of the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal and any subsequent extension of that approach. Objectives do seek to be aspirational – e.g., in promoting net zero carbon (KO10). In other areas this may need to be reconsidered. In particular, objective KO 1 (Allocate sufficient land to meet our housing and employment needs), is not consistent with either the evidence base or the existing or emerging policy framework for Oxfordshire and this part of it. Instead, Objective KO 1 should seek not to meet needs but the housing and employment opportunities that are highlighted and evidenced in the emerging aspirational scenario of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. Moreover, if delivery is to be achieved, then objective KO 1 should commit to making generous rather than “sufficient” provision for meeting the housing and employment aspirations of the Plan. In reviewing the existing Local Plan, the consultation document notes the issues that have arisen as a result of delivery slipping against aspirations.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 3	Hallam are of the view that a broad range of sites will be required to meet the employment needs of Cherwell, but particular focus should be given to delivering jobs at 1) the main urban centres and Banbury, Bicester, and Kidlington and 4) at the larger villages. Careful selection of sites under both strategic approaches will be necessary to ensure the wider vision of a net zero County can be achieved. For example, the site promoted by Hallam is within active travel distance and benefits from regular public transport to the population centre of Bicester where a large working population resides. Development of this site would not require significant investment or behavioural changes to secure a net zero operational environment. Not all the larger villages or development sites promoted within them will have equal sustainability credentials and the rural settlement hierarchy needs to be carefully considered. Support the principle of delivering jobs on previously developed land but contend that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that previously developed land can deliver all the employment needs of Cherwell. Longterm sustainability and sustainable travel choices should be key objectives when selecting sites to deliver jobs thus simply selecting previously developed land is counterproductive to achieving sustainable development – and the suggested Vision and Oxfordshire 2050 Strategic Vision. Suggestion 2) at significant transport interchanges can be appropriate to meet the distribution (B&Use) needs of the District but selecting sites to meet all of the employment needs of the District is likely to require significant investment to ensure sustainable transport choices can be made and therefore the wider vision for the County to be net zero.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 4	Oxfordshire, and more specifically Cherwell, is an economic hub of national importance which supports an extensive range of employments uses and opportunities which then in turn support far reaching spin-off industries. Therefore, Hallam contend that the Cherwell Local Plan Review should seek to secure a mixture of sites to ensure the economic significance and diversity of the District continues.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 6	Regulation 18 (Part 2) Oxfordshire Plan 2050, Option 28 Technical Report Homes: How Many? Commitments and Locations submitted with this representation. Hallam are of the view that the Local Plan Review should keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as the current Local Plan as this was recently determined appropriate through the examination and subsequent adoption of the Local Plan. Delivery of affordable housing over the previous three monitoring years 2017/18; 2018/19 and 2019/20 was broadly in line and in some cases exceeded the policy requirement which is further evidence that the current policy requirement is appropriate for the current market. Maintaining the current policy requirement and with it the currently market certainty is vital to ensuring the affordable housing requirements of the District continue to be met
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 7	Hallam are of the view that the Local Plan Review should keep the affordable housing tenure mix requirement the same as the current Local Plan as this was recently (5years) determined appropriate through the examination and subsequent adoption of the Local Plan. Hallam are of the view that maintaining the current policy requirement, and with it the currently market certainty, is vital to ensuring the affordable housing requirements of the District continue to be met. Supporting text makes reference to the Government’s First Homes policy but are of the view this requirement should be explicitly included within the future policy wording.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 8	The decision on a housing internal space standards policy should not be made in advance of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan as this could risk contradicting the Sustainable Design and Construction (Policy Option 1) and Energy (Policy Option 2) draft policy objectives the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan is seeking to achieve. Hallam would not support seeking uplift from established national or forthcoming standards (e.g., the Government’s forthcoming future homes standard) in the context of seeking to achieve the suggested Vision for the District as well as the holistic vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. A benefit of existing or established standards is that they are supported by an evidence base. Robust evidence to support higher than national standards is unlikely to be forthcoming. There is a risk an uplift in standards would undermine the ability to achieve other, equally as important, objectives, including the delivery of affordable housing

LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Separation Distances	Strongly object to the introduction of a policy requiring minimum separation distances between residential properties as this suggestion is not evidence based nor is it consistent with national policy or guidance. No supporting evidence has been published which tests the implications of introducing such a requirement. Hallam are of the view that the following assessments would need to be undertaken as a minimum before a policy requirement of this nature could be considered for inclusion in the Local Plan review. Site capacity of the District (including existing site allocations) against the proposed housing requirement – which won't be known until a decision is made on the County-wide housing requirement as part of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan; Viability assessment (which takes into account the capacity considerations); and District-wide Urban Design implications study. The lack of any supporting evidence, particularly with respects to District-wide capacity testing, could have serious implications for the growth requirements and holistic vision the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan seeks to achieve. The introduction of a policy requiring minimum separation distances between residential properties could artificially limit Cherwell District Council's ability to meet a fair contribution of the Oxfordshire growth requirement – to be decided at the Regulation 19 stage of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. Design implications of introducing such a requirement have not been tested and could have serious implications on the character of sensitive areas such as conservation areas. No suggestion within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) nor the National Design Guide (NDG) or National Model Design Code (NMDC) which suggest or require a policy for minimum separation distances between residential properties. The NMDC only refers to separation in respect of ensuring there is clear separation between public and private spaces. The NPPF at paragraphs 60 and 124 set out the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes and making efficient use of land which do not support the introduction of a policy requiring minimum separation distances between residential properties. In short, there is no national planning policy support for introduce a minimum separation distance between dwellings.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 9	The decision on a housing accessibility standards policy should not be made in advance of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan as this could risk contradicting the Sustainable Design and Construction (Policy Option 1) and Energy (Policy Option 2) draft policy objectives the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan is seeking to achieve. Not support seeking uplift from established national or forthcoming national standards (e.g., the Government's forthcoming future homes standard) in the context of seeking to achieve the suggested Vision for the District as well as the holistic vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. There is a risk an uplift in standards would undermine the ability to achieve other, equally as important, objectives, including the delivery of affordable housing.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Housing Policies	Hallam wish to reserve comment at this stage until the policy options that are to be included within the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and their interrelationship with the individual District Plans has been confirmed. Would not support seeking uplift from established national or forthcoming national standards (e.g., the Government's forthcoming future homes standard) in the context of seeking to achieve the suggested Vision for the District as well as the holistic vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. There is a risk an uplift in standards would undermine the ability to achieve other, equally as important, objectives, including the delivery of affordable housing.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 10	Support suggestion 1 and are of the view that the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 should not set further sustainable standards and instead leave this for the Government to set at the national level. More specifically, the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 should look to the Government's forthcoming Future Homes Standards to set the policy direction with respects to the future construction of homes. Seeking uplift from established national or forthcoming standards risks the Council's ability to achieve the suggested Vision for the District as well as the holistic vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Hallam wish to reserve comment at this stage until the policy options that are to be included within the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and their interrelationship with the individual District Plans has been confirmed.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 12	The natural environment is not easily divided into discrete parcels or sites and as such Hallam contend that a flexible approach should be pursued to ensure the best outcome for the natural environment. A hybrid approach which combines suggestions 1, 2 and 3 should be pursued and this offers the best opportunity to ensure biodiversity improvements (whether that be through land and/or funds contributions) are directed to where they are needed most and/or would be most effective. The Environment Bill which is expected to achieve Royal Assent before the end of the year proposes to introduce a biodiversity credit system. Any future policy requirement which seeks to secure contributions with respects to biodiversity (whether that be standalone or as part of a hybrid policy) should utilise this biodiversity credit system rather than unnecessarily seek to set up a separate system. This could also ensure a consistent approach is applied across the Oxfordshire Authorities to secure an effective policy that can be implemented anywhere across the County area.

LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 13	The decision on a natural capital policy should not be made in advance of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan as this could risk contradicting the environmental enhancement policies- Policy Option 07 and Policy Option 08 sought at the JSP level. Support the principle of strengthening the ecological networks, biodiversity, and resilience to climate change of the County. Hallam, however, did raise concerns with the specifics of the policy options seeking clarity and suggesting the two policy options (Policy Option 07 & 08) could be more effective if combined. It would be premature to make a decision on natural capital and how to implement this through the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 without the clarity on what the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan seeks to achieve and how they interrelate. Hallam would not support a policy requirement which sought a natural capital assessment or a requirement to demonstrate environmental net gain as the concept of assessing natural capital is in its early development in comparison to biodiversity net gain. The 'DEFRA Metric' developed to measure and monitor biodiversity net gain has undergone numerous iterations, stakeholder, and public consultations and continues to be refined. No such equivalent currently exists for natural capital. In the case of most major development proposals, effects on the natural environment are tested and mitigated through the Environmental Impact Assessment process. Introducing such a requirement risks unnecessary delays to delivery and risks the Council's ability to achieve the suggested Vision for the District as well as the holistic vision of the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Hallam wish to reserve comment at this stage until the policy options that are to be included within the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and their interrelationship with the individual District Plans has been confirmed. Hallam wish to stress that the Cherwell Local Plan Review should seek uplift from established national or forthcoming national standards (e.g., the 10% requirement for biodiversity net gain within the forthcoming Environment Bill).
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 14	Hallam have no specific suggestions with respects to policy requirements for children's play but are of the view that a flexible approach should be pursued to ensure the needs for children's play can be most effectively met.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 15	Hallam are of the view that the future Local Plan should adopt a flexible approach to achieve the best outcome for outdoor sports provision for the District and beyond. A flexible approach would ensure more feasible facilities are grouped together which are better suited to supporting a wide range of outdoor sports. For example, the provision of changing facilities or storage facilities in close proximity to existing outdoors sports facilities that may well be just beyond an application site boundary. Pursuing a flexible approach to outdoor sports provision would secure a better overall outcome (both in terms of provision and range of opportunities) for the District, and the County, than limited provision sporadically dotted around.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Hallam are of the view that the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 can best support improvements in design but acting as a flagship plan on how to effectively implement the Government's National Model Design Guide and National Model Design Code into local planning policy. The timing of the Local Plan review in relation to the publication of both documents provides the optimum opportunity to lead the way in how Government policy and guidance should be interpreted into local planning policy. Adopting such an approach would allow the other Oxfordshire Authorities to adopt the same method to further ensure a coherent planning policy framework across Oxfordshire.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principle but are of the view that this should not be used as the sole or rigid determinant for allocating development sites as there are other equally important sustainability considerations which should be taken account of. This is important for Cherwell as there is a high number of rural settlements which would struggle to meet all of the defined characteristics of the '20-minute neighbourhood' but do offer sustainable locations for future development. For example, the settlement of Ambrosden benefits from the following: existing population estimated to be over 2,500 people; a range of local facilities; large areas of land which benefit from a lack of technical constraints; and, sustainable transport opportunities to Bicester. The above demonstrates a sustainable location for development when considered holistically but may not meet every characteristic of a 20-minute neighbourhood.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Hallam would support an approach which recognised that there is a variation in the opportunities available at the rural settlements vs. urban centres for reducing the need to travel (a principle highlighted by paragraph 105 of the NPPF). In that regard, a greater focus on low carbon technology and sustainable transport opportunities, such as frequent public transport and cycle routes, would be more appropriate for the rural settlements.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 16	Hallam support suggestion 1 to provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections. However, Hallam are of the view that should this approach be pursued, a caveat should be included within the policy requirements which notes that rural locations are less likely to be able to achieve highquality, and highspeed, digital connections and this should be considered accordingly when selecting sites for development.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Transport Policies	Hallam wish to reserve comment at this stage until the policy options that are to be included within the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and their interrelationship with the individual District Plans has been confirmed.

LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 17	Hallam generally supports a place-based approach to infrastructure planning and recently advocated for such as part of the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) Stage 1 consultation. A place-based approach enables a better consideration of schemes that may be important to the creation of successful places and better supports initiatives that deliver decarbonisation, particularly in relation to public transport bus services. Therefore, Hallam are of the view that Cherwell District Council should continue to prepare the IDP by place to ensure a continuity between the IDP and overarching OxIS. Flexibility will be required so as not to prejudice any decision on the spatial strategy for the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Hallam wish to reserve comment at this stage until the policy options that are to be included within the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and their interrelationship with the individual District Plans has been confirmed.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 30	Regardless of the spatial strategy pursued at the County-level, the significant role that the rural settlements play in the function of the spatial strategy should continue to be recognised at the District level. Approximately 31% of the District's population live outside the main urban areas, whilst there has been growth within these rural settlements which has met the 2015 Local Plan growth requirement this will need to be reassessed in light of the housing requirement set at the County level. Not only that but there will be a need to ensure sufficient choice within these rural communities to maintain local communities and the viability of existing and new services and/or facilities. Hallam would exercise caution at this stage with suggestions that the rural communities have met their 'requirement' as this would be premature and potentially disregard sustainable development opportunities at key settlements.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 31	Hallam support suggestion 1 and agree that the emerging Local Plan should work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Hallam are of the view that it is imperative that local communities are given a voice when selecting sites particularly within the rural communities. To this regard, the future policy should include a provision which stipulates that development on sites where local support can be demonstrated are to be considered favourably. Development sites which offer the most compatible community benefits would be selected by the local communities and reflected within the Local Plan. If this approach is pursued it would fit seamlessly within the forthcoming planning policy structure of the overarching Oxfordshire 2050 Plan which is to set the future spatial strategy and housing need at a county level with the local communities then directing the choice of specific sites at the local level. Engagement with the local communities would need to be undertaken in a fair and constructive manner to achieve consistency across the District. Engagement would need to be undertaken on a regular basis to ensure the development sites selected are delivering as promised and reflect the evolving needs of communities. Selection of sites by local communities would need to fit within the overarching spatial strategy and vision for the District. Therefore, the majority of the development sites should be directed to the more sustainable villages that are within close proximity and have a close functional relationship with the main urban areas with local communities selecting sites within those areas. The provision of a policy which seeks the views of local communities should not allow the community which 'shouts loudest' to dictate which settlements growth is directed to and risk compromising the overall vision for the District and net zero ambitions of the County.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Option 32	Hallam are pleased to see a recognition of the need for reviewing the rural settlement hierarchy. It is disappointing that the document outlines two options for developing the rural settlement hierarchy and seeks views on the preferred approach. Hallam contend that developing the rural settlement hierarchy is a holistic process which must consider a range of factors not just one consideration and it is necessary to update and review Category A villages in the context of the additional housing need to establish which settlements are the most sustainable to help meet housing needs. Previous evidence consists of: i.) Cherwell Integrated Transport and Land Use Study (CRAITLUS) published in 2009; (ii.) Technical Note on Village Categorisation contained in the Topic Paper 2: Housing Appendix 3 (January 2014); and (iii.) Village Categorisation Update (August 2014). There are significant differences between different Category A villages as defined in the adopted Local Plan Part 1. For example, larger villages with populations of 1,500- 2,500 people were grouped together with those with less than 600. CRAITLUS overall sustainability scores showed that settlements with as low as 17 out of 30 are now considered to be just as sustainable as settlements achieving a score 28 or more out of 30. The Village Categorisation Update 2014 essentially confirmed that there had been no change in the relative sustainability of the settlements. The village categorisation should now be updated and reviewed with an additional analysis to identify the most sustainable villages capable of best meeting development needs. In developing the evidence and rural settlement hierarchy, consideration should be given to: scale; local affordable housing needs; range of local facilities and proximity to and accessibility of the settlement to the identified urban centres by sustainable transport modes. It is suggested that the rural settlement hierarchy it will show a further differentiation is justified between the more sustainable villages, such as Ambrosden, and smaller villages due to the significant degree of variation in terms of their size and sustainability.
LPR-B-641	David Lock Associates for Hallam Land management	Question - Development Management Policies	Hallam wish to reserve comment at this stage until the policy options that are to be included within the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan and their interrelationship with the individual District Plans has been confirmed.

LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-178	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>
LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-081	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>



LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-002	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>
LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-156	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>

LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-077	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>
LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-146	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>

LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-258	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>
LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-086	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>

LPR-B-642	Lyndsey Scholz	LPR-A-218	<p>Object. I appreciate the pressure local planning authorities are under nationally. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since 2011 census. Owing largely to post2015 developments on each of the roads into the village, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built this amount to a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past 6 years, particularly, has been overwhelming, and compromised its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north which have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if more development occurs, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village. Traffic speed has caused recent problems for the village and even with the recent addition of the new chicanes at the entrances to the village. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. A few families on St Marys Road have already had school applications refused by Christopher Rawlins due to capacity restrictions; meaning the children need to travel to neighbouring towns/villages to attend school. In addition to this there are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking during school opening/closing hours. The extra traffic development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area.</p> <p>Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is concerning. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats which mitigation can offset. The proposals will irreversibly destroy not only the character of our community but our wildlife habitats too. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths popular with residents. The presence of fossils in the ploughed fields. Residents of Berry Hill and St Marys Road will have significant concerns over the security and privacy of their homes if these sites are developed upon. Adderbury has the highest hectare coverage amongst Cherwell villages and second highest hectare coverage in the entire proposal. This seems unfair. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade continues, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, undesirable and unsustainable way.</p>
LPR-B-644	Jan and Diana Thompson	Sibford Gower	<p>Object. Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower should not in our view for the purposes of any future Local Plan be regarded as one village. Not only are they physically separated by the Sib Valley the villages are different from each other in a number of subtle ways. The villages have different physical characteristics and indeed a different atmosphere/feel which was not apparent to us until we moved from one to the other. The minimal public transport serving the village means that any significant further expansion of housing will be dependent on car usage. The relative lack of commercial facilities in the villages means car usage by residents will still be heavy and this is neither desirable from the point of view of sustainability or indeed traffic movements within the villages. The general infrastructure of the village will be unlikely to cope with anything other than the most modest levels of new development</p>
LPR-B-644	Tadmarton Parish Council	Option 30	Option 1- limit development in rural areas to that required to meet local needs, if at all needed whilst respecting village constraints
LPR-B-644	Tadmarton Parish Council	Option 31	Option 3 - use a combination of work with communities and provide a parish level figure to allow for Neighbourhood Planning/community-led plans. Direction should be driven by the parish and not OCC or CDC. For additional rural housing, it should not be driven by developers or central government departments as they do not understand individual parish requirements or concerns. The process should be a joint venture with the Parish having the final say.
LPR-B-644	Tadmarton Parish Council	Option 32	We should give weight to settlement size, existing infrastructure (or lack of), transport availability, suitable road layout, connectivity, environment, conservation areas, carbon footprint, health and wellbeing of parishioners, footpaths/bredleways and cycleway routes
LPR-B-644	Tadmarton Parish Council	Question - Settlement	Yes, they should be defined.
LPR-B-644	Tadmarton Parish Council	Option 33	Option 3 - combination. Where possible, use existing facilities or the renovation of existing facilities but where such facilities do not meet the need then and only then specific sites for development will need to be identified. Important not to create conflict but enhance a synergistic approach.
LPR-B-644	Tadmarton Parish Council	Option 34	Option 1- retain current approach but look to strengthen guidelines by declaring areas which have specific landscape/countryside qualities, historical values, wildlife habitats, PPOW, conservation areas. Strengthened guidelines should then form an absolute guarantee that designated areas become protected
LPR-B-644	Tadmarton Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Not having developed a local plan, the first stage would be to understand how one is built and what should be included. A parish "teach in" may be required.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 1	Broadly Support - pleased Vision recognises Cherwell's position within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and the excellent links.

LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 2	Broadly support - also support the fact meeting the needs for employment and housing as well as raising the value of the local economy sit at the very top of the list. Would however suggest they are reduced in number and made more succinct. Having 31no. key objectives has the effect of diluting key messages.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 3	Option 1 and 2 - at main urban centres and significant transport interchanges. Client's site is consistent with both, east of Banbury J11.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 4	To provide for key sectors of the local economy it is important to provide sites that meet these requirements on accordance with paragraph 83 of the NPPF. This should be based on robust evidence and meet the objectives of paragraph 81 of the NPPF ("Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development"). Client's proposal east of J11 would align with key objectives 1 and 2. Specifically, it would help unlock the CambridgeOxford Arc as a premier growth corridor. <b>The site meets the criteria of the Council's Economic Needs Assessment Report (Sept 2021).</b>
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Question - Supporting	No - other policies in the plan should be capable of delivering the objectives.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 10	Support Option 1 - to not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan, leaving this for Building Regulations (option 2 would create unnecessary duplication and option 3 would ignore the message from the government that such matters are to be dealt with at national level to avoid inconsistency)
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Support for logistics development being well located adjacent to key transport links and interchanges contribute to managing climate change by minimising the need to travel. It also supports home shopping which again reduces the need to travel for individual households.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 12	A flexible approach should be taken for BNG. On a case by case bases. The Client's site could offer such benefits, but more might be gained with coordinated enhancements in focused areas to secure optimum benefits rather than a piecemeal approach. Greystoke CB support a policy which allows all approaches to be considered at the application stage.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 13	The natural capital assessment, if required, should be carried out at the Plan making stage rather than through the development management process. Many aspects of natural capital are already considered through other guidance and legislation.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The client's proposal at J11 M40 would provide employment opportunities at Banbury supported by sustainable transport measures reducing net commuting from Banbury to other locations. Its location at a motorway junction minimises the need for HGVs to travel through urban and rural roads. Any development proposals for the site will come forward with a package of public transport measures that can assist in reducing emissions.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 16	General support for enhanced digital connections and provision of the necessary digital infrastructure to support local and national economy.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Question - Transport Policies	Policies that support the logistics sector by reducing congestion, and locating such development in accessible and sustainable locations at key junctions on the strategic road network.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 18	The Plan should consider further extensions at Banbury including employment opportunities to exploit its sustainability credentials (e.g. land east of Banbury given its proximity to the M40)
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Option 19	Option 3 - East of the town (including east of the M40/J11) - this can exploit accessibility to the strategic highway network.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Question - Addressing Inequality in	Realising employment opportunities is part of the solution in Banbury.
LPR-B-645	Pegasus Group for Greystoke CB	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Junction 11 M40, Banbury	Land at Junction 11 M40, Banbury is promoted for employment.
LPR-B-646	Oxfordshire Badger Group	Option 1	The local plan needs to commit fully to tackling climate change and ecological emergency. The plan has good intentions but its current emphasis is on encouraging economic growth and population growth. Unsustainable housing targets - the plan should aim for the minimum possible growth in new housing stock. We are concerned proposals consulted under Oxfordshire Plan 2050 are far in excess of projected natural population growth. This growth would irreparable harm to our local environment, our communities and ultimately the planet. Cherwell needs to ensure that it puts planning policies in place to ensure that decisions favour the enhancement and retention of biodiversity and the natural environment. This is for the benefit not only of nature but the health and wealth of the people of Cherwell. In our experience, under the current system nature and wildlife is more often than not undervalued, ignored or side-lined. <b>The Local Plan is an opportunity to rectify this.</b>

LPR-B-646	Oxfordshire Badger Group	Question - Green Belt	The green belt is a permanent designation. The council should have policies in place to encourage land owners to improve biodiversity (planting of hedgerows, trees etc.). Green belt should not be kept 'green' if allocated to car parks/park and rides or other uses that impact the natural environment. No further review of the green belt should be performed. Land already allocated through review should be ample.
LPR-B-646	Oxfordshire Badger Group	Option 12	1: Sites that cannot achieve a satisfactory net gain (BNG) or mitigation are not suitable for development. Off site measures are open to abuse and should not be routinely permitted (or permitted only where doing so is clearly advantageous. 2: The number and scope of Conservation Target Areas and Nature recovery network should be increased. Sites of local nature interest (identified by the community) should also be protected. Development within these areas must be able to demonstrate a very high contribution to BNG. Those that cannot should be refused permission. There should not be a presumption that only sites of special designation/ interest merit protection. Nature should not be confined to specific zones with 'anything goes' permitted elsewhere. 3: support option 3. Further, Cherwell should be actively working to help local bodies to network and undertake work of enhancing biodiversity. A coordinated approach is needed. Cherwell should promote measures that householders and landowners can take to help biodiversity (e.g. hedgehog routes through garden fencing). Sites that include badger sett or important foraging area merit special attention. Our group should be notified at an early stage and given the opportunity to comment. There should be a policy of protecting and enhancing hedgerows and woods across the district. Measures should be taken to avoid badger/human conflict e.g. by 'badger proofing' allotments.
LPR-B-646	Oxfordshire Badger Group	Option 13	We are sceptical that attempts to put monetary value to the natural world will help efforts to preserve its value. However, we support options 1 and 2 with the caveat that all calculations and the evidence base for each natural capital assessment must be transparent and placed in the public domain
LPR-B-646	Oxfordshire Badger Group	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	The Environment Bill has become law. It requires long term improvements in air, water, nature and waste. The public demands greater protection for wildlife and the environment. Cherwell should take action now to set local targets for improvement. The key policy requirement is to prioritise biodiversity and the natural environment over development, excessive growth (over and above that needed by residents). The NPPF presumption in favour of development is an obstacle to efforts to tackle the environmental emergency
LPR-B-646	Oxfordshire Badger Group	Question - Local Green Spaces	We support the creation of local greenspaces. There should be no reason Cherwell should not approve LGS designation to any space proposed by the local community that meets the needs of NPPF criteria.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	Adderbury	The Adderbury Neighbourhood Development Plan (ANP) should carry weight - it is now a statutory requirement as part of the local planning decision process including the Local Plan. Policy AD1 states that development proposals will not be supported outside of settlement boundary unless demonstrated it will enhance, or at least not harm, the local landscape character. Adderbury Parish Council support the concern about the coalescence of villages and sites north of the village are getting close to Bodicote and Banbury. Policy AD3: Local Green spaces designate 7 locations. Residents are seeing a continued loss of green spaces and the elimination of wildlife corridors. This should be considered fully, in all its aspects when forming this Local Plan. It seems that Adderbury is in danger of bearing a disproportionate amount of CDC housing targets and the Parish Council requires that any housing allocation should be proportionate with that allocated to large urban settlements like Banbury and Bicester and other parishes in the rural area. There does not appear to be any reference to waste management in the Plan and how that will be dealt with as part of the proposals. There have also been reports recently of businesses pumping sewage into open waters such as rivers in the Cherwell area and that needs to be addressed too.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	Parish Profile - Adderbury	Maps - Would be helpful for all parish profiles to include areas of land which already have planning permission but not yet built, and those included in the Local Plan. It would then allow for more accurate analysis, especially highlighting coalescence. It would be helpful if the map could outline any additional road works or road developments, so that it is clear how the additional impact of traffic will be controlled. The map should also include new community developments, such as the community facility on Milton Road. It would be helpful to indicate where points of interest are in the village. It would be helpful to show the current number of households in Adderbury. Housing completions and committed figures do not include the development on Berry Hill Road (40 dwellings). Census information is very out of date. It would be useful to indicate on the map where flood zones 2/3 are. Pleased that key green spaces are identified. Visual connections to St Mary's Church from the south are mentioned, but strong visual connections from the north should be considered. No mention of Walled Garden Allotments or Adderbury Cemetery. St George RC no longer exists, it is now a house. A new community pavillion and sports pitches are currently under development and this is not mentioned. Employment sites are mentioned, but there are many small businesses operating in the village which is not mentioned. Ball-Colegrave is not included. The Lucy Plackett Playing Field is the correct name for 'Adderbury Recreation Ground'. There are many community groups in the village which could be listed.  Constraints: new large scale development needs provision for a primary school/secondary school/doctors/dental and should be in accordance with ANP; avoid development near Adderbury Lakes Nature Reserve and Sor Brook Valley or any designated green space; protection of bats, swifts and all wildlife and increasing biodiversity, especially bees; flood zones, conservation area; views of St Mary's Church; traffic control and congestion through the village, losing the 'green and rural' aspect of the village, affordable housing and 1 bedroom housing needed, affordable housing to reflect lower wages, footpaths and PRoW. Opportunities: Section 106 funds to mitigate impacts, boost income for existing businesses, larger pool of potential employees, boost for village facilities. Other considerations: any development must comply with Neighbourhood Plan. Some sites impact Conservation Area and views of church, new developments should have adequate greenspace, electric charging points, energy efficient heating and sufficient insulation, adequate off-road parking, preserve the rural character and encourage all residents to think about their green footprint. Need for more cycle lanes. A need for good quality housing developments (many look the same and lose the character of the village. Often poor quality).
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-002	Already has outline planning permission for a care home extension and is within the settlement boundary in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan (ANP). Could have potential for limited housing if suitably designed. Suitable as a Rural Exception Site

LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-041	Obejection. Outside of the settlement boundary.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-077	Objection. Within settlement boundary but no access. Detract from views of St. Mary's Church.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-077	Objection. Within settlement boundary but no access. Detract from views of St. Mary's Church and Adderbury Conservation Area.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-081	Objection. Outside settlement boundary. Within Twyford Gap and would lead to coalescence.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-086	Objection. Outside settlement boundary. Adversly affect views of St. Mary's church and Adderbury Conservation Area.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-086	Objection. This is outside the Adderbury Settlement Boundary. Development could be seen as beginning to creep towards Deddington.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-146	Objection. Outside settlement boundary.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-156	Objection. Outside settlement boundary, and would affect views of Sor Brook vallye and St. Mary's Church and Adderbury Conservation Area.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-178	Objection. Outside settlement boundary and within Twynford Gap and would lead to coalescence.
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-218	Parish Council objected to this application, however it has now been allowed by Appeal for outline permission and the 40 houses should be an absolute maximum. There should be a suitable mix of housing styles, including affordable housing
LPR-B-647	Adderbury Parish Council	LPR-A-258	Objection. Outside settlement boundary and would lead to coalescence.
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of Merton Road, Ambrosden	Land north of Merton Road, Ambrosden is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA376. A Vision Document, Landscape and Visual Technical Note, Masterplan, Transport and Highways Appraisal, Archaeology Built Heritage Appraisal, and Flood Risk and Drainage Appraisal has been submitted with the representation.
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Call for Sites Promotion - Land south of Park Farm Close, Ambrosden	Land south of Park Farm Close, Ambrosden is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA016. A Vision Document, Landscape and Visual Technical Note, Masterplan, Transport and Highways Appraisal, Archaeology Built Heritage Appraisal, and Flood Risk and Drainage Appraisal has been submitted with the representation.
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 1	Broadly agree with the suggested vision for Cherwell and its coverage of a wide range of development issues. Point 3- however this a little too vague and although there is reference to ageing communities, we observe a lack of specific reference to housing provision and delivery, including affordable housing, which should have greater prominence in the vision, being at the forefront of the plan. Given Cherwell's position, it is particularly well located to accommodate sustainable growth. More homes are greatly needed across Cherwell and Oxfordshire as a whole, and the high cost of housing has significant impacts for those living and working in the area, which also has knock-on effects on economic growth. The latest ONS data for 2020 shows that Oxfordshire is one of the least affordable counties to live in, with average house prices in Cherwell 9.3 times the average income. There are approaching 10,000 people on the affordable housing waiting list across Oxfordshire and according to Cherwell's housing performance 2020-2021, as of April 2021, the housing register comprises 1,449 households, a 15% increase from the previous year. This illustrates that the need for more affordable homes is evidently growing. There is a significant and growing housing need and demand across Cherwell and Oxfordshire as a whole. Housing provision is a key consideration in informing and identifying areas for future growth and should therefore have a greater emphasis within the vision to better guide development to 2040, ensuring future needs are met. Spatial option 1, supplemented by elements of options 3 and 4, is considered the best approach to achieving Oxfordshire's Vision. Focusing new homes in areas already identified as being suitable for growth, that have or will have access to sustainable transport modes and that benefit from new and improved employment provision is the optimum approach. Ambrosden near Bicester would represent a ideal location for new homes that would fit with this spatial strategy and illustrate the potential spatial realisation of this strategy.
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 2	Objectives 1, 20, 21, 23, 27, 28 and 31 to be most relevant, as these relate to land for housing and employment and meeting housing needs, development in sustainable locations and accessibility to services and facilities, which are the key elements and considerations in identifying areas for future sustainable growth

LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 3	Employment land should be focused as a combination of 4 options, including the main urban centres (including Bicester); at significant transport interchanges; on previously developed land, including in less sustainable locations and at the larger villages such as Ambrosden, in order to deliver the jobs needed in Cherwell. Agree with the need to make effective and efficient use of previously developed land, it must be recognised that brownfield redevelopment alone will not deliver the level of economic growth needed. It is also important that the focus is not solely on the main urban centres, but also on sustainable settlements close to but outside of the main urban centres to ensure they are not left behind. The same can be said for housing growth. Economic growth and housing are interdependent and go hand in hand, both of which facilitate the sustainable growth of places. If not enough houses are provided or not enough people are able to buy houses in the area, then this is likely to have a significant impact on labour supply at all levels due to insufficient provision and people being priced out of the area. This will impact companies driving economic growth and also the supply chain companies and service industry that makes up a successful region. This is confirmed in the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment (July 2021), which states “it is clear that affordability issues are having a real impact not just on young people in Oxfordshire, but its business community. If left unaddressed this could hold back future economic growth potential.” Housing is a key component of economic delivery and there is a need for housing to meet the forecast growth and economic aspirations of the District. Ambrosden is an example of a place near to planned employment growth at Bicester, where additional housing growth will help to reinforce employment growth and to create a sustainable place.
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 4	Support development in locations where new homes can be located close to jobs to support economic development and reduce the need to travel. Needs to account for planned employment growth in order to allow for consideration of alternative options for future growth areas. For example, the Graven Hill masterplan includes significant new employment space which, whilst not yet built out, will nonetheless provide an important employment hub during the plan period which will mean locations such as Ambrosden will be ideally located to accommodate housing growth that will support the new employment opportunities coming forward in a way which minimises travel. The spatial options considered should also therefore take account of future provision but specific opportunities to support existing businesses by considering housing and other opportunities in these locations. For example, opportunities to improve linkages to planned employment areas may be possible for the land promoted at Ambrosden by Obsidian Strategic.
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 6	To enable a sufficient level of affordable housing is brought forwards up to 2040, the emerging Local Plan must allocate enough medium and large scale sites to allow for greater affordable housing provision across the District. Allocating more housing is the most effective way to deliver more affordable housing. We consider that the percentage levels of affordable housing should be kept the same as in the 2015 Local Plan – 30% at Banbury and Bicester and 35% across the rest of the District and not increased. This will assist in ensuring future proposals can be viably developed. Any affordable housing figure should be tested robustly to ensure the delivery of housing is not undermined. The emerging plan should therefore be aspirational in its plans for new homes as this will help to not only significantly boost the supply of housing overall, which is a key Government objective as expressed in the NPPF, but specifically improve the supply of affordable housing. There are approaching 10,000 people on the affordable housing waiting lists across Oxfordshire. The most successful vehicle for delivery of affordable homes is as part of new development allocations, particularly on greenfield sites, which can usually deliver a high proportion of affordable homes as part of a balanced community than on brownfield sites. A more aspirational housing figure would hence also deliver more affordable homes. Aspiring to meet the Transformational housing requirement would likely deliver over 4 times the number of affordable units between 2030 and 2050 than the number of homes required by just the Standard Method. Affordable housing is essential to ensure a balanced and diverse community results with key workers and those on low incomes an essential part of the economy. The preferred approach to Policy 30 (Affordable Homes) which leaves local authorities to set affordable housing requirements is supported. Whilst affordability issues are endemic across the County, there are differences in the particular market dynamics across the region, as well as different viability considerations across the County. Suggested requirement that the District Authorities seek ‘maximum’ levels of affordable housing is considered unnecessary if the expectation is that authorities set their own standards based on local evidence. Whilst supporting the delivery of more affordable housing, any affordable housing policy within the Oxfordshire plan should point to the need for district authorities to base their affordable housing policies and requirements on robust local evidence. It is important that the viability of any affordable housing policy is robustly tested, including taking account of the costs associated with other policy requirements, such as proposed environmental standards which will increase home building costs. Sufficient flexibility has to be provided to make sure the policy is open to review to take account of changing circumstances over time.
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Housing Policies	More homes are greatly needed across Oxfordshire and the high cost of housing has significant impacts for those living and working in Oxfordshire, as well as on economic growth. The latest ONS data for 2020 shows that Oxfordshire is one of the least affordable Counties to live in, with average house prices being over ten times the average income. If not enough people are able to buy houses in the area then this is likely to have a significant impact on labour supply at all levels as people are priced out of the area. This will impact companies driving the economic growth and also the supply chain companies and service industry that makes up a successful region. To match the aspirations of the Growth Deal up to 2050 also requires aspirational housing delivery that exceeds what the Standard Method alone would deliver. The Growth Deal agreed that Oxfordshire would plan to deliver at least 100,000 new homes by 2030. The aspirations for further delivery beyond 2030 and up to 2050 should match these commitments and plan for growth that will continue to improve the economic and social prosperity of the County. The Oxfordshire Plan provides a unique opportunity to plan holistically, across the country, to achieve these aims. Failure to plan for higher number of homes would likely result in a significant reduction in home building beyond 2030, despite forecast continued growth in Oxfordshire’s population.



LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Green Belt	<p>The result of exceptional employment growth in the County has brought considerable economic benefits to the area. It is has resulted in higher house prices and, as a result, increased, unsustainable, in commuting from relatively more affordable areas outside of the County. This is recognised in the conclusions of the OGNA report. This is contrary to the NPPF and Government policy on promoting sustainable development. A strategic approach to plan making across borders provides opportunities for a holistic approach to housing growth which increases the opportunities for identifying sites for housing delivery outside the constraints within the County, such as its AONBs and Green Belt. The proposals hence provide an opportunity for true cross border planning that can deliver effectively the houses the borough needs without harming environmentally, sensitive area or Assuming an average 40% affordable housing requirement, 40% of the residual Standard Method housing quantum equals 6,450 affordable units. 40% of the residual Transformational housing quantum equals 26,934 affordable units. needing substantial Green Belt release. The plan should use this opportunity to be aspirational in its housing delivery. Planning to achieve higher housing delivery of at least 5,000 new homes per annum up to 2050 should be a key priority at the forefront of the new plan which will increase investment into the country and provide leverage for achieving the plans aspirations, for example around climate change and exemplary design. The aspirations of Policy 29 (Urban renewal) which focus development on previously developed land, are not disputed. The strategy must recognise that brownfield redevelopment alone will not deliver the level of housing growth and investment Oxfordshire requires. Brownfield development is inevitably more complex and costly and often cannot afford to deliver the same levels of community and infrastructure benefits, such as affordable housing and infrastructure investment, that an equivalent greenfield development can provide. Whilst not objecting to policies that may enable brownfield development, such policies and approach to growth should not be to the exclusion of greenfield development, recognising the additional benefits such developments can bring, such as infrastructure investment and affordable homes. Option 2 focus on Oxford led growth, covers urban development within the City of Oxford, along with new or extended urban extensions on the edge of the City. Following the release of land on the edge of the city in the Cherwell, South and Vale local plans there are only limited options for additional growth and it is anticipated that greenbelt land would need to be released in order to facilitate any expansion. This option contradicts the objective of the protection and enhancement of Oxfordshire's highly valued countryside and landscape and the maintenance of an effective Green Belt around in line with national policy. This option is hence considered the least sustainable as it would likely compromise the objectives and purposes of the Green Belt contrary to the NPPF, particularly when suitable alternative options to Green Belt release exist.</p>
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 10	<p>Policy options 1 – 3 (Sustainable Design and Construction, Energy and Water Efficiency) are laudable in their aims, they need to be led by national policy and regulation, particularly Building Regulations. The Government is already reviewing the requirements of Building Regulations, which will likely require considerably higher environmental standards within all new homes. Building Regulations remain the most suitable mode for setting energy and efficiency requirements as they provide certainty and consistency as to how measures will be assessed and applied through the design and construction of development. If higher standards are pursued through the Oxfordshire plan, the effect on viability, both in terms of technical standards and in financial terms, needs to be thoroughly considered. This should include consideration of how it may affect the ability of developments to deliver against other policy requirements and aspirations, such as affordable housing. If higher standards are set by Oxfordshire, a county wide approach is supported to provide some consistency of approach, but this must also be mirrored in how the policy is applied by each authority.</p>
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 12	<p>The broad need to provide biodiversity net gains to offset the historic loss of biodiversity is supported. Requirements of Policy Option 8 (Biodiversity Gain) need to make sure they are thoroughly tested in viability terms, including against the latest DEFRA BNG metric, particularly if targets beyond those forecast within the Environment Bill are sought. Any such target will also need to consider what affect this may have on the capacity of sites to deliver housing, which may require additional areas for growth to be considered. A more nuanced approach which focuses biodiversity net gains on areas where they can provide the best ecological benefit would be more sensible. Consideration should be given to allowing opportunities to utilise Biodiversity Credits to offset losses or gains which can provide a valuable way for development schemes to come forward whilst providing funds towards ecology improvements that can be focused on priority areas.</p>
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 22	<p>Areas around Bicester should be identified as a location for further growth. Development should be focused at existing and new settlements well connected to Bicester, specifically Ambrosden. Focusing new homes in areas already identified as being suitable for growth, that have or will have access to sustainable transport modes and that benefit from new and improved employment provision is a logical approach. Ambrosden would represent an ideal location for new homes, given the recent growth at Graven Hill, which has provided new facilities and employment opportunities within easy, cyclable, reach of Ambrosden thus providing opportunities for further sustainable growth in this location. Development at existing settlements well connected to Bicester, including Ambrosden, is the optimum method of achieving sustainable growth, with new development focused in areas with excellent access to sustainable travel options, services, facilities and job opportunities. Ambrosden is also located near to planned employment growth, where additional housing will help to reinforce employment growth. Further investment in areas with anticipated growth will further enhance its sustainability credentials by providing opportunities for further investment in sustainable infrastructure provision. Provision of homes in these locations means they will benefit from the latest and most sustainable facilities, for example, additional housing growth at Ambrosden will benefit from forthcoming investment in sustainable travel, services and facilities.</p>

LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 23	<p>If development is directed to Bicester requiring greenfield sites, then sites to the south of the town should be considered. Planning for housing near to sustainable transport corridors and hubs will maximise the environmental, economic and social benefits unlocked through easy access to sustainable transport nodes. Locating future developments in regions with existing sustainable developments, such as at Graven Hill which is within cycling distance of places like Ambrosden to the south, provides opportunities for residents to use established transport nodes, maximising and enhancing sustainable mobility and connectivity. The area to the south of Bicester is subject to planned service upgrades, including the OxfordBicester train line, which will improve capacity and journey times between Bicester and Oxford and therefore further enhancing opportunities for sustainable travel. The consideration of development to the south of Bicester will ensure greenfield sites that are suitable for housing growth, including at Ambrosden can benefit from the latest new facilities and services. Ensuring consideration is given to greenfield sites means those sites which are suitable, are not missed from the future housing strategy. Some areas to the west of Bicester are covered by Greenbelt designation and areas to the north and east are characterised by a greater sense of open countryside, including smaller settlements that are not as well connected to Bicester as areas to the south, including Ambrosden. South of Bicester is the most suitable direction of growth. Further investment in areas with anticipated growth will further enhance each growth area's sustainability credentials by providing opportunities for further investment in sustainable infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Provision of homes in these locations also locates housing where the latest and most sustainable facilities are going to be located. Locating development in areas close to existing larger settlements, such as Bicester, which benefits from excellent and highly sustainable developments, such as at Graven Hill, maximises opportunities for residents to use established transport nodes, such as Bicester station. Recent growth at Graven Hill for example has provided new facilities within easy reach of places like Ambrosden, providing opportunities for further sustainable growth south of Bicester, for example in Ambrosden.</p>
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 30	<p>Development should be directed proportionately to rural locations over the plan period but mostly concentrated to the highly sustainable settlements, like Ambrosden. It is important that rural areas are not left behind. Future growth should be distributed proportionately to rural settlements that are most sustainable and can accommodate additional development, with consideration of environmental and spatial constraints. This will assist in developing balanced communities. The NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.</p> <p>Ambrosden is well placed and has the capacity to grow and thrive. It is sustainably located within cycling distance to both Graven Hill, which is undergoing substantial housing growth, as well as Bicester and Bicester Village, including Bicester Village railway station, which offers onwards travel connections to Oxford and London Marylebone. Ambrosden itself also has a wide range of services and facilities to meet the day to day needs of residents.</p>
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 31	<p>A combination of working with communities to allocate specific housing sites and providing a parish level figure to each area is the best approach. It is important that rural areas are not left behind. Future growth should be distributed proportionately to rural settlements that are most sustainable and can accommodate additional development, with consideration of environmental and spatial constraints. This will assist in developing balanced communities. The NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Ambrosden is one such rural villages that is well placed and has the capacity to grow and thrive. It is sustainably located within cycling distance to both Graven Hill, which is undergoing substantial housing growth, as well as Bicester and Bicester Village, including Bicester Village railway station, which offers onwards travel connections to Oxford and London Marylebone. Ambrosden has a wide range of services and facilities to meet the day to day needs of residents. Policy Option 5 Focus on supporting rural communities covers rural Oxfordshire and focuses on the villages and areas between the villages. It includes consideration of growth proposals beyond the areas supported through the current adopted local plans. This spatial approach would focus growth in areas that are unlikely to be able to fulfil Oxfordshire's aims and objectives for the County up to 2050. Whilst appreciating a degree of limited growth may be of some benefit to rural villages, and this could be planned through Neighbourhood Plans, a focus on this option at the strategic level will likely lead to unsustainable forms of development in areas which cannot sustainability support residents. The likely scale of such developments is also such that it is unlikely that proposals will be able to viably support the significant amount of infrastructure, such as new schools and improved transport infrastructure that would support sustainable development and help Oxfordshire achieve its vision.</p>
LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Option 32	<p>It is important that rural areas are not left behind. Future growth should be distributed proportionately to rural settlements that are most sustainable and can accommodate additional development, with consideration of environmental and spatial constraints. This will assist in developing balanced communities. The NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Ambrosden is one such rural villages that is well placed and has the capacity to grow and thrive. It is sustainably located within cycling distance to both Graven Hill, which is undergoing substantial housing growth, as well as Bicester and Bicester Village, including Bicester Village railway station, which offers onwards travel connections to Oxford and London Marylebone. Ambrosden has a wide range of services and facilities to meet the day to day needs of residents.</p>

LPR-B-648	Tetra Tech for Obsidian Strategic	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Policy Option 3 provides opportunities to more equally distribute growth in a sustainable way, such as to settlements such as Ambrosden which is located about 10 minutes cycle along designated cycle routes from the major rail hub of Bicester railway station. Such locations, at 'rural' settlements, but with good access to transport nodes, offer an excellent opportunity for sustainable growth that could meet Oxfordshire's objectives of reducing the need to travel and where travel is necessary, maximising sustainable travel, whilst still distributing development and associated investment to a wide range of communities. The option is considered to not fully account for planned infrastructure investment that will significantly improve opportunities for sustainable travel in a number of areas not identified by Policy option 3. The plan should take explicit account of planned upgrades to services. Failure to consider such schemes mean potential alternative options for additional development could be missed that contribute to achieving the plans vision. Whilst appreciating there remains some uncertainty over the delivery of some longerterm schemes, given the time-frame of the plan, forecasts for improved infrastructure delivery should be considered when identifying areas for growth.
LPR-B-649	DP Ltd for Value Retail Management (Bicester Village) Ltd	Option 1	Value Retail welcomes the commitment in the Vision to ensuring Bicester continues to adapt to maintain its role as an attractive and vibrant retail, cultural and social centre for the community and visitors. As the Local Plan develops it is considered that specific major attractions within Cherwell, such as Bicester Village, should be acknowledged reflecting the importance of the role they play in supporting the urban areas of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, and the District generally. Value Retail welcomes the support for a flexible economy in the Vision and the acknowledgement that a diverse employment provision is a key driver of this. The continued sustainable growth and development of the economy, and the role that the retail and tourism sectors play in this, should be specifically emphasised. Finally, Value Retail supports the important sustainability principles established in this draft Vision and would welcome the opportunity to explore this with Cherwell, and other partners.
LPR-B-649	DP Ltd for Value Retail Management (Bicester Village) Ltd	Option 2	Supportive of key objectives. Three main themes are considered appropriate and in alignment with, and have the support of, Value Retail as they relate to sustainable growth of the district and the broader economic, social and environmental objectives of sustainable development. In terms of other themes, it is questioned whether "adaptation" could be identified as its own theme (rather than within these other themes), recognising the current challenges and future changes to the District. Within the theme of developing a sustainable local economy, Value Retail welcomes the positive attitude towards working with partners and taking a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure. It is considered that this will improve collaboration in planning and development that will help key town centres, such as Bicester, grow sustainably. The support for the growth of all sectors to create an inclusive economy is also welcomed. In particular, Value Retail is supportive of the encouragement of tourism and it is considered that the promotion of tourist activity and development should continue to be prioritised in the Local Plan. Value Retail also welcomes the support for redevelopment and renewal of Cherwell's urban centres. It is considered that this should recognise the need to adapt to the broader challenges in the retail environment highlighted by the pandemic, which has accelerated the re-thinking of the role of town centres (and retail). The ambitious climate change and environmental goals are supported and commendable. Value Retail is committed to facilitating sustainable development and promoting the sustainable operation of Bicester Village and will work with Cherwell and other stakeholders as part of this, and more widely, where possible.
LPR-B-649	DP Ltd for Value Retail Management (Bicester Village) Ltd	Option 5	Supportive of initiatives that support sustainable development of Bicester Town Centre. Welcome recognition of the role that Bicester Village plays in providing employment and attracting national and international visitors. Value Retail is pleased to engage with Cherwell's retail consultants, Nexus, on the new town centre and retail study, which will inform the development of new retail policies. In terms of the two options presented, Value Retail recognises the critical need for greater flexibility and the adaption of the town centre in order to meet the needs of an everchanging retail environment. In order to support the sustainable evolution of the town centre, in line with the economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the NPPF, it will be critical to ensure these adaptability objectives are central to the emerging Local Plan and the draft Vision. This should be a balanced approach to land use in terms of how to protect the character of the town whilst also remaining flexible to support its evolution.
LPR-B-649	DP Ltd for Value Retail Management (Bicester Village) Ltd	Option 25	Value Retail is strongly supportive of the recognition within the CIP2 of the importance and economic benefits of attractions, such as Bicester Village, in bringing significant value to the local economy and ensuring that Bicester is a vibrant and successful town. Value Retail is supportive of objectives to align these key cultural anchors and considers that the continued evolution, flexibility and consolidation of these attractions should be supported.
LPR-B-649	DP Ltd for Value Retail Management (Bicester Village) Ltd	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	Value Retail supports the principle of the development and activation of secure, safe and accessible green infrastructure. VR own the Bicester Oxford Road Site which was the subject of a Call for Sites submission in September 2020. We note that this site has been identified as a potential local green space (LPRA196) and Value Retail does not support this as a future allocation. It is noted that the private site is currently vacant with the previous sports facilities relocating to an existing site in Chesterton, which received planning consent in August 2021 for significantly extended and enhanced facilities. As set out in Value Retail's Call for Sites submission, the Oxford Road site is an important town centre redevelopment site and should be allocated as such, recognising that public realm provision should be developed alongside a range of other uses. These should support the key theme of maintaining and developing Bicester as an attractive and vibrant retail, cultural and social centre, and which also recognises the important role Bicester Village plays in bringing sustainable growth and jobs to the District. Value Retail welcomes the opportunity to discuss this further to develop plans alongside Cherwell officers and key stakeholders.

LPR-B-650	John Pilgrim	Question - Local Green Spaces	I support Kidlington Parish Council's aim to secure a connected ring of green space around the whole edge of Kidlington through the Local Plan Review and to strengthen Kidlington's distinctive character of a 'village set in the landscape'. I agree with CDC's proposal to explore the potential to create a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. It should be possible to do much more than simply 'explore the potential'. There should be a commitment to actually create the network of what green spaces now remain and to retain the distinctive character of a 'village set in the landscape' as far as possible. I support the proposals by Kidlington Development Watch for two specific areas to the north and northeast of the village to be designated as Local Green Space (i.e. Bury Moor Fields north of the Moors and land east of Church Street which lies wholly in the Church Street Conservation area). These two areas provide the best remaining examples of Green Space fulfilling the 'village in the landscape' concept. They are only currently protected by Green Belt designation (a matter which CDC says is for the Oxfordshire Plan). Given this and the recent removal of substantial areas of land from the Green Belt elsewhere around the village, CDC should provide additional protection in its Local Plan Review by designating these two areas as Local Green Space.
LPR-B-650	John Pilgrim	Question - Green Belt	Green Belt (and housing need) is the second fundamental issue for which the consultation document passes on responsibility to the Oxfordshire Plan. Having removed large amounts of Green Belt in the LPPR by allocating so much of it for development around Kidlington, other villages and areas north of Oxford, I support your proposal not to cause more damage by removing further land from the Green Belt. Adopted local authority plans would already increase housing stock to meet Oxford's claimed need by around one third and there is absolutely no justification for further building in the 'urban fringe' or Green Belt. Concerned at the indications that this is exactly what the Oxfordshire Plan will propose. It is not acceptable for Cherwell to say that further Green Belt release around Kidlington is a matter for the Oxfordshire Plan. Cherwell should insist, as one of the joint planning authorities for the Oxfordshire Plan, there should be no further release of Green Belt land in Cherwell, or in Oxfordshire. This is consistent with government policy which states that Green Belt is a permanent designation and that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. As Green Belt boundaries have only recently been established through the LPPR, they should not now be changed. To do otherwise would be to make a mockery of Government policy and oft-repeated statements of support for the Green Belt by the Prime Minister and other ministers. No further small scale Green Belt Review for employment purposes is needed or justified. The 'Technology Park' at Langford Lane is only in the early stages of development (possibly 1000- 1500 jobs) and the LPPR has provided for expansion of the Science Park at Begbroke. Both have the potential to accommodate a very significant number of jobs. There are other very substantial proposals for employment generating uses nearby in the adjacent Districts such as at Oxford North (4-8,000 jobs) and at Eynsham. Oxford City itself continues to protect large areas of land for employment uses, even though there is little sign that this will be developed. Indeed, large sites to the south of the City – the Business Park and Science Park are still not fully built or occupied despite having been under development for very many years.
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Infrastructure: General Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure Comments - Water and wastewater infrastructure is essential to any development. Failure to ensure that any required upgrades to the infrastructure network are delivered alongside development could result in adverse impacts in the form of internal and external sewer flooding and pollution of land and water courses and/or low pressure. A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be for new development to be coordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Ref to paras 20, 28 and 26 of the NPPF 2021. It is important to consider the net increase in water and wastewater demand to serve the development and also any impact that developments may have off site, further down the network. The new Local Plan should therefore seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. request that the following information is included: "Developers need to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve their developments and also any impact the development may have off site further down the network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided. Thames Water encourages developers to use our free pre-planning service <a href="https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers/larger-scale-developments/planning-yourdevelopment/water-and-wastewater-capacity">https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers/larger-scale-developments/planning-yourdevelopment/water-and-wastewater-capacity</a> ). This service can tell developers at an early stage if we will have capacity in our water and/or wastewater networks to serve their development, or what we'll do if we don't. The developer can then submit this as evidence to support a planning application and we can prepare to serve the new development at the point of need, helping avoid delays to housing delivery programmes."
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	consider that the New Local Plan should include a specific policy on the key issue of the provision of water and sewerage/wastewater infrastructure to service development. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend the Local Plan include the following policy/supporting text: Proposed New Water Supply/wastewater Infrastructure Policy Text- "Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for offsite upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades". "The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development". Local Authorities should also consider both the requirements of the utilities for land to enable them to meet the demands that will be placed upon them. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all the water and wastewater/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (AMPs). AMP7 will cover the period from 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2025. AMP8 will cover the period from 1st April 2025 to 31st March 2030. We therefore request that the new Local Plan include the following policy/supporting text: "The development or expansion of water supply or waste water facilities will normally be permitted, either where needed to serve existing or proposed development in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impact is minimised."

LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Comments in relation to Flood Risk. It is important to recognise that water and/or sewerage infrastructure may be required to be developed in flood risk areas. By their very nature water and sewage treatment works are located close or adjacent to rivers (to abstract water for treatment and supply or to discharge treated effluent). It is likely that these existing works will need to be upgraded or extended to provide the increase in treatment capacity required to service new development. Flood risk sustainability objectives should therefore accept that water and sewerage infrastructure development may be necessary in flood risk areas. Flood risk policies should also make reference to 'sewer flooding' and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure and capacity is not in place ahead of development. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the sewerage system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewage to reduce the risk of sewer flooding. Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change. SuDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to: improve water quality; provide opportunities for water efficiency; provide enhanced landscape and visual features; support wildlife; and provide amenity and recreational benefits. With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the new Local Plan: "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Comments re Sustainable Drainage Systems - Thames Water requests the Local Planning Authority adopts a policy within its Local Plan to: a) Seek to ensure that new connections to the public wastewater network do not pose an unacceptable threat of surcharge, flooding or pollution; b) Encourage the discharge of surface run off as high up the drainage hierarchy as reasonably practicable c) Require the separation of foul water and surface water on all new developments.
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Comments re water efficiency/Climate Change - Water conservation and climate change is a vitally important issue to the water industry. Not only is it expected to have an impact on the availability of raw water for treatment but also the demand from customers for potable (drinking) water. Therefore, Thames Water support the mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day (105 litres per head per day plus an allowance of 5 litres per head per day for gardens) as set out in the NPPG (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 56-014-20150327) and support the inclusion of this requirement in Policy. Proposed policy text: "Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption). Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met." Where developers do not engage with Thames Water prior to submitting their application, this will more likely lead to the recommendation that a Grampian condition is attached to any planning permission to resolve any infrastructure issues.
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Grimsbury Reservoir Water Treatment Works, Banbury	Land at Grimsbury Reservoir Water Treatment Works, Banbury is promoted for employment.
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Buckingham Road, Bicester	Land at Buckingham Road, Bicester is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Call for Sites Promotion - Thames Water Kidlington Depot, Kidlington	Thames Water Kidlington Depot is promoted for employment. Update to HELAA171.
LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Call for Sites Promotion - Former Lagoon at Banbury Sewerage Treatment Works, Banbury	Former Lagoon at Banbury Sewerage Treatment Works, Banbury is being promoted. Update to HELAA381.

LPR-B-651	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Plc	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Bretch Hill Reservoir, Bretch Hill, Banbury	Land at Bretch Hill Reservoir, Bretch Hill, Banbury is being promoted. Update to HELAA382.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Call for Sites Promotion - Shipton-on- Cherwell Quarry, Bunkers Hill, Shipton-on-Cherwell	Shipton-on-Cherwell Quarry, Bunkers Hill, Shipton-on-Cherwell is promoted for mixed uses. A vision document has been submitted with the representation.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 1	It is clear from the vision that a greater emphasis has been placed on addressing climate change in response to the Council's declared climate change emergency. This is welcomed. It is apparent that the vision does focus on maintaining and adapting Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington as places of attractive, vibrant, retail, cultural and social centres for communities and visitors. It is the client team's view that in addition to directing growth toward these settlements, the vision should recognise the opportunity to provide self-contained development through new settlement propositions, as is recognised within the emerging Oxfordshire Plan. Particularly those that are located within key transport corridors and the Oxfordshire 'Knowledge Spine'. Cherwell benefits from good transport links and sound infrastructure, linking London to Oxford via rail. What the vision fails to recognise is the opportunity that 'rural areas' and new settlements can bring, in the form of transformational infrastructure; and building on the locational advantages of the District. The Shiptons offers a deliverable opportunity for the District to bring transformational change that takes advantage of the existing railway line by introducing a new passenger train station with direct links to Oxford and Banbury and a sustainable link to Woodstock and Blenheim Palace both accessible by sustainable personal transport modes.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 2	Refer to KO 1, and KO 2 and KO 3 (could group these two together), and KO 9? Just say Shipton will help meet these. KO 7 looks to support Cherwell's urban centres, including where beneficial, redevelopment and renewal, to maintain and enhance their vitality, viability, distinctiveness and safety. The client team through the promotion of 'The Shiptons' recognise an opportunity to introduce new employment that is served by the new local residents of the communities. Whilst it is important to support existing urban centres, it is the client team's view that new sustainable economic growth opportunities should be capitalised on and can be done so outside the realms of existing urban centres. Generally in agreement with the key objectives towards meeting the challenge of climate change. Addressing climate change will be largely dependent on the Council's ability to reduce the number of people travelling by car. The Shiptons development could be an exemplar for change, creating a template of how new development can help address the climate emergency. The vision for a new settlement at Shipton on Cherwell is to provide an exemplar for modern living with a prime focus on promoting a more sustainable form of development for future generations that significantly reduces our carbon output and seeks transformational change in the way we both live and work. As a consequence, this development confronts our reliance on movement by the private car, creates a self contained development where people can both live and work within the same community, creates a green and sustainable infrastructure from the outset and produces a sustainable growth point that has the ability to be expanded beyond the proposed plan period (2050) according with Paragraph 22 of the NPPF. The design team are mindful that developing new communities that are based on a sustainable infrastructure from the outset will help move us quickly to a low carbon environment. This design team recognise that transformational change cannot be delivered through traditional forms of developments such as urban extensions. Shiptons development is centred on healthy place-making principles. At its heart is a new infrastructure design that turns its back on conventional car use and seeks to repurpose traditional street designs into more imaginative and healthier places to live. The integration of a new train station and the inclusion of carfree streets to supplement a comprehensive network of personal transport routes help link a number of key neighbourhoods to services and facilities, allowing for a self-contained, car-free settlement. The design approach is to provide green, attractive, and psychologically healthy places for all by delivering quality spaces, landscape, and good design. Developing streets with biodiverse habitats as well as sustainable urban drainage with integrated swales and rain gardens, and ultimately creating attractive spaces where people meet, reside, socialise, and children play is a key part of the vision for the Shiptons. This will undoubtedly help Cherwell fulfil their aims of the Local Plan in relation to their healthy place-shaping and climate change objectives. The client team are generally supportive of the main themes and key objectives proposed but consider addressing these that the emerging spatial strategy should consider the delivery of new settlements that do not sit within proximity of Bicester, Banbury and Kidlington as an option to help deliver its growth targets. Particularly given the aims of the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050 which looks to the delivery of new settlements as a potential growth option.

LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 3	<p>Supportive of this option particularly given the introduction of a new major rail interchange that is proposed at the Shiptons. Shipton is located along the northern “Knowledge Spine” which is considered to be an area of globally recognised knowledge activity that runs through the centre of the Oxfordshire Functional Economic Market Area, largely along the A34 corridor. Oxford City Centre and the Fringe have seen robust economic and housing growth in recent times and Shipton represents an opportunity to support these areas. As part of the Oxfordshire Wide evidence base, it is clear that Shipton is considered in close proximity to two Key Employment Sites (KES); Oxford International and Begbroke Science Park. there is no mention of focussing employment in locations close to KES or within the Oxfordshire ‘Knowledge Spine’. It is assumed from the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 that 88.77 hectares of employment land will be required in the Knowledge Spine and will be portioned up with the north and south. However, despite the County’s focus and the response of the public, there is no option to focus employment land in the Knowledge Spine within the emerging Cherwell Local Plan National planning policy provides encouragement to build a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation, improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure. Shipton will provide employment in a location near to its own transport interchange, which, in turn, will provide easy access to its own employment uses and support other KES by residents travelling (via train) to their locations. It is the team’s view that Shipton benefits from being located within the County’s Knowledge Spine, in close proximity to new major infrastructure and is only a short rail journey to other KESs; making Shipton perfectly positioned to accommodate employment land uses. The Council should look to consider employment opportunities close to KES and the Knowledge Spine to align with the emerging Oxfordshire Plan. Failing to do so will discourage the growth of these areas and impact negatively upon the district’s role within these strategic employment locations.</p>
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 31	<p>The strategy focusses development primarily at Bicester, Banbury and Kidlington with limited growth in rural areas. This approach aims to strictly control development in the open countryside. To date the current strategy has delivered 28% of the planned for growth in Bicester; 50% of the planning for growth in Banbury; and 87% of the planned for growth in the Rural Areas. The current strategy, at the half way point has met 43% of its overall target and is currently on track to fall short of meeting its planned housing needs. Growth have focused on Banbury and Bicester and these settlements have absorbed large levels of growth in the past with extensive urban extensions. It is understood why further growth is directed towards these settlements as part of the emerging plan period. It would be restrictive of the Council to not explore other options aside from directing growth towards these three settlements to ensure it meets its housing target for the emerging plan period, such as new settlements. It is clear from the Oxfordshire 2050 consultation that OCC would prefer to adopt a transformational trajectory for projected housing need. In order to achieve transformational change. This would provide the optimum amount of development including 152,790 homes to enable transformational infrastructure throughout the plan’s lifetime and beyond. To meet this and achieve a transformational amount of growth that enables transformational infrastructure, the Oxfordshire Plan consults on five spatial strategies with new settlements recognised as a genuine option for delivering transformational change. However, the Cherwell Local Plan appears not to be as bold and ambitious as the Oxfordshire Plan. New development in locations with sustainable transport should be considered within the development plan, particularly in locations that are or can be well connected to existing settlements such as Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, overall supporting the general principle of the current emerging spatial strategy under Option 19 and Option 22 which present the option to locate growth in areas that are well connects to Banbury and Bicester independently. The settlement would be able to connect to all existing centres (including Oxford City) by rail. the importance of linking settlements together and utilising historic linkages/routeways was highlighted by members of the public. Historically these routeways/linkages provided transport corridors across the country, county and district for the movement of goods and commodities and linear connections between settlements. CDC recognises that as new development is built, there is a need to consider how these linkages/routeways can be incorporated so we do not lose these relationships. The public response placed a degree of importance on infrastructure provision aligned to growth. There was a desire expressed to improve connections between town and rural areas, and also within towns where there is a need for improved pedestrian and cycling facilities. The lack of public transport options, particularly in the rural areas was a reoccurring theme. In rural areas particularly, with limited local facilities and fewer public transport services, many people are reliant on private transport which contributes to greenhouse gas emissions. There is potential for the Plan to provide better transport connectivity in rural communities supporting a transition to more sustainable transport modes, and subsequently reducing emissions. The options paper recognises that there will need to be a focus on means of transport and location of development which cause the least impact on the transport network and minimise carbon emissions. This could be through 20- minute neighbourhoods or other locational choices such a new transport infrastructure.</p>
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 6	<p>Poor housing affordability is providing a deterrent for the younger demographic to live and work within Oxfordshire. A need to address this issue and the impacts on Oxfordshire’s competitiveness within the national market is likely to be hindered particularly when considering that the younger demographic will need to travel into Oxfordshire for their employment opportunities, ultimately impacting the climate change initiatives. House prices across the county tend to vary within local authority areas, with a concentration of high values in Oxford, in area close to the A34 “Knowledge Spine” running through the centre of the county. This is influenced by the geography of and accessibility to employment opportunities. High house prices have led to those working in Oxfordshire needing to commute longer distances to and from their workplace, which in turn puts increased pressure on transport infrastructure across the county. The team aims to confront this issue by providing a proportionate amount of affordable housing that is in close proximity to employment opportunities via sustainable means of transport. Poor housing affordability can provide a deterrent to young professionals hoping to live and work in Oxfordshire. The team support the intention of the preferred Policy Option 30 and its aim to maximise affordable housing provision where possible. Detail surrounding tenure mix and affordable housing requirements (expressed as a percentage) would remain a decision for local authorities to include in their local plans in light of local evidence.</p>

LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Question - Housing Policies	The Standard Method calculation indicated a minimum local housing need for Oxfordshire of 3,383 dwellings per annum which would equate to a baseline level of provision of 101,490 homes over the 2020-50 plan period. This is based on 2014-based Household Projections. The review of demographic data undertaken as part of the OGNA indicates that it is likely that Oxford's population has been under-estimated. To address these issues, revised demographic projections have been developed to provide a revised baseline assessment of the demographic need for housing informed by past population trends. With appropriate assumptions on household formation, the revised demographic projections presented in the OGNA result in a marginally higher need of 3,386 dwellings per annum equivalent to 101,580 homes over the plan period. Support a focus on "transformational change" within Oxfordshire which would result in a figure approaching 5,093 dwellings per annum, resulting in a transformational trajectory for projected housing need of 152,790. This would provide the optimum amount of development and enable transformational infrastructure to be achieved throughout the plan's lifetime and beyond.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	The Growth Board agreed that the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) should be updated, and a Stage 1 OxIS, covering the period up to 2040 has now been produced. The client team note that this consultation did not consider potential new strategic infrastructure and that this will be address in a future consultation called the Stage 2 OxIS. The client team will respond to this consultation accordingly setting out the key strategic infrastructure that can be delivered to the benefit of Oxfordshire. The team agree with the preferred policy approach
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Question - Transport Policies	This is most important aspect that the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan should be focussing upon, especially if transformational change is to be achieved. The strategy for Shipton Community is entirely focussed on delivering sustainable transport links within and outside Shipton, creating more strategic active travel links between settlements and other key locations such as Woodstock and Blenheim Palace. The preferred policy option would help to ensure that new developments in Oxfordshire support sustainable transport options such as walking, cycling and public transport. Supportive of Policy Option 18. The measures and initiatives to be implemented at Shipton Community to ensure a sustainable transport strategy are: noncar Green Ways & Corridors; provide flexible approaches to parking; "MaaS" and subscription-based transport; and, marketing towards specific individuals.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The location of the development at Shipton along a key transport network presents a unique opportunity to provide a new train station which will undoubtedly support the immediate and nearby settlements of Woodstock and Oxford through use of rail and other forms of sustainable transport, ultimately contributing towards a net zero transport network and transformational change. Supportive of the preferred policy option, particularly as it encourages and supports the delivery and enhancement to the rail network, including linking in with new and improved stations, and supporting service enhancements. In addition, particular support is given to the preferred policy because it supports the delivery of improvements to transport interchange, including enhanced transport hubs such as at rail stations that facilitate take up of sustainable travel opportunities. Opportunity create and improve new cycle routes that connects facilities and services to where people live, work and attend school. Development at Shipton Community could meet the aspirations of the policy.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Support the preferred options and will look to incorporate many leisure, recreation, community and open space facilities that can serve Shipton Community and nearby communities.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Support the suggestion that new settlements should be within locations that are accessible by sustainable modes of transport; Shipton proposes a new train station along the Oxford London line, thus supported by planned sustainable transport infrastructure. Shipton takes advantage of the opportunity to strengthen cycling and walking connections to regional and national networks. Additionally, Shipton will increase the accessibility of Blenheim Palace, a considerable asset with international status. Support the overall approach to achieve high quality design in Oxfordshire. the preferred option would take advantage of the opportunity to set an Oxfordshirewide high-quality design ambition. Although it is felt that local plans and neighbourhood plans would be best placed to address local circumstances, rather than establishing the framework. Shipton Community provides an exciting opportunity to create a new settlement with place making and sustainable living at the heart of its proposals. The specific focus on personal sustainable modes of transport has developed an interconnection with Woodstock via a sustainable link which aims to promote significant health and wellbeing benefits through travel, access to service, facilities and green spaces. Support the principles set out in the preferred policy option.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Question - Green Belt	The preferred option for the Oxfordshire Plan is to identify strategic opportunities to enhance the existing Oxford Green Belt (for delivery through Loca Plans). Oxfordshire Plan should have regard to the Green Belt in determining the spatial strategy and in particular regard should be afforded to NPPF paragraphs 139-142 which relate to Green Belt release. Suitable Green Belt sites should be considered for development. This is considered an option within the Spatial Options and which is supported. Shipton Quarry is currently operating within the Green Belt. From our initial assessments it is considered that the area of Green Belt covering Shipton could be released from its designation and provide unprecedented benefits to the current conditions on site. Support the preferred option providing it recognises the opportunity to alter the Green Belt boundaries through exceptional circumstances that are fully evidenced and justified. It is the team's case that Shipton presents a strategic opportunity to enhance the existing Oxford Green Belt i.e., provide access, opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; and improve damaged or derelict land.



LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 12	Support an approach that assesses each site on its own merit and that the local authority can establish policies within their own Local Plans that aims for 20%. This approach would allow flexibility and allow for each site to be considered on its own merits. Setting the minimum target of 20% is likely to disrupt delivery of development sites, particularly those that are small to medium sized. Design team will aim for biodiversity and nature habitat to be designed into the proposed scheme at Shipton to achieve the increased requirement for biodiversity net gains. Alternative option 081 proposes to set a high target for sites within the Green Belt. The client team are concerned that if this benchmark was applied this could affect the deliverability of Shipton which would ultimately impact the deliverability of achieving a new, green and sustainable settlement which would help deliver the aspirational housing needs set by the forthcoming Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. This could be applied to other sites in a similar context. Agree with the conclusions raised by the consultation document in respect of alternative policy option 082 insofar that the Oxfordshire Plan should apply at least a 10% biodiversity net gain requirement. Delivery of the new settlement at Shipton would adhere to the proposed biodiversity net gain requirements set out in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 13	Support an approach that assesses each site on its own merit and that the local authority can establish policies within their own Local Plans that aims for 20%. This approach would allow flexibility and allow for each site to be considered on its own merits. Setting the minimum target of 20% is likely to disrupt delivery of development sites, particularly those that are small to medium sized. Design team will aim for biodiversity and nature habitat to be designed into the proposed scheme at Shipton to achieve the increased requirement for biodiversity net gains. Alternative option 081 proposes to set a high target for sites within the Green Belt. The client team are concerned that if this benchmark was applied this could affect the deliverability of Shipton which would ultimately impact the deliverability of achieving a new, green and sustainable settlement which would help deliver the aspirational housing needs set by the forthcoming Oxfordshire 2050 Plan. This could be applied to other sites in a similar context. Agree with the conclusions raised by the consultation document in respect of alternative policy option 082 insofar that the Oxfordshire Plan should apply at least a 10% biodiversity net gain requirement. Delivery of the new settlement at Shipton would adhere to the proposed biodiversity net gain requirements set out in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Support this approach as it recognises the important county's habitats, natural resources and landscapes in supporting biodiversity, connecting habitats and aiding nature's recover. However, on a larger scale, the opportunities to improve the credentials of core, recovery or wider landscape zones should be recognised and supported when the opportunities arise.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 11	Support this approach and consider that the areas prone to flooding can be alleviated by utilising natural flood management and drainage methods such as; green infrastructure, SuDs, design measures (permeable surface materials), restore natural river flows and floodplains, avoiding building over or culverting watercourses, and removing existing culverts wherever possible. It is considered that the Shipton Community is capable of meeting the requirements set out by the preferred policy. Agree with the preferred option set out in Policy Option 04, which is considered to generally reflect the advice within the NPPF.
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 11	The preferred policy option looks to impose a target for 100% of energy needs for major developments to be met from renewable energy sources. This is supported although this should be subject to viability testing and should not prevent otherwise sustainable development being achieved. The alternative policy options offer a more realistic opportunity to address the issue associated to county-wide targets for renewable energy in new development. 02-1 proposes to allow local plans and individual developments to set targets. This has been utilised by other authorities within the Country and has proven to work and should be considered as a valid proposition for future policy. The future of energy in Oxfordshire may have implications for the future distribution of development, and delivery of strategic scale renewable energy generation will have land use implications. This element should be considered in relation to the overall and wider needs of the County and distributed accordingly. Option 022 looks to set a percentage target for renewable energy generation in new developments e.g., minimum 10%. We agree with this assumption and further add that this option is less likely to restrict for development proposals and offers greater flexibility for developers. <u>02-01 provides the most flexible and realistic approach to achieving the desired targets for the County and is the preferred option</u>
LPR-B-652	Ridge and Partners for Shipton Quarry Landowners	Option 10	The Oxfordshire Energy Strategy identifies the main sources of greenhouse gas emissions in Oxfordshire as road transport and housing. It is considered that the focus should be placed on addressing the highest emitters without impacting on the delivery of necessary infrastructure and services to meet the needs of Oxfordshire's communities. We are of the view that focus should be placed on addressing the highest emitters without impacting on the delivery of necessary infrastructure and services to meet the needs of Oxfordshire's communities. The Government have confirmed that from 2025, the Future Homes Standard will ensure that new homes produce at least 75% lower CO2 emissions compared to those built to current standards. In the shortterm this represents a considerable improvement in the energy efficiency standards for new homes. Homes built under the Future Homes Standard will be 'zero carbon ready', which means that in the longerterm, no further retrofit work for energy efficiency will be necessary to enable them to become zero carbon homes as the electricity grid continues to decarbonise. The definition of zero carbon for ecotowns set out in the Planning Policy Statement (2009) is that, over a year, the net zero carbon dioxide emissions from all energy use within the buildings on the ecotown development, as a whole, are zero or below. The initial planning application and all subsequent planning applications for the development at Shipton would demonstrate how this will be achieved. The definition excludes embodied carbon and emissions from transport but includes all buildings. The preferred Policy Option 01 is supported by the team. This preferred policy approach aims to define an Oxfordshirewide definition for net zero carbon design and construction for development in Oxfordshire. This policy is aligned to the aspirations of the client team as it supports the health and wellbeing of communities and encourages clean growth and innovation, consistent with Strategic Vision and Oxfordshire Plan objectives. It is considered vitally important that this policy approach is tested from a viability and deliverability perspective. The client team are entirely conscious of the changing context and required focus to improve the efficiency of homes. It is considered that a large number of houses can be delivered that meets a high standard and reduces emissions at Shipton Community. The alternative proposal 01-1 would defer standards for sustainable design and construction to Local Plans which could create discrepancies between authorities and hinder efforts to achieve net zero carbon emissions in Oxfordshire during the lifetime of the plan. Option 012, which is to defer guidance on sustainable design and construction to building regulations, could hinder Oxfordshire's efforts to achieve net zero carbon emissions during the lifetime of the Plan. This would not align towards the national agenda and would be contrary to the ambitions of 'transformational change'.

LPR-B-653	Ioana Davies	Kidlington	should maintain and protect the existing Kidlington village centre, possibly expanding to the Exeter Close area but not using the green space behind it. I think Kidlington would benefit from a much wider range of shops, including independent specialised shops which would discourage people from driving elsewhere. Perhaps an electric bus could serve the centre, include the Sainsbury's store and connect to surrounding areas like Begbroke/Yarnton. This would reduce car dependency.
LPR-B-653	Ioana Davies	Question - Development Management Policies	refers to the inclusion of sites LPR-A-024, -063, -108, -224, -237, -230, -156, -082 as being retained as green belt/space. The council should place the utmost priority on retaining the rest of the green belt surrounding Kidlington. We have all been made aware of the importance of accessible green spaces during the Covid 19 pandemic. The ability to have access to places to walk for families is vital. It helps with air quality and children's health. The airport is becoming busier and this makes having unpolluted areas around the village very important. The area behind St Mary's church and between Mill End and St Mary's is historical with evidence of medieval settlement. The views need to be protected for future generations both to enjoy and to learn from. There should be no development in this area. The area behind the Moors floods on a frequent basis and this is becoming more frequent in the 20 years that I have lived in Kidlington. The area beyond, over the fields to the Cherwell, is flood plain. When sluice gates are opened in Banbury the water collects here. It would be worth exploring the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington but the main focus should be protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way.
LPR-B-653	Ioana Davies	LPR-A-175	need a policy to control the redevelopment of larger dwellings or plots to apartments. There will be problems with parking and more cars. (comment may relate to Kidlington in particular)
LPR-B-654	Valerie Handunge	Islip	Strongly opposes development. the development is not in the broader interests of the character of Wardington as a conservation village. The size and scale of such a development is not sustainable with the current services, schools and infrastructure requiring expansion of these services, which yet again negatively impacts Wardington as a conservation area. The increased traffic to A361 and M40 access will simply destroy the character of the village.
LPR-B-655	David Farrer	Islip	The fields surrounding Islip offer precious habitat for a variety of wildlife which are all thriving amongst a great many other vulnerable species. The fields & field margins are vital for this to continue. Particularly disgusted to see Church Commissioners so willing to sell off huge tracts of land for short term profit over long term ecology. Urge the council to reject the proposals surrounding Islip
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Option 1	We recommend that the new Local Plan is driven by the primary objective of needing to develop the economy. In line with recent Government announcements, this is the principal role that the planning system is able to play in supporting the recovery from the economic effects of the Covid-19 crisis. In balancing the inevitable policy conflicts between economic development and other considerations (Green Belt protection for instance) it is essential that much greater weight is placed on economic development than has been the case in the past. The Vision should be more focussed on 'maintaining and developing a sustainable local economy' than is currently the case.
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Option 2	Support the objectives set out under the theme 'maintaining and developing a sustainable local economy', subject to the following point:- KO1: suggest that this is expanded to clarify that this includes the needs of existing businesses.
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Option 3	A combination of all of the above. On accessibility and deliverability grounds it is logical to direct a large proportion of new employment development to existing urban centres and transport interchanges. Equally important is the need to take advantage of the economic clustering benefits of locating new employment development in/around existing major employment locations (such as Langford Lane) and other economic nodes (such as airports).
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above. Providing positive, supportive planning policies in the local plan that strike an appropriate balance between certainty and flexibility is key to attracting investment in new employment development (to allow existing businesses to expand and to attract new businesses to the district). Key to this is allocating a sufficient supply of suitable and appropriately located sites to accommodate a flexible range of employment uses alongside policy support for an appropriate range of complementary uses that would boost the attractiveness of the employment offer.
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Question - Supporting Employment	London Oxford Airport should be specifically recognised as a key economic asset in the new Local Plan and allocated for development to include aviation related development; high value employment uses; and a new park and ride, alongside a review of the Green Belt boundary at the site.

LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Question - Green Belt	The 2015 Local Plan identified exceptional circumstances to justify a review of the Green Belt in/around London Oxford Airport/Langford Lane to address the then identified need for employment land in the Kidlington area. There continues to be exceptional circumstances to justify a review of the Green Belt boundary in/around the Airport today. Local plans should adopt a positive approach to meeting the assessed development needs for their area and should place significant weight on supporting economic growth. This includes specific support for the needs of the aviation sector and small airports such as London Oxford Airport (LOA). LOA is a valuable transport and economic asset of strategic county-wide significance, which plays a key role in supporting many of the County's major employers and economy as a whole. There is a strategic need in economic and transport/connectivity terms to ensure the long term continuation of the airport use. The Airport currently operates at an unsustainably low profit level. Satisfying the aforementioned economic need is dependent on making the airport a more viable going concern, which is dependent on generating additional value from the Site/asset. LOA's intended response to this need is to invest in airport facilities/infrastructure in order to maintain/grow its market share. The capital investment necessary to deliver the above development will be significant and unlikely to be viable in its own rights. LOA's intention is to facilitate this by generating value (capital injection and long term income stream) from the airport estate via the development of surplus land for complimentary non-aviation uses. The Site is uniquely suitable for the proposed development, in that it offers the opportunity to satisfy economic needs that otherwise would not be capable of being met on any other site. This has significance for the delivery of the economic strategy for the district and subregion as a whole. This economic need comprises the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the removal of part/all of the site from the Green Belt.
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Question - Transport Policies	Strongly support the principle of including a site specific policy to positively support development at London Oxford Airport. Local plans should adopt a positive approach to meeting the assessed development needs for their area and should place significant weight on supporting economic growth. This includes specific support for the needs of the aviation sector and small airports such as London Oxford Airport (LOA). LOA is a valuable transport and economic asset of strategic county-wide significance, which plays a key role in supporting many of the County's major employers and economy as a whole. There is a strategic need in economic and transport/connectivity terms to ensure the long term continuation of the airport use. The Airport currently operates at an unsustainably low profit level. Satisfying the aforementioned economic need is dependent on making the airport a more viable going concern, which is dependent on generating additional value from the Site/asset. LOA's intended response to this need is to invest in airport facilities/infrastructure in order to maintain/grow its market share. The capital investment necessary to deliver the above development will be significant and unlikely to be viable in its own rights. LOA's intention is to facilitate this by generating value (capital injection and long term income stream) from the airport estate via the development of surplus land for complimentary non-aviation uses. The Site is uniquely suitable for the proposed development, in that it offers the opportunity to satisfy economic needs that otherwise would not be capable of being met on any other site. This has significance for the delivery of the economic strategy for the district and subregion as a whole. In our view, this economic need comprises the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the removal of part/all of the site from the Green Belt. The Site is available for development and the emerging plans are considered to be achievable. The owners of LOA wish to work with CDC to prepare a masterplan (with supporting evidence) for the site to underpin a site specific policy (allocation) and associated revision to the Green Belt boundary in the new Local Plan. The proposed development comprises (1) aviation related development; and (2) Nonaviation related development: (1) Aviation related development: New/upgraded vehicle access; Pilot training facility (including residential accommodation and 'campus' amenities); Helicopter training facility; New fire station and fire training facility; Hangars and sheds; Hotel (potentially including conference and exhibition facilities); and Upgraded/extended terminal facilities. (2) Complimentary Nonaviation development: Employment (Class E(g), B2, B8), Hotel, Park and Ride and Other complimentary uses such as healthcare.
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Option 26	Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses. The 2015 Local Plan identified exceptional circumstances to justify a review of the Green Belt in/around London Oxford Airport/Langford Lane to address the then identified need for employment land in the Kidlington area. There continues to be exceptional circumstances to justify a review of the Green Belt boundary in/around the Airport today. National planning policy (and relevant guidance) is clear that local plans should adopt a positive approach to meeting the assessed development needs for their area and should place significant weight on supporting economic growth. This includes specific support for the needs of the aviation sector and small airports such as London Oxford Airport (LOA). LOA is a valuable transport and economic asset of strategic countywide significance, which plays a key role in supporting many of the County's major employers and economy as a whole. There is a strategic need in economic and transport/ connectivity terms to ensure the long term continuation of the airport use. The Airport currently operates at an unsustainably low profit level. Satisfying the aforementioned economic need is dependent on making the airport a more viable going concern, which is dependent on generating additional value from the Site/asset. LOA's intended response to this need is to invest in airport facilities/infrastructure in order to maintain/grow its market share. The capital investment necessary to deliver the above development will be significant and unlikely to be viable in its own rights. LOA's intention is to facilitate this by generating value (capital injection and long term income stream) from the airport estate via the development of surplus land for complimentary non-aviation uses. The Site is suitable for development, in that it offers the opportunity to satisfy economic needs that otherwise would not be capable of being met on any other site. This has significance for the delivery of the economic strategy for the district and subregion as a whole. This economic need comprises the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the removal of part/all of the site from the Green Belt.
LPR-B-656	Avison Young for Oxford Aviation Services Ltd.	Call for Sites Promotion - London Oxford Airport, Langford Lane, Kidlington	London Oxford Airport, Langford Lane, Kidlington is promoted for commercial, C1 and C2 uses. Update to HELAA162. A supporting statement has been submitted which includes a site plan, a previously developed land review, and a high level economic impact assessment.

LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Option 1	The selection of sites for development will be vital in Cherwell achieving the suggested Vision. We are in particular agreement with Vision 6. Achieving this vision will rely on two key policy responses: 1. Ensuring there is sufficient opportunity for employment to match the evidence base underpinning the emerging Oxfordshire Plan; and, 2. Exploiting locations which offer the greatest potential for sustainable transport opportunities and where connectivity between corridors and key locations can be improved through new growth. The Oxfordshire Councils Growth Needs Assessment and NPPF (paras 81 and 82) emphasise the importance of allocating strategically selected land to science/technology employment uses in order to meet predicted need and encourage innovation. Regarding point 2, it is vital that this employment land is well located in relation to transport networks and other key employment sites, whilst having the capacity to support further growth of sustainable transport infrastructure. Located at a critical transport node in the Oxford Knowledge Spine, Frieze Farm (LPR-A-222) is ideally situated to achieve this. A low-to-net zero science and innovation facility at LPR-A-222 would be a means to develop a new approach to sustainable employment growth, and would align with many of the Vision bullet points. This not only includes the above Vision 6, but also “fostering and retaining young talent, attracting business and investment” and “embrac[ing] and champion[ing] new and green technology, shared knowledge and common resources”.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Option 2	Consider KO1 and KO2 of particular significance. Allocating the correct parcels of land for housing and employment will be crucial for future of the District, affecting the ability to achieve the other, more specific, Key Objectives. Land allocations must be strategically decided to meet the important KO16 and KO24; These Key Objectives relating to lowcarbon transport and active travel could be achieved through the allocation of LPR-A-222 as employment land, as there are a range of existing sustainable transport and active travel links to the site
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Option 3	In order to meet the important Visions and Key Objectives outlined in the preceding comments, we believe that Option 2, focusing employment land at significant transport interchanges, would be the best choice. This choice will allow employment to be accessible from across the District. Additionally, if these transport interchanges offer both sustainable and active travel choices, then employment sites will be able to contribute to the creation of a zero carbon transport network and have a positive impact on the overall health and wellbeing of those travelling to work. Site LPR-A-222 should be regarded as one such transport interchange as cycle, footpath, road, bus and rail routes all pass in close proximity. Aspiration 5 of the Introduction to the Oxfordshire Plan states that “choices such as the location of new development should be informed by the ability for them to connect into existing networks or be planned at a scale that would support new effective connections or networks”. Both aspects of this Aspiration apply to the potential development of Frieze Farm, as a science and technology park in this location would make use of existing networks whilst being of a sufficient scale to warrant the development of new transport connections. This approach would be in accordance with NPPF para 11a. Existing sustainable transport links include the site’s proximity to Oxford Parkway Station and strategic bus routes along the A44 and A2460 corridors. The site is also well located in terms of transferring all modes of transport between the A44, A2460 and A34 corridors, bypassing the problematic Pear Tree Interchange. The site’s proximity to academic and residential communities, particularly as a result of the surrounding housing allocations in the Cherwell Partial Review, will allow LPR-A-222 to function as high-value employment collocated with new homes. Working in tandem with the other new urban developments to the north of Oxford would be a sensible choice. Active travel could also be enhanced by connecting the site to the planned cycle super routes north of Oxford and through connectivity with the Oxford Canal. The Oxford Canal defines the west of Frieze Farm, and the towpath could become a key active travel route to and from the site. This could involve creating new foot and cycle path connections to Oxford Parkway, the new development sites in Cherwell District to the east, the Northern Gateway development, and existing services within urban Oxford to the south. Option 1, locating employment at existing urban centres, should not be taken to be inherently sustainable. Further extensions to existing urban centres will only increase distances from key services, and there may be a lack of capacity and scope for sustainable transport options. The most important consideration is allocating land that can be connected to housing and services in sustainable ways. Option 3, allocating employment land only on brownfield sites, does not make the most of existing land allocations in the District. Employment sites should be strategically located to maximise on already agreed development patterns.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Option 4	Option 3, providing a mixture of types of employment, will ensure that communities’ needs are met alongside promoting local economic growth. If employment land is situated in a sustainable location that can be easily accessed by residents as well as employees, a mixed use employment site would be preferable in its ability to serve the community in more diverse ways. For example, providing E class uses alongside a B1 science/technology park at Frieze Farm would contribute to enhance the sense of place for residents living nearby, especially in sites such as PR6a and PR6b.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Proposed allocations should be assessed on their capacity to achieve a low-to-zero carbon development and therefore land allocated for development should be of a significant scale to justify the investment and phasing issues around district energy and heating schemes. This level of investment in carbon reduction is not possible where only smaller scale and opportunistic allocations are being put forward. If the LPR-A-222 land was to be allocated for employment uses, we are committed to ensuring this employment site is a Low-to-Zero carbon development. This would be possible due to the scale of the development proposed, the nature of the intended occupiers, the ambition of Exeter College and the amount of land available. We would like to discuss this ambition with the Council in more detail.

LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - Green Belt	Land for employment in the Kidlington area was released from the Green Belt in the 2015 Plan. The current opinion is that the further release of land will need to be reviewed, however, the Economic Needs Assessment report (September 2021) suggests that Kidlington remains an area of economic growth and is becoming a focal point for technology companies. Furthermore, “as Kidlington turns towards the Technology market and becomes a more viable option for laboratory users it is likely that stock will increase and become more attractive”. The growth of science and technology sectors near to Kidlington is an important trend, but it is vital that the role of Oxford in this pattern is recognised and that sites closest to Oxford are considered more carefully. Oxford is the primary economic driver for the region and generates much of the talent that is contributing to the growth of science and technology sectors to the north of the city. When considering the location of new employment sites, locations near to Oxford, such as LPR- A-222, must be considered despite their location in the Green Belt. Whilst Frieze Farm is located within the Green Belt, it has already been allocated for substantial change from farmland to a Replacement Golf Facility as Site PR6c in the Cherwell Partial Review. If local golfing need is able to be met through alternative means, which should be seriously considered due to the prime strategic location of the site, the land at Frieze Farm presents a significant opportunity. This land is primed to welcome technology companies and laboratory users due to its sustainable and strategic location on the Oxford Knowledge Spine and proximity to Oxford.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Option 12	Option 3, to secure biodiversity net gain through local bodies already undertaking biodiversity enhancement, would be the most effective choice. Using existing bodies will ensure that biodiversity gain can be achieved in a timely manner whilst securing gains in effective locations, as opposed to simply choosing locations close to the original site. Exeter College has an existing estate within which biodiversity net gain could be established. This potential to establish biodiversity elsewhere will be beneficial to the wider ecological landscape, especially as the site’s current use as farmland is ecologically uninteresting. Furthermore, Exeter College is part of Oxford University’s initiative to see how biodiversity and green infrastructure can be enhanced and linked through active travel. The proximity of the Frieze Farm site to the Oxford Canal presents an exciting opportunity to explore on-site biodiversity gain alongside investment into footpath and cycle path infrastructure.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Option 15	All three Options are appropriate and set out in the NPPF (paragraph 99). Any policy will need to align with this approach as there will be situations when any one of the three options could be an appropriate response.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods offer many benefits, and in the sub-urban areas north of Oxford these principles could be helpfully applied. The development of employment in the Kidlington area would benefit the housing sites allocated in the Cherwell Partial Review, as the residents of these new homes would be able to access employment via active travel networks. This connectivity would represent a highly sustainable pattern of development in accordance with NPPF objectives.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - Transport & Connectivity	broadly agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach, particularly the emphasis on locating new development in “areas that minimise the need to travel and support people in meeting their daily needs in the local area through active travel” and focusing “on means of transport and location of development which cause the least impact on the transport network and minimise carbon emissions”. These transport considerations are essential for social and environmental wellbeing. It is in line with this transport and connectivity approach that we are advocating for the land at LPR-A- 222 to be considered as an employment site. This already well-connected location, with huge potential for active travel network development, should not be overlooked in favour of sites further away from Cherwell’s growing residential areas. Whilst the decarbonisation of rural transport would reduce carbon emissions, this will only increase competition for scarce road space. In order to reduce residents’ reliance on private cars, it is best to locate development in areas where genuine multimodal travel choices are available, particularly of low-carbon and active travel options. To illustrate the point we would highlight some comparative research we undertook in support of the Partial Review Examination which demonstrated how accessible Frieze Farm is and how central it is in terms of the critical mass of activity within North Oxford/South Cherwell: Frieze Farm- Jobs within walking distance = 4438 and jobs within cycling distance = 68099. Site PR7a/PR7b by comparison - jobs within walking distance = 650 and jobs within cycling distance = 65868.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - Transport Policies	We believe the new Local Plan should revisit the principal of a new EastWest route through Frieze Farm connecting the A44 corridor in the west with the Frieze Way/Kidlington corridor in the east. Substantial detail was shared with the Council on the benefits of this link through the Partial Review Examination. Its principal benefits were relieving pressure on the Loop Farm Roundabout and Pear Tree Interchange to facilitate bus and cycle movement through these junctions, as well as offering a more direct route to Oxford Parkway for A44 sites as shown in the diagram provided in the response form. the diagram illustrates a desire line from PR8 and PR9 to Parkway Station via the PR6c Frieze Farm link road. this route is approx 3.7km from Sandy Lane Jct to Parkway Station where alternative routes via Sandy Lane and Oxford Road are approx. 4.7km; a saving of 1km. therefore seeking a release of Green Belt land for employment purposes in a highly sustainable location, which Cherwell District Council had conceded in its report to Council in February 2020 was a ‘reasonable option’ following the Inspector’s direction for it to be considered as part of the process of settling Main Modifications. As part of this release, the Council could consider a new road connection between the two corridors and an active travel link directly to Oxford Parkway utilising the College’s landholdings which provide a continuous link between the A44 and Oxford Parkway. It is our request that the Plan engages with its key Objectives and incorporates the site within its thinking.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	A Link Road between the A44 and A4260 with active travel connections extending to Oxford Parkway should form the basis of a specific Infrastructure Policy alongside release of the Frieze Farm site (LPR-A-222) for employment. This issue has been covered in more detail in response to the transport policies question.

LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Option 26	Undertaking a Green Belt review would be the favourable option, as this will allow for employment to be located in the most sustainable location aligned with the Vision and Objectives of the Draft Plan. Cherwell District should anticipate the employment objectives set out in the Oxfordshire Plan and begin a significant review of the Green Belt in order to effectively allocate land to meet county-wide employment need. In line with the NPPF (para. 142), when reviewing Green Belt boundaries “the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account” and “strategic policymaking authorities should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary”. After the release of Green Belt land is decided, “plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously developed and/or is well-served by public transport” and “set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land”. This policy background indicates that an Oxfordshire Green Belt review may be necessary to ensure sustainable patterns of development in Cherwell. Locating new employment opportunities south of Kidlington at the nexus of active travel routes and sustainable transport is a significant consideration as accommodating employment further away from Oxford and sustainable travel options will increase dependency on private cars
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	the Local Plan should prioritise connectivity between the A44 corridor and the Kidlington A4260 corridor as well as active travel connections to Oxford Parkway.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Evidence has previously been provided to the Council in connection with the demand for access to golfing opportunities. The PR6 Matter 4 Statement from the Partial Review Examination includes an assessment of golfing need in the locality, concluding that the loss of North Oxford Golf Club can be sustained. This evidence should form the part of the overall evidence for the Local Plan. Additionally, the Council’s ‘Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment and Strategies- Part 2: Sports Facilities Strategy’ supersedes the requirement for an 18-hole golf course at Site PR6c. Instead, the Strategy concludes that a maximum of 6 holes could be required in the Kidlington SubArea by 2031 if the golf course on Site PR6b were to close. Moreover, the Strategy concludes that new provision should aimed at encouraging the participation of younger players, thus the development of short-format Par 3 courses is identified as appropriate. Paragraph 99 of the NPPF would also allow a quantitative and qualitative sporting improvement through the enhancement of existing golfing facilities elsewhere. The need could also be replaced by an entirely new form of sporting or recreational activity that could be judged to outweigh the loss of golf provision. The promoters of Sites PR6a and b will be bringing forward additional evidence that an 18 hole golf course is surplus to requirements.
LPR-B-657	Turnberry for Exeter College	Call for Sites Promotion - Freize Farm, North Oxford	Freize Farm, North Oxford is being promoted.
LPR-B-658	Nicholas King Homes	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	The Oxfordshire Plan will provide the strategic planning framework for the whole county and it makes sense that its Vision sets out broad principles for development in the county. Whilst it is recognised that a Spatial Plan for Oxfordshire must contain a level of detail that is proportionate to its strategic objectives, it is essential that the Plan’s policies provide clear guidance for the future preparation of Local Plans, Neighbourhood Plans, and other Development Plan documents. We trust that the Oxfordshire Plan will set out clearly the housing requirement for each Local Authority and how the unmet needs of districts (particularly Oxford City) will be provided. This is critical for the timely adoption of emerging Cherwell Local Plan. A Plan led system can only operate successfully when there is clear policy guidance in place to produce Local Plans.
LPR-B-658	Nicholas King Homes	Option 1	It is accepted that greater emphasis should be placed on achieving climate action targets by means of sustainable development, however it is questionable how the Vision for the Local Plan does not make any reference to the housing need that needs to be achieved for the growing population during the plan period. The socio, economic and environmental aims identified in the Vision are admirable, but it is considered that there is a glaring absence of any meaningful statements about housing provision in order to achieve the Government’s ambitious housing delivery target. It is also considered that an aspirational Vision such as this one, should make reference to the “beautiful homes”, which has been included in the NPPF, following the findings of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission.
LPR-B-658	Nicholas King Homes	Option 2	Following on from the comments on the Vision, if the Council is of the opinion that the housing target for the Local Plan should not be stated in the Vision, it is reasonable to expect that a ‘SMART objective’ will state the number of homes that need to be delivered within the plan period. It is accepted that the housing requirement for Cherwell to 2040 will be set by the Oxfordshire Plan, but it should be able to amend this objective at the appropriate time, to reflect the housing need. We note the three proposed methods for calculating the housing need for Oxfordshire and we strongly believe that in order to meet the Government’s and expected growth across the district that the transformational trajectory of 5,093 dwellings per annum should be the minimum target. It is welcomed that despite the lack of reference to housing delivery in the Vision, the first objective relates to the allocation of land to meet the housing and employment needs of the district.
LPR-B-658	Nicholas King Homes	Option 12	It is considered that in order to facilitate the delivery of the housing need for the district, it would simplify the planning process to secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking enhancement projects within the district. There is however no reason why this cannot be merged with option 1, by securing contributions for the environmental body closest to the application site. This would ensure that biodiversity enhancements are delivered across the whole district.

LPR-B-658	Nicholas King Homes	Option 30	In accordance with paragraph 60 of the NPPF, in order to achieve a sufficient supply of homes “it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed” in order to support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. It is therefore considered that option 2 is more likely to deliver a greater number of sites and of a wider variety. This goes hand-in-hand with the findings of the Letwin Report regarding build-out rates, because by providing a wider variety of sites, it would mean that there will be less reliance on national house builders to deliver the housing need across a smaller number of large development sites. The Government is already seeking to encourage a greater number of SME / regional housebuilders to deliver a larger proportion of the annual housing supply. This will mean that house purchasers will have greater choice, which in turn will increase demand and house builders are likely to achieve faster build-out rates. The Community Involvement Paper rightly acknowledges the fact that the pandemic has changed how and also more relevant to this point, where people want to live. There has been a shift in desire from residing in large conurbations, towards living in more rural areas and smaller villages. It is therefore considered that the villages and smaller settlements should actively contribute to achieving the housing supply across the district. The land to the north of Henge Close is a good example of a site in a sustainable location, which can be delivered swiftly and with very little impact on the surrounding area. Planning policy should provide sufficient flexibility in the way that decision makers are able to consider its appropriateness for development.
LPR-B-658	Nicholas King Homes	Option 31	it is considered that decision makers should be given greater flexibility by making use of option 3, in order to deliver a more responsive planning policy framework and avoid overly prescriptive spatial policies.
LPR-B-658	Nicholas King Homes	Question - Settlement Boundaries	in order to retain flexibility for the decision makers, it is considered that settlement boundaries should not be introduced in a district, which has successfully operated without it. In a similar way as changing Green Belt designation, determining settlement boundaries will be a very emotive and timeconsuming process. It is important to retain the flexibility for the decision maker to consider the merits of each site, which would contribute to achieving the district’s housing need. Whilst Introducing settlement boundaries would not prevent the submission of applications outside the settlement boundaries and it would therefore not be the most productive use of limited Council resources
LPR-B-659	Mr C Aramini	LPR-A-152	sites are not suitable for development and should be kept as green spaces for agriculture and farming or be turned into a forest to offset emissions from Banbury, M40 and the Hennef Way. By allowing the attractive, valued green landscape between Hanwell and Banbury to be destroyed for housing, Cherwell District Council will be responsible for ignoring the climate emergency by continuing to build on green spaces. Hanwell is a historic village dating back over 800, it is a conservation area and a rural village that wishes to remain as a village and not a part of Banbury. Hanwell and its surrounding countryside must be protected and conserved, or even enhanced with a new forest to help offset Banbury’s emissions and industrial pollution. Use Banbury town centre and its empty retail units to fill with attractive and affordable homes for families. Bring the heart back to Banbury instead of ripping the heart out of Hanwell’s rural identity.
LPR-B-659	Mr C Aramini	LPR-A-214	sites are not suitable for development and should be kept as green spaces for agriculture and farming or be turned into a forest to offset emissions from Banbury, M40 and the Hennef Way. By allowing the attractive, valued green landscape between Hanwell and Banbury to be destroyed for housing, Cherwell District Council will be responsible for ignoring the climate emergency by continuing to build on green spaces. Hanwell is a historic village dating back over 800, it is a conservation area and a rural village that wishes to remain as a village and not a part of Banbury. Hanwell and its surrounding countryside must be protected and conserved, or even enhanced with a new forest to help offset Banbury’s emissions and industrial pollution. Use Banbury town centre and its empty retail units to fill with attractive and affordable homes for families. Bring the heart back to Banbury instead of ripping the heart out of Hanwell’s rural identity.
LPR-B-659	Mr C Aramini	LPR-A-205	sites are not suitable for development and should be kept as green spaces for agriculture and farming or be turned into a forest to offset emissions from Banbury, M40 and the Hennef Way. By allowing the attractive, valued green landscape between Hanwell and Banbury to be destroyed for housing, Cherwell District Council will be responsible for ignoring the climate emergency by continuing to build on green spaces. Hanwell is a historic village dating back over 800, it is a conservation area and a rural village that wishes to remain as a village and not a part of Banbury. Hanwell and its surrounding countryside must be protected and conserved, or even enhanced with a new forest to help offset Banbury’s emissions and industrial pollution. Use Banbury town centre and its empty retail units to fill with attractive and affordable homes for families. Bring the heart back to Banbury instead of ripping the heart out of Hanwell’s rural identity.
LPR-B-659	Mr C Aramini	LPR-A-154	sites are not suitable for development and should be kept as green spaces for agriculture and farming or be turned into a forest to offset emissions from Banbury, M40 and the Hennef Way. By allowing the attractive, valued green landscape between Hanwell and Banbury to be destroyed for housing, Cherwell District Council will be responsible for ignoring the climate emergency by continuing to build on green spaces. Hanwell is a historic village dating back over 800, it is a conservation area and a rural village that wishes to remain as a village and not a part of Banbury. Hanwell and its surrounding countryside must be protected and conserved, or even enhanced with a new forest to help offset Banbury’s emissions and industrial pollution. Use Banbury town centre and its empty retail units to fill with attractive and affordable homes for families. Bring the heart back to Banbury instead of ripping the heart out of Hanwell’s rural identity.
LPR-B-659	Mr C Aramini	LPR-A-047	sites are not suitable for development and should be kept as green spaces for agriculture and farming or be turned into a forest to offset emissions from Banbury, M40 and the Hennef Way. By allowing the attractive, valued green landscape between Hanwell and Banbury to be destroyed for housing, Cherwell District Council will be responsible for ignoring the climate emergency by continuing to build on green spaces. Hanwell is a historic village dating back over 800, it is a conservation area and a rural village that wishes to remain as a village and not a part of Banbury. Hanwell and its surrounding countryside must be protected and conserved, or even enhanced with a new forest to help offset Banbury’s emissions and industrial pollution. Use Banbury town centre and its empty retail units to fill with attractive and affordable homes for families. Bring the heart back to Banbury instead of ripping the heart out of Hanwell’s rural identity.

LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Call for Sites Promotion - Hanwell Rise, Land at Hardwick Hill, Banbury	Hanwell Rise, Land at Hardwick Hill, Banbury is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA387. An Evolution Document has been submitted with the representation.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 2	Thakeham supports the key objectives detailed, and strongly supports the Council's vision for new development to come forward with sustainability and healthy place shaping at the forefront. Thakeham support the focus on healthy place shaping, with a need to ensure future development maximises opportunities for journeys to be made on foot or bicycle. This will necessitate ensuring new developments prioritise non-motorised transport and are easily accessible to a full range of day to day services and facilities.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 3	To ensure vibrant communities, employment needs to be directed to a combination of the above options, Ideally, most employment land should be located at and around Banbury and Bicester, which will likely coincide with significant transport interchanges. Kidlington is constrained by the Oxford Green Belt and any release of land from the Green Belt will be a strategic matter and would be a matter for the Oxfordshire Plan rather than the Cherwell Local Plan Review.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 4	Employment Land provision needs to be allocated in response to identified need. The strategy for Cherwell needs to align with the aspirations of the strategic plan for Oxfordshire. Where possible flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that provision can adapt to changing need. Employment provision needs to ensure variety to provide effective access to jobs and job creation, provision should encourage opportunities for all works including skilled, unskilled, apprenticeships and seasonal jobs.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 6	Affordable Housing requirements should be considered strategically across the whole of Oxfordshire as part of the overall housing need position. Distribution should be set through the strategic plan, determined through a viability study and located to areas with specific identified need. Any suggested requirement will need to be tested for viability to minimise the risk of developments under-delivering due to viability concerns.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 7	Affordable housing requirements will need to align with the requirements of the Oxfordshire Plan. A degree of flexibility needs to be adopted in respect of tenure mix to ensure provision can accord with updated needs over time. Care needs to be considered as regards the impact of First Homes that this does not distort the tenure mix such that shared ownership is squeezed out completely or reduced to levels that do not allow sufficient family accommodation to be available to those who need it. Examples might include families trading up in shared ownership accommodation for larger accommodation or formation of two new households following divorce but where neither household would qualify as first time buyers.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 8	Whilst Thakeham supports the Council's aspiration to see good quality homes delivered across their district, such policy requirement which seeks all dwellings to meet NDSS need to be supported by robust evidence that there is a specific need to introduce such standards
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - Separation Distances	It is recommended that arbitrary separation distances are not an appropriate tool to achieve good urban design since they cannot reflect the specific character of an area. It is instead recommended that policies directly address issues of privacy and natural light, allowing the District Council to focus on the issues specific to each site.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 9	Any policy requirements in respect of housing accessibility requirements should be based off identified need, with sufficient flexibility incorporated to ensure that provision is directed to the right places. In particular, blanket policy requirements for M4(2) in all new developments should not be adopted as these requirements should be based off identified need, whilst requirements in relation to M4(3) can be particularly onerous and should only be directed to developments where there is an identified end user
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - Housing Policies	Welcomes support for alternative methods of construction, as we are looking to reduce our environmental impact during construction through factory based options. A similar option was set out in the recent Oxfordshire Plan consultation, and it may be better to have a countywide policy ensuring consistency of approach rather than potentially having different standards in each LPA area.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 10	Thakeham build for the future, for communities and individuals. Our approach sets us apart from our competitors. Thakeham's schemes are delivered with a focus on sustainable development, looking ahead of current housing standards. From 2025, all Thakeham homes will be carbon neutral in production and zero carbon in lifetime use. Thakeham are a founding member of the HBF Future Homes Task Force, which examines how the house building industry can work toward delivering net zero carbon homes in order to support the Government's target of the country delivering net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Thakeham has a particular focus on first improving the fabric of buildings, constructed from sustainable timber sources, consideration of sustainable energy features and a sustainable procurement strategy which encourages the use of recycled materials. Thakeham intends to open a new MMC factory, providing new jobs to the area and ensuring all of its developments in Oxfordshire will have locally sourced MMC constructed homes helping to reduce the environmental impact of construction. Construction standards for Oxfordshire should be set through Building Regulations and at County level through the Strategic Plan to ensure the aspiration to focus on climate change is addressed through a countywide consistent approach.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 11	There should be an aspiration to maximise the use of renewable energy in new developments. Larger strategic sites will have more opportunity to utilise innovative technologies through onsite provision and this should be encouraged. However, development management policies requiring blanket provision across all new developments does not represent a suitable approach as some sites may not be able to accommodate such provision, policies should be flexible to ensure viability and accommodate advances in technology over the plan period.



LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 12	Thakeham has made a commitment to at least 20% biodiversity net gain across all of our schemes post2025. Whilst on-site provision of measures to achieve biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures should be the preferred approach, it is acknowledged that some sites may have particular challenges which require alternative offsite measures or contributions to achieve these standards. A strategic approach to off-site mitigation across the district would seem an appropriate response to focus ecological enhancements to improvements Conservation Target Areas/Nature Recovery Network.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 13	Advocate the use of natural capital assessments. While other forms of environmental net gain may also be material considerations in the determination of planning applications, these should be considered alongside but separate from natural capital
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 14	Supports a more flexible approach to the provision of children's play facilities and would suggest a preference towards suggestion three. Thakeham are encouraged by the Council's acknowledgement that opportunities for informal play are an important part of creative play, and would suggest that in some cases a cohesive approach to landscape design which provides more naturalistic opportunities for play represents a suitable option.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 15	Strategic sites should seek to provide as much provision to meet their own needs as possible. This will not be possible for all sites and therefore financial contributions should continue to be used to mitigate the increase in demand. How these contributions are spent should be on a case-by-case basis: if there is a clear deficit within a settlement, a new hub might be appropriate, but if improvements to existing infrastructure would resolve the deficit this should take precedence.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Design Codes will need to vary to reflect local context, we would therefore suggest that the Local Plan includes a policy requiring developments to have regard to the latest local design codes but leave the codes themselves to supplementary planning documents, site specific development briefs and neighbourhood plans.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Support the concept of 20-minute neighbourhoods. As an infrastructure-led sustainable place-maker, Thakeham continually looks to explore internalisation within its developments to ensure that both existing and future communities can meet their needs with just a short walk or cycle. Measures which align with the concept of 20minute neighbourhoods are not only acknowledged to encourage active behaviour and improve mental and physical health, but also helps shape communities to ensure that local shops and businesses thrive. Whilst an effective principle for larger development and urban edge developments, the application of 20-minute neighbourhood requirements through blanket policies would likely be preventative to development in rural areas. These measures should be encouraged, however should not seek to limit or prevent development where such principles are not suitable, yet nonetheless development is required.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Thakeham's approach to sustainable movement starts with the principle of reducing the need to travel through the offering of bespoke home offices for all houses. Our strategy then looks to shift the mode of travel through the prioritisation of walking and cycle routes, the provision of easy cycle storage with charging capability to facilitate the use of ebikes/e-scooters, whilst encouraging change to more sustainable car choices through the provision of fast electric vehicle charging to all houses.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 17	Advocate an updated methodology that reflects the increasing importance of climate, healthy places and sustainable economy. The IDP needs to be reflective of the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy to ensure cohesive delivery of infrastructure across the county
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 18	Oxfordshire has already set out ambitious growth targets up to 2050 in its early Strategic Plan consultation. Given the constraints around other authority areas within Oxfordshire, Cherwell is best placed to accommodate a significant amount of growth. Banbury is a key sustainable settlement in Cherwell and should perform a key role in the delivery of new homes and employment development. Thakeham believe that providing new homes are a key part of sustainable economic growth, through the provision of new settlements and significant expansion of existing settlements, which includes significant infrastructure delivery. However, we endorse the important role that smaller sites, such as Hanwell Rise, Banbury provide in terms of short term housing delivery at the start of the plan period. Across the district, a mix of the above options should be considered to ensure consistent delivery across the plan period.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 19	Development opportunities around Banbury are limited, with the M40 currently providing a defensible and logical boundary with the district boundary beyond. In the past there has been growth to the south and west of the settlement, however proximity to smaller villages in the surrounds of Banbury limits further expansion to the south or west due to coalescence with the villages. Support the provision of sites north of the town. Thakeham are promoting Hanwell Rise, which is located to the north of the town, and west of Southam Road and south of the M40. The site is available and has the ability to deliver approximately 150 dwellings alongside a Country Park. The site sits adjacent to newly constructed development at Cherry Fields, the Crematorium and an allocated site to the south of the Crematorium. It is in close proximity to employment along the Southam Road (as well as in the wider Banbury town); retail and leisure opportunities also lie in close proximity to the site. The site is also well connected as result of an existing bus service next to the site and pedestrian/cycle access to Banbury is readily available using existing pavements along the Southam Road. An Evolution Document has been provided alongside these representations which provides further information in respect of the proposals for Hanwell Rise.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 20	Paragraph 53 of the NPPF makes clear that Article 4 directions should only be used where the vitality and viability of primary shopping areas are undermined by the changes allowed under permitted development in respect of non-residential to residential. Such areas are required to be kept to the smallest geographical area possible and the use of an Article 4 direction must be based on robust evidence. Therefore, careful consideration needs to be taken on the use of Article 4 directions to ensure that these align with national policy

LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	These spaces and facilities should be subject to a policy stating that proposals resulting in their loss would normally be refused. There should be a degree of flexibility to ensure that developments that provide significant net gain in spaces and facilities are not unreasonably penalised to the loss of some existing areas.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - Addressing inequality in Banbury	Thakeham has a particular interest in community well-being and believes that our industry has a role to play in tackling inequality through placemaking, and this is what drives Thakeham's approach to social value. Thakeham's approach enhances our established business practices to maximise wellbeing benefits that our developments can offer those who build them, those who live in them and the communities around them now and into the future. We are passionate about having a positive impact on people's wellbeing, constantly striving to deliver against our four key focus areas. Building Local Communities via excellent placemaking that creates interconnected communities that challenge issues of loneliness and promote healthy living. Building Future Generations via our school engagement programmes, including our industry leading holistic ecology programme 'Eddie and Ellie's Wild Adventures' for primary age pupils through our Cornerstone Employer status with the Careers Enterprise Company. Building a stronger industry with our support of small and medium size enterprises and upskilling for local workers, supporting apprenticeships, and actively contributing to the diversification and upskilling of the construction sector. Building sustainable places by tackling issues of climate change, biodiversity loss and societal disconnects via our ambitious Sustainability Strategy.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Sites should incorporate design measures which encourage alternative modes of transport to car use. Thakeham's approach to sustainable movement starts with the principle of reducing the need to travel through the offering of bespoke home offices for all houses. Our strategy then looks to shift the mode of travel through encouraging access to more efficient and affordable public transport options, the prioritisation of walking and cycle routes, the provision of easy cycle storage with charging capability whilst also encouraging change to more sustainable car choices through the provision of fast electric vehicle charging to all houses. The proposals for Hanwell Rise incorporate these measures, including dedicated pedestrian and cycle routes which link into the existing network on Southam Road providing routes into the town, whilst the site's proximity to local bus stops provide access to the existing public transport network.
LPR-B-660	Thakeman Homes Ltd	Option 30	A mixture of sustainable sites of varying size will be required to ensure consistent delivery across the plan period. Whilst Thakeham encourage growth to be principally directed to sustainable locations, the delivery of new housing in rural areas can form an important part of ensuring the vitality of rural settlements. This is equally important to ensure that rural areas can provide for next generations rather than encourage migration towards larger settlements. All development options should be reviewed and growth should be directed proportionately to meet district need to ensure a holistic growth strategy.
LPR-B-660	JMD Investments and Estates Ltd	LPR-A-077	The proposals, contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Indeed, sufficient land has already been allocated in the district to meet predicted demand for the next 13 years. development on these sites expressly contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. These locations contradict both the current Local Plan Policy and contradict the Key Objectives of the CDC Local Plan Review and therefore the proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development should be dismissed. The proposal does not support KO8; The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. This risk is not only to children, the elderly, pedestrians and cyclists from a sheer volume perspective but clear links with increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development of this land would also be contrary to NPPG Rural housing para 78. Proposals do not align with SO12 or KO 9: Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development on these sites would be contrary to Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. This area should remain free of substantial new build structures. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA and as such, according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. Any development would overlook both the houses and gardens of the surrounding area, leading to an invasion of privacy. Both the height of any structure and the position of the structures' windows would be extremely detrimental to neighbours amenity. The proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development would result in the loss of the remaining open space to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and therefore should be dismissed. Proposals do not support KO 13 or KO 16: Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements.

LPR-B-662	Wendy Oliver	Adderbury	Adderbury village has been substantially developed since the 2011 census where 1064 dwellings were registered. Since 2015, the village now has more than 1250 dwellings; a 17% increase with further permitted developments to come forward, resulting in a 21% increase in housing since 2011. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past six years, particularly, has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. If the fields west of Berry Road are developed, those living at St Mary's Road will be hemmed in by development, which will change the setting of their homes significantly. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. Based on 30 homes per ha, many of the sites would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. One site, land east of Twyford could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of homes in the village itself. Adderbury's infrastructure, in terms of both roads and many local services, is already at capacity; Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue. Already tensions around the school a key times, anything more than 100 homes would mean the school would be at capacity. Additional traffic will add to the existing air quality pollution in the area, particularly near the school. Development of any or all of these greenfield sites will also have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats. Concerned about the effects that water runoff from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain; Although none of the sites proposed in Adderbury are within the existing floodplain, it stands to reason that if housebuilding takes place in areas adjacent to it, as several of the proposed sites are, the floodplain may not be able to cope. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths. These routes are all popular with walkers and local families. Further development will erode the lack of light pollution in the village. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade mirrors or exceeds the rate and scale of development of the past ten years, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, completely undesirable and unsustainable way.
LPR-B-663	Juniper-Hope Strong	Adderbury	Object to the sites proposed for Adderbury. Taken as a whole Adderbury and Bloxham have a disproportionate number of sites nominated in relation to all other parishes in Cherwell. If just half of these sites are granted Adderbury and Bloxham will become urban extensions of Banbury, losing their rural village character. Policy AD1: Adderbury Settlement Boundary is explicit that proposals outside the boundary will not be supported. Approval of these sites will be in direct contradiction of Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan policies. The plan was adopted by Cherwell District Council in July 2018 following significant cost and many hours of work by village volunteers. The plan was approved by the villagers in a referendum (June 2018) settling a difficult and often fractious debate. If the result of villagers' hard work and consternation is cast aside by the Cherwell Local Plan Review belief in the legitimacy of the planning process will be severely undermined. Many of the villagers are already angry that the ANP has only a cursory mention in the 'Parish Profile' accompanying this review.
LPR-B-663	Juniper-Hope Strong	LPR-A-086	proposed site is of a disproportionate size to the existing settlement. will defile the rural nature of the existing community, negatively impact on sensitive landscape and generally erode the separation of the Adderbury and the Bodicote/Banbury communities
LPR-B-663	Juniper-Hope Strong	LPR-A-156	proposed site is of a disproportionate size to the existing settlement. will defile the rural nature of the existing community, negatively impact on sensitive landscape and generally erode the separation of the Adderbury and the Bodicote/Banbury communities. The field has three different footpaths which are all form important local circular walks, as well as extending through to longer distance circular routes. Urbanisation of these important recreational facilities will greatly diminish their value and contribution to local community health and wellbeing. The field sits above the Sor Valley which floods on a regular basis. The flooding is felt throughout the village often entering homes further downstream. Building further on these higher pieces of land will accelerate the runoff, increase the speed that the water rises and exacerbate the impact further downstream notably for homes at the bottom – Chapel Lane including the Tennis and Squash Club, Dog Close, Water Lane/New Road and the village community centre and playing fields at Lucy Plackett. There is an urgent need to maintain suitable areas which allow gradual soak away of rain and filling of underground aquifers to hold back the speed by which the flood waters rise. The regularity and extent of the flooding in this area has increased significantly in recent years and this will get worse as the climate changes.
LPR-B-663	Juniper-Hope Strong	LPR-A-178	proposed site is of a disproportionate size to the existing settlement. will defile the rural nature of the existing community, negatively impact on sensitive landscape and generally erode the separation of the Adderbury and the Bodicote/Banbury communities. the development of this site will leave an even smaller gap of 300 metres between Bodicote and Adderbury. Joining Adderbury into the greater Banbury urban area contravenes objectives in the extant local plan (saved policies from The Cherwell Local Plan 1996 Policy C15 Prevention of Coalescence of Settlements and C33: Protection of important gaps of undeveloped land). Similarly, the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan policies AD5 Local Gaps – Twyford and Bodicote/Banbury specifically addresses this issue. An extension to Twyford of a development of this scale will change the character of the existing village extension and thereby change the character of the wider community. Such an urban extension would require significant additional infrastructure including mitigations for the motorway noise.
LPR-B-663	Juniper-Hope Strong	LPR-A-218	proposed site is of a disproportionate size to the existing settlement. will defile the rural nature of the existing community, negatively impact on sensitive landscape and generally erode the separation of the Adderbury and the Bodicote/Banbury communities

LPR-B-663	Juniper-Hope Strong	LPR-A-077	The field has a footpath which is always very busy with walkers as it forms part of popular long and short distance trails. Contrary to the information supplied in the 'Parish Plan' there are very few footpaths in Twyford and the eastern end of Adderbury. Loss or development adjacent to this path would erode our green infrastructure. The lower part of the field as with the rest of the Sor valley is designated 'Flood Zone 3' and regularly floods. The flooding causes significant disruption throughout the village, notably to homes at the bottom of Chapel Lane including the Tennis and Squash Club, Dog Close, Water Lane/New Road, the village community centre and playing fields at Lucy Plackett. The Sor Valley floods on many occasions throughout the autumn, winter and spring. Over very recent years flooding has increased in severity and presumably will continue to do so as the climate changes. The valley forms a useful flood plain slowing water as it goes through the village and beyond. Building on the upper slopes of the valley is likely to increase the speed water rises and therefore increase the damage further downstream. It is unclear how this could be managed by a SUDS scheme.
LPR-B-663	Juniper-Hope Strong	LPR-A-081	The development would result in the coalescence of Adderbury and Bodicote. Following the development of Cotefield Farm and Longford Park Phase 5 (CLP Site Banbury 12) the development of this site will leave just 500m between Bodicote and Adderbury effectively joining the two settlements. In recent years Bodicote has been joined with Banbury due to development and has become a suburb of the town. Joining Adderbury into this greater urban area contravenes objectives in the extant local plan (saved policies from The Cherwell Local Plan 1996 Policy C15 Prevention of Coalescence of Settlements and C33: Protection of important gaps of undeveloped land). Similarly, the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan policies AD5 Local Gaps – Twyford and Bodicote/Banbury specifically addresses this issue.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 1	The success of this Cherwell Local Plan Review will be measured in delivering the right housing and the right quantity of housing to the right people in the right places at the right time. Decisions must be delivered through a secure and robust evidential base, rather than the speculation of developers and councils.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 2	Seeking to rationalise the complex nature of the Cherwell Local Plan Review into themes and objectives is a major challenge in itself
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 3	Option 5 would appear to be the pragmatic choice with some consideration, as it embraces the other options while continuing to offer a range of flexibility however we need to be careful NOT to disrupt villages and spoil them with sprawl. Kidlington is also going to be at maximum capacity with housing so CDC needs to be mindful not to add to that sprawl for employment land. Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options Representation Form 4 There are clear advantages in continuing to utilise the existing urban centres of Banbury, Bicester with their already established transport connectivity. The use of previously developed land will clearly reduce the negative impact of further employment development on the rural landscape, but may offer insufficient land area.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 4	Option 2, but it is essential that the provision is made where the local need is identified rather than as an afterthought in the provision of development sites.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Supporting Employment	Essential to identify the need and then prioritising that need rather than the mere application of an arbitrary formula.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 5	Option 1
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	We need to ensure a positive awareness of climate change and the creation of new heritage environments for the future.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 6	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 7	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 8	Option 1
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	Yes

LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 9	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Travelling Communities	It is certainly needed and may reduce the impact of travelling communities turning up on parish land where it is not wanted
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	Environmentally friendly construction but IN KEEPING with the existing area should be considered
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 10	Option 3 could be identified as aspirational if the objective is to identify and achieve the highest quality for our residents. However, such aspiration may be significantly moderated by the implementation of relevant national guidelines.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 11	Option 1
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	Protect the local green belt – we should not be building on it especially in line with the recent Prime Minister comments. Build on areas already developed that need redevelopment instead. We also need to protect farmland for a sustainable future.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 12	Options 2 and 3
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 14	Option 3
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 15	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	We need to protect as much green space as possible.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 16	Option 1
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 17	Option 1
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 18	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 19	You should not develop on green field sites
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 20	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 21	Option 2

LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 22	Option 2 – Bicester is already losing its identity through urban sprawl
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 23	No further development
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 25	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Actually keep some more green space – a lot of concrete in Bicester
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Reducing car dependency in Bicester	More shuttle services, more cycle routes and safe crossings across the major surrounding roads
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Yes, there is going to be a huge problem if this is not addressed as all large plots seem to be developed to apartments. Families will not have the ability to purchase smaller houses. Small houses on the sites (with gardens) would be more useful.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 26	Option 2 – we should NOT be building on the green belt – expand on existing underused development – MANY empty units in Kidlington on industrial, new business parks and retail already – no need for more building
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 27	Option 3
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Cycle paths
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 28	Option 2 - keep green space
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community	Residents are complaining about the golf course going for housing, if CDC is serious about community and recreational needs the golf course would remain as it's a very good green space and recreational area and very well used. More facilities for football and rugby are required – grass pitches etc.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 29	Option 2
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 30	Option 1 – limit development, rural areas are being destroyed
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 31	Option 1 – work with communities and do not build unless the COMMUNITY needs it especially in rural areas. At the moment we often cater for areas in the surrounding area.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 32	Option 2 but we should also always consider if it will destroy the feel of the rural area. We also need to protect the farmland.
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 33	Option 1 – we need to protect agricultural and farm land further to ensure UK sustainable futures

LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Option 34	Combination of both – some areas need more protection and gaps should be maintained between parishes and towns
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Provide a dedicated support person
LPR-B-664	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council	Question - Development Management Policies	Protect green space
LPR-B-665	Dr Amy Levy	Islip	feel strongly there should be no further development on the green belt area around Islip. Concerned about the suggested number of new homes proposed for the greenbelt area around Islip. Concerns that the estimated number of new homes required in this area by 2050 is significantly higher than the area can accommodate (and note that the predicted figure is higher than would be estimated if calculated by standard methodology). The noted review of the Green Belt around Kidlington does not identify comprehensive exceptional circumstances to justify development on the potential site around Islip, and valid questions are raised about limiting settlement boundaries as applied to the edges of Islip Village. It appears that there has been limited assessment of potential development sites, and further consideration is required to assess the impact of housing development of this scale in rural area. Voice concerns that a development of this scale on this potential site for development would have a detrimental impact for residents of Islip and unrecognisable change the nature of this rural area, in addition to creating additional burdens to the infrastructure, commuting and nature of this rural village.
LPR-B-666	Mrs liz Wingrove	Adderbury	To have plans, which seem to have been sneaked in, not advertised – where was our letter describing these plans?, to add housing that more than doubles the size of Twyford with the LPR 178 + 156 proposals, is obscene, uncalled for and not required. Until the government has put in new legislation that enforces all housing developers to build eco friendly, low carbon emitting, sustainable housing, then we as a country should not be constructing any new housing which just lines the pockets of UK backward thinking building companies, who have not evolved their practices with global advances of self sufficient home building. As well as Twyford, West Adderbury has also already taken their hit of extra housing. No more housing is required. Adderbury is a village, not an extension of Banbury. The planning department needs to remember this fact.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 1	OU support much of the direction and thought shown by CDC in the Options document and are very much encouraged by our shared ambition to realise the many opportunities for sustainable growth and development that exist in the District. We recognise the important role that the Local Plan Review will have in shaping the kind of place Cherwell can become. We recommend that Cherwell continue to be ambitious in its vision and take advantage of the significant opportunities it is presented with; both from its existing assets and from government-backed growth in the wider region. Most notable of these is the Ox-Cam Arc, which represents possibly the greatest chance to deliver long-lasting, sustainable growth anchored by the innovation of its two world-leading universities.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 1	Cherwell has significant opportunities to help the country recover and grow in the coming decades – both in economic and environmental terms. It is to be commended that the draft Vision has such a strong focus on environmental improvements and sustainability. These are absolutely crucial to ensuring that our natural environment is able to recover and flourish; and it is right that the first 4 objectives of the draft Vision are related to this. OUD are committed to delivering development that has sustainability as its heart, and it is encouraging to see that these aspirations are shared with CDC. Cherwell's location within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc places it at a pivotal location in what is potentially one of the greatest growth opportunities in the country and the Vision for Cherwell should embrace this. The draft Vision as currently worded does reflect this, though perhaps not to the same ambitious extent as its importance within the OxCam Arc could allow. Cherwell, especially the south of the District, is at the intersection of growth corridors, including the Knowledge Spine North. Coupled with its proximity to Oxford and its world-leading university, this area has great potential to be one of the engine rooms behind the nation's modern industrial strategy, which can be based on innovation, technology, research and development. The Vision should mirror this ambition and potential by linking the benefits that can be provided through well-planned, sustainable development and growth to truly unlock the District's potential.

LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 2	<p>Comments on KO1-9: Maintaining and Delivering a Sustainable Local Economy. support these KOs and commend the recognition that green infrastructure and nature recovery have potential not only for attracting tourists but people and companies who want to settle and work in Cherwell. We also commend the recognition implicit in KO 1 that housing delivery is crucial to supporting economic growth and recommend that policy is drafted to reflect this. we consider the KO 1 should be adapted to reflect that simply meeting 'needs' based on previous employment and housing delivery may miss the very real opportunities the District has for growth and development, such as through the OxCam Arc. We consider such an approach would align more closely with paragraph 81 of the NPPF (2021), which requires planning policies to place significant weight "on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development... This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential". As the Council is aware as an active participant in Oxfordshire LEP and the Future Oxford Partnership, there are ambitious plans to ensure that the economic growth potential of the world leading scientific and knowledge-base created by the University, other research bodies, and the private sector is maximised. Oxfordshire is one of a few areas in the UK outside London that can be a global leader in driving innovation which are a national priority identified in paragraph 81 of the NPPF. Quote from NPPF para 83 re specific locational requirements for different sectors. The spatial disposition of knowledge and data driven uses should build on existing strengths and the geographical location on the edge of Oxford in the south of the district. The current strategic allocations in the Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review, particularly that at Begbroke, offer the potential to build new sustainable clusters and these should be considered as a spatial option for employment growth in the new Local Plan. We also encourage CDC to incorporate into the KOs a clear desire not only to allocate sufficient land but to use that land effectively and efficiently. Translating this into policy means allowing for a flexible approach with regards to development proposals, recognising that previously unforeseen opportunities should not be stifled by constricting policy requirements. Incorporating this kind of "responsive" approach to supporting growth is closely in line with the Framework's definition of sustainable development. We note that a small-scale review of the Green Belt around Kidlington is suggested. Such releases of Green Belt land should only occur in exceptional circumstances, and that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist the authority should demonstrate that it has "examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development." As part of this exercise, the capacity of sites already allocated for development should be tested to understand whether a greater quantum of floorspace could be delivered. This is in line with part (b) of paragraph 141 of the Framework, as well as paragraphs 125(a) and 130(e) which each require plans and policies to require the use of land to be optimised.</p>
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 2	<p>Comments on KO10-19: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change. like to endorse CDC's ambitions for delivering highly sustainable development that can help meet the UK's net zero carbon targets. We fully support the Council's aim of prioritising active travel and increasing the attraction of and opportunities for public transport and look forward to working with CDC and Oxfordshire County Council to achieve this for land allocated by Policy PR8 of the Local Plan (Part 1) Partial Review. Whilst acknowledging that these comments may equally apply to the KOs for 'Healthy PlaceShaping', we consider that greater emphasis could be given to the role that settlement patterns and the location and type of development can have on fostering sustainable transport networks. This involves recognising the need to make best use of land near to existing settlements where existing infrastructure can be used. A key component of reducing dependency on the private car is by reducing the need to travel by any kind of motorised vehicle; and indeed we are pleased to see this reflected in the Transport Hierarchy on page 59 of the Options document. The challenge is then to translate that into policies that can achieve the hierarchy. This can be achieved through the collocation of development types; by integrating residences with commercial uses, with community uses, with open space and with cultural amenities. Having retail and cultural amenities close to peoples' homes will ensure that everyday trips can be made by active travel modes, with knock on benefits for health and wellbeing, streetscapes and environmental health. We are pleased to see that this is reflected in KO28 of the Options document. The Options document also references the principle of '20minute neighbourhoods'. We support this as a notion, but also encourage Cherwell to consider the benefits of truly mixed-use neighbourhoods and how these could be supported through policy. Of course, not all trips can be made by active travel modes, and for those we strongly support the Council's ambition of improving the quality of public transport options. Cherwell's location is such that it is well-connected by road and rail to multiple key 'nodes'. However, there are greater opportunities arising for connectivity, notably through the East-West Rail being promoted as part of the Ox-Cam Arc. We encourage CDC to make the most of opportunities to expand the District's connectivity at the local, regional, and national levels and to work collaboratively with stakeholders on this.</p>
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 2	<p>Comments on KO20-31 on Healthy Place-Shaping. support the Council's KOs for Healthy Place-Shaping. The recognition that housing needs to be delivered for a broad range of sectors, and the implicit understanding that housing is not a 'one size fits all' product is strongly supported. We encourage CDC to consider how, for example, affordable housing policies could be sufficiently flexible as to give locationally-sensitive responses an opportunity to be considered, whilst not avoiding the clear need to deliver a significant quantum and proportion of affordable housing. Key worker housing, for example, should be explored as a potential component of a compliant affordable housing offer in the same vein as Oxford City Council have achieved in their adopted Local Plan 2036. This would go at least some way to ensuring that housing can be delivered to suit the needs of local people and foster mixed and balanced communities. We recognise the role that design codes can have in ensuring that development is delivered to suit local character and to be of a certain quality, however, any such codes should not stifle distinctive and innovative design.</p>
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 3	<p>All of the above - The Local Plan should reflect the diversity of operational requirements across employment types and allow for a flexible approach to employment development proposals. We encourage Cherwell to also consider options for capitalising on existing strengths and the geographical location on the edge of Oxford in the south of the district. This means considering the ability of sites already allocated through the Part 1 Partial Review to accommodate employment land through the new Local Plan.</p>



LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 4	A mixture of the above – a diverse economy is a strong economy. We would though encourage Cherwell to seek to maximise opportunities for growth in innovative and technologyed sectors. The Ox-Cam Arc represents an opportunity to be part of the modern economic engine that will drive the country's economic recovery, and in this sense opportunities arising from the University of Oxford should be made the most of.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 5	support increased flexibility that could allow for co-location of uses – whether these be commercial, retail, residential, community, cultural or leisure.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 6	strongly supports the delivery of affordable housing, recognising the constrain that housing affordability has on attracting and retaining top talent to the area.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 7	consider it appropriate that the Council have district-wide targets, but consider that the best housing responses are those that are locationally-specific and informed by up to date evidence. In this regard, we encourage Cherwell to formulate policy that allows for this, including developing an understanding of key worker housing as a type of affordable housing, as Oxford City Council have done.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Question - Green Belt	Only that Cherwell should remember that Green Belt land should only be released through a Development plan in exceptional circumstances and that for exceptional circumstances to exist all other options should be assessed and discounted. These options that are assessed should include the ability of brownfield sites and sites already allocated in the Development Plan to meet development needs through site optimisation.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Whilst acknowledging the positive role that design codes and guidance can play, we would encourage Cherwell to recognise that innovative, sustainable and modern design cannot always be accurately coded or boiled down into guidance – nor should it be. Whilst it is right that design should be influenced by its surroundings, codes and guidance should not stifle the chance for truly high quality design proposals to be brought forward.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	support the principle of the 20-minute neighbourhoods, which are critical to engendering a sense of place but also tackling environmental impacts from the use of private car use. A founding principle of the 20-minute neighbourhood is the co-location of uses and we consider this to even more the case in a post-COVID world.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Question - Transport & Connectivity	fully support Cherwell's ambition to reduce private car use and improve and encourage the use of public and active transport modes. The private vehicle, however, is not going to disappear and it is important that development accurately and fairly contributes to ensuring that the correct infrastructure is delivered at the correct time.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Question - Transport Policies	Encourage Cherwell to consider ways of ensuring there is a mechanism by which developments can calculate reasonable and accurate contributions to infrastructure. This will provide greater clarity and certainty to prospective developers, whilst also ensuring that single sites are not unduly burdened with mitigation or improvement costs.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	See response to Option 16 also. encourage Cherwell to ensure there is a mechanism for fairly and accurately calculating contributions to infrastructure delivery from development sites. We would also encourage Cherwell to engage as openly as possible with the County Council to ensure there is clarity and consistency between the parties.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Option 26	encourage Cherwell to robustly test all options for delivering employment floorspace in and around Kidlington as a prerequisite to identifying exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release. Of these options to be tested, assessing whether brownfield sites and sites allocated in the Development Plan are optimised for development or if they can accommodate a greater quantum of development should be carried out.
LPR-B-667	Quod for Oxford University Development	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	recognise that many people in Kidlington commute to Oxford and the role that the 'PR' sites can have in helping deliver infrastructure to improve links between Kidlington and Oxford. We would encourage Cherwell to consider options for ensuring that all PR sites contribute to delivering a cohesive transport network.
LPR-B-668	Robert and Paula Musekiwa	LPR-A-041	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan should be honoured and strike this site from the parish profile.

LPR-B-668	Robert and Paula Musekiwa	LPR-A-086	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan should be honoured and strike this site from the parish profile.
LPR-B-668	Robert and Paula Musekiwa	LPR-A-146	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan should be honoured and strike this site from the parish profile.
LPR-B-668	Robert and Paula Musekiwa	LPR-A-218	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan should be honoured and strike this site from the parish profile.
LPR-B-668	Robert and Paula Musekiwa	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages. Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan should be honoured and strike this site from the parish profile.

LPR-B-669	Richard Hazel	LPR-A-119	4ha of the 5ha site are 'ridge and furrow' as designated by Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER). the ridge and furrow part of the field is a heritage asset in its own right and this site should therefore not be considered appropriate for development. This land is considered inappropriate for development on a number of accounts. 1. It is crossed by an existing public footpath and there is additionally a second historic footpath which is being considered for re-instatement. Furthermore an agricultural access track also crosses the land. 2. The land is in direct view of the Grade II Listed property, Farnell Fields, and therefore any development on this land would have a very significant impact on the setting of a listed building dating from 1623.
LPR-B-670	Joe Wilson	LPR-A-077	The current plan is totally out of proportion with the character of the village, both in its current form and in its historical context. The proposal will overwhelm the existing community and destroy its rural setting, without any reasonable justification for doing so. There are no jobs, or work potential for an increased population, alongside inadequate provision for a rise in school pupil numbers and medical facilities. Public transport does not support an expansion on such scale, and road infrastructure is already struggling to deal with increased numbers resulting from the developments on Milton Road, and the extreme traffic already evident on the Oxford road. The proposals, contradict Cherwell District Council's own Local Plan Key Objectives and existing Local Planning Policies. Any further development will have a severe visual impact on the rural character of Adderbury, specifically those proposed within the conservation area or adjoining its boundary. Indeed, sufficient land has already been allocated in the district to meet predicted demand for the next 13 years. development on these sites expressly contradicts Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change. Adderbury is not a sustainable location as described in the Local Plan. These locations contradict both the current Local Plan Policy and contradict the Key Objectives of the CDC Local Plan Review and therefore the proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development should be dismissed. The proposal does not support KO8; The local infrastructure, particularly the through road, road junctions, access roads and roads adjoining the school are at or near capacity and create a health and safety risk to residents. This risk is not only to children, the elderly, pedestrians and cyclists from a sheer volume perspective but clear links with increased volumes of traffic, particularly stationary, results in poor air quality. Any further development would place an unnecessary strain on these services and does not support a sustainable economy. Any development of this land would also be contrary to NPPG- Rural housing para 78. Proposals do not align with SO12 or KO 9: Continued development of land, particularly that located within the conservation area and green belt should be refused on the basis that any further loss of this attribute would severely impact the character and beauty of Adderbury's natural heritage, lessen its natural capital and degrade its ecosystem. Any development on these sites would be contrary to Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment. Substantial new build structures on elevated land, filling a space within the village that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in its undeveloped form, should be resisted. This area should remain free of substantial new build structures. Any new development in this area would appear unusually incongruous and out of character to the historic character of the immediate locality. Wild Oxfordshire have included this proposed development land within their North Cherwell CTA and as such, according with Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas, development which would prevent the aims of a Conservation Target Area being achieved will not be permitted. Any development would overlook both the houses and gardens of the surrounding area, leading to an invasion of privacy. Both the height of any structure and the position of the structures' windows would be extremely detrimental to neighbours amenity. The proposal to allocate land at LPR-A-077 for residential development would result in the loss of the remaining open space to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and therefore should be dismissed. Proposals do not support KO 13 or KO 16: Further and increased residential development in inappropriate locations (ie rural villages) where the local road infrastructure is at or near capacity has resulted in a significant increase in vehicular movements. reference made to The Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) report into 'The Causes of Air Pollution'. Responsible rural planning policies and strategic objectives should seek to limit local resident's exposure to these noxious and poisonous pollutants. Croft Lane is wholly unsuited to any increase in traffic flow and traffic density; any proposed increase in traffic, however minimal, will create a significant road safety risk; there simply is not sufficient capacity in the current road layout to support an increase in traffic without increasing the risk of death or severe accident to children and other frequent pedestrian users. Further residential development in Adderbury does not support this objective as it decreases the areas natural capital, it increases air pollution, lowers connectivity and does not form part of a sustainable transport model facilitating by lowered car usage. The proposals do not support KO 23: The CNC Local Plan Review must resist the continued erosion of villages in Cherwell and specifically around Adderbury. Based on current build rates and current planning consent together with
LPR-B-671	Joanna and Andrew Howard	LPR-A-178	Development would radically change the nature of the village. It would be unbalanced on one side, with such a vast area of new housing stretching towards the Northamptonshire border and distanced from the village centre and amenities. This area is enjoyed by a large proportion of local residents for quiet recreation, ie using the public footpath that goes from Walton Avenue to Kemps Farm, with views of open space and fields on either side. The need for open spaces for both physical and mental health is vital. Traffic on the Oxford/Banbury Road and the Aynho Rd can already get congested. The Kings Sutton Road is comparatively narrow with cars parked on it, and more traffic would cause congestion. The local infrastructure does not support large scale new housing in this area. This site proposal was not in the recent Adderbury village plan that was voted on by residents following considerable local consultation.

LPR-B-672	DLP Planning for Inspired Villages	Option 1	<p>Contact Consulting Report - Headline Social Needs Report, supporting the proposal by Inspired Villages to develop a Retirement Village within Cherwell LPA submitted along with this response. This is conservative and lacks ambition. The Arc is intended as a high-growth sub region, which will offer substantial opportunities of local, regional, national, and international significance. It presents a real opportunity for Cherwell, and it follows that the vision should seek to utilise this to drive forward sustainable growth and to contributing to meeting local and regional needs. The Council are able to create a real legacy with regard to green infrastructure and sustainable methods of construction. There is currently a national and global focus on climate change, and given the location of Cherwell, the opportunities presented from the Arc, could include large-scale green infrastructure alongside new communities and businesses. As such, the Council should seek to be bolder in its delivery and where possible consider sustainable technologies. The Arc presents the opportunity for the Council to influence the design and shaping of residential and commercial developments, using for example innovation to address climate change, creating green transport solutions, ensuring sustainable development benefits all and use zero carbon methods of construction. The Council should be guided by the needs of local people, including older people, so as to provide for inclusive new developments.</p> <p>Aspects of the vision are supported however further consideration towards the positive attributes specialist older persons housing can deliver should be acknowledged, specifically as this type of development presents benefits, which contribute to each of the overarching themes. The vision is consistent with the Oxfordshire Plan, however, it should be clearer about the role of Cherwell in both the greater Oxford area and also in the Oxford to Cambridge Arc, as this could provide further focus for the objectives and consequently the policies. In February 2021, the Government published its plan for developing “a spatial framework” for the Arc, including a timeline and how it will work with local partners. The plan cites studies suggesting large economic gains: Forecasts vary, but successive studies have found that there is a clear transformational opportunity. With the right interventions and investment, economic forecasts suggest that by 2050 we would see economic output growing by between £80.4 billion and £163 billion per annum, with between 476,500 and 1.1 million additional jobs. The plan goes on to note that the Government has identified the Arc as a national economic priority area. The proposed Oxford-Cambridge Spatial Framework will have the status of national policy and is intended to form a material consideration for plan-making alongside the National Planning Policy Framework. Between August and October 2021 the Government sought views on priorities for the Framework as part of consultation on the document ‘Creating a Vision for the Oxford- Cambridge Arc’. The latest consultation proposals set out that the Spatial Framework will aim to guide sustainable planning and investment decisions under four policy pillars: environment; economy; connectivity and infrastructure; and place-making. The consultation followed publication of an initial policy paper in February 2021 setting out the approach to developing the Framework. Paragraphs 2.10 and 2.11 of the policy paper set out in terms of the strategy for housing and planning in the Arc the role of the Framework will not be to make site allocations or to include detailed policies set elsewhere in national policy or better left to local plans (including for example, setting out the housing requirement or meeting the housing needs of different groups). The policy paper emphasises the importance of meeting housing needs in full, this including by inference, the range of needs as well as quantum, and therefore relies on the calculation of minimum annual local housing need in accordance with the standard method as its starting point. Opportunities to increase levels of development above this minimum starting point are clearly anticipated as part of the Framework’s aspirations to support economic development and ensure a balance between the delivery of new jobs and homes and the position of these representations is that circumstances in Oxfordshire support exceeding the standard method figure. Details of the emerging Spatial Framework demonstrate that it is imperative that Local Plans continue to be prepared without delay to deliver policies that support meeting the specific needs for the sustainable development within an area, within the context of planning positively for overall housing needs. This is of particular importance in the context of specialist housing for older people, where provision within the current development plan falls far short of the current requirements of national policy and guidance despite the pressing nature of the need. PPG identifies that the need to provide housing for older people is ‘critical’, the only group identified as such in national policy guidance (Para:</p>
LPR-B-672	DLP Planning for Inspired Villages	Option 2	<p>The overarching themes navigating the set of objectives are supported as each theme reflects district and national wide issues. The specific key objectives currently seem isolated from one and other and this should not be the case. Rather it should ensure that housing and the economy are considered concurrently in parts, as these should be intertwined to encourage sustainable development. For example, the priority for Healthy Place- Shaping, as a concept that would align with the social objective of the National Planning Policy Framework, is supported in principle. Under Healthy Place-Shaping the objective KO 20 specifically refers to ‘the need to provide homes for an aging population... in a way that creates sustainable, well designed, safe, inclusive and mixed communities, which promote inter-generational connectivity and lifetime neighbourhoods.’ This focuses on the design aspect of specialist housing for older people. The Council should consider the wider benefits of such accommodation in contributing towards sustainable development, which include freeing up of family housing for younger generations helping deal with the issue of affordability and housing need and reducing pressure on health infrastructure. The benefit of the Extra Care model was set out in a report by the Aston Research Centre for Healthy Ageing and the Extra Care Charitable Trust in April 2015 which sought to evaluate “whether the Extra Care approach gives positive outcomes for healthy ageing which result in measurable health and social care cost savings” and a total of fourteen villages and schemes took part in the project. The study found that the Extra Care model can result in significant saving for NHS budgets reducing costs by 38% of a 12month period. Further, the same study demonstrated a 46% decrease in planned GP visits, and a reduction from 8-14 days in hospital per year for an Extra Care resident to 1-2 days for a resident of a retirement village. A report by the Kings Fund, ‘Evaluating the Care and Support Specialised Housing (CASSH) programme: results of a scoping exercise’ was published in November 2020. CASSH is a Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) programme which provides capital funding to build new specialised housing in England for older people and disabled adults with care and support needs. The scoping exercise was intended to explore areas including the established benefits of CASSH-type housing generally and the wider health and care policy goals. This set out the types of benefits of CASSH-type housing in a series of tables, from various sources, which includes savings to the NHS due to reduced elective and non-elective usage of NHS services; reduction in non-elective admissions to hospital; improvement in individual’s personal health; and improvement in individual’s mental wellbeing. By considering the economic and environmental benefit of providing specialist housing for an aging population, this will facilitate and promote sustainable growth. This would more effectively be achieved through introducing a dedicated objective outlining the importance and broad approach to meeting the housing needs of older people in full.</p>

<p>LPR-B-672</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1914</p>	<p>DLP Planning for Inspired Villages</p>	<p>Option 7</p>	<p>Paragraph 65 b) of the Framework makes clear that proposals for specialist accommodation should be exempt from providing at least 10% affordable housing stating: “Exemptions to this 10% requirement should also be made where the site or proposed development: b) provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purposebuilt accommodation for the elderly or students);” Government Policy is therefore clear that specialist accommodation should be exempt from the affordable housing policy requirement. The retirement village model takes the form of a “core building” and surrounding purpose designed specialist accommodation. The village core will provide a number of communal facilities focused on facilitating wellness and typically comprise up to 25% of its floorspace as non-saleable space. This includes the communal and care facilities available to its residents. These facilities may vary from village to village but will always include a minimum level of communal provision. The specialist accommodation takes the form of ‘extra care’ units that have been carefully designed to incorporate features that allow for practical living for older people and the delivery of care and assistance safely within that setting, which can be increased over time as necessary. The development provides the following features which suggest that it would fall within use class C2. The development provides specialist housing that caters for the specific needs of older persons. The care village provides a wide range of communal facilities to promote physical and mental health and wellbeing, including a wellness spa, restaurant, meeting spaces/library, transport service, landscaped grounds, back office and staff facilities. The accommodation provides the following specialist features: level access, maximised natural daylight, internal room layout, connectivity to staff. The development would provide specialist management services including; a village manager, wellbeing navigator and reassurance response coordinated through the central reception. In addition security and domestic assistance staff would be provided. IV will carry out an extensive review process to identify Registered Domiciliary Care Providers to provide Personal Care to residents; although individuals retain choice over which Registered Care Provider they choose to deliver their care. IV’s wellbeing Navigators will assist with the practical arrangements to facilitate the introduction of Registered Care within the resident’s accommodation, which can be tailored to their needs and available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Registered Care Provider will provide a qualified Care Manager and care workers. It is envisaged that the extra care units will be restricted through a legal agreement so that they are only used for class C2 purposes in perpetuity. Retirement villages fall within use class C2 of the Use Classes Order. Delivery of Affordable Housing on Extra Care sites it typically challenging, which is why paragraph 10-007-20190509 of the NPPG states that viability may need to be considered on schemes ‘where particular types of development are proposed which may significantly vary from standard models of development for sale. While an initial purchase may be discounted, the ongoing service charge for access to the village’s services and facilities cannot be discounted. It would not be possible to discount the cost of care for “affordable” residents. These practical issues should be addressed within policy as otherwise it could be difficult to implement and be ineffective. Levels of owneroccupation among older people in the district are also above national averages at 81.13% for those between 65 and 74 years of age. This suggests that the current level of provision of Extra Care Housing does not reflect the need for specialist accommodation in all tenures but particularly for that substantive majority of older people who will wish to maintain their tenure of choice when moving to a setting providing the care and support services that meet their needs. The Retirement Village/Extra Care model predominantly operates on the sale of individual units as part of a managed development. Care packages are purchased either from the operator or by a third party care provider. This differs from care homes which are sold or let to an operator with individual residents paying for their room, board and care. The Retirement Village model also differs from more general development in that they incorporate a significant level of facilities this results in the net to the total floor space (‘gross’), is significantly poorer than in traditional/general needs housing. This means that such schemes have a substantially lower amount of saleable space compared with traditional developments. Such schemes will also require the additional costs of lifts and specially adapted bathrooms and other such facilities appropriate to the target age group. At para 10-007-20190509 of the National Planning Practice Guidance, it states that ‘where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that fully comply with them should</p>
---	---	-----------------	--

LPR-B-672	DLP Planning for Inspired Villages	Question - Housing Policies	<p>policies of the Local Plan Review set out a clear approach to support the provision of specialist housing for older people. It is a requirement of national policy and guidance that these policies are based on an up-to-date assessment of needs for specialist housing, as a central component of the housing needs of different groups. A Needs Assessment has been carried out by Contact Consulting, reviewing the future housing need for specialist older persons housing based on the demographics of the district, existing and planned supply, and tenure. This assessment identifies an ageing population and one with an age profile above the national average and where home ownership amongst older people is also significantly above the national average. The result of this, is that even accounting for existing and consented future demand, the needs of home-owning older people is not and will not be met. National policy and guidance are clear in requiring local authorities to plan to meet the needs of older people and importantly, the NPPG confirms that “where there is an identified unmet need for specialist housing, local authorities should take a positive approach to schemes that propose to address this need” (Para: 016). The PPG confirms that plan makers should evaluate the tenure, types and size of supply and current stock to assess whether future needs will be met, recognising that, “The need to provide housing for older people is critical as the proportion of older people in the population is increasing”. There is a projected rise of around 50% for those people aged 65 years and over within the population of Cherwell up to the year 2040. Those aged 90 years of age or over, are the fastest growing age group in the local population, projected to increase by 136% between 2020 and 2040. Levels of owner-occupation among older people in the district are also above national averages at 81.13% for those between 65 and 74 years of age. The current level of provision of Extra Care Housing does not reflect the need for specialist accommodation in all tenures but particularly for that substantive majority of older people who will wish to maintain their tenure of choice when moving to a setting providing the care and support services that meet their needs. The current supply of Market Extra Care Housing in Cherwell District is just 56 units, less than 15% of the current need for this type of accommodation. By 2040, current provision will be just 8% of anticipated demand for this tenure. The current provision of Extra Care Housing in the Borough does not reflect the need for such accommodation in all tenures, but particularly for those who will wish to maintain their tenure of choice as homeowners when moving to a setting providing the care and support services that meet their needs. A need within Cherwell for the provision of housing for older people. The policies of the current Local Plan 2011–2031 fall far short of the current approach within national policy and guidance. Local authorities should define the need for such accommodation including recognising the trends for different options and tenures and then seek to address this need through allocations or policy support. Policies should recognise the various forms of accommodation and care for the older population can come forward without delay. Para 14 contains the following requirement for Planning Authorities: “as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses”. Planning Practice Guidance relating to the Housing Needs of Older People was updated in July 2019 and applies to preparation of the Local Plan Review. The PPG outlines that Local Authorities will need to count homes for older people as part of their housing land supply. The PPG (Para 003) also advises what ‘range of needs should be addressed’. The PPG sets out that a range of specialised provision is available but notes that any single development may contain a range of different types of specialist housing (Para: 010). The guidance makes it clear that Local Plans need to appropriately provide for specialist housing where a need exists (paragraph 012). The guidance then goes on to state how plan makers will need to account for older people who wish to stay or move to general housing that is already suitable, ensuring that general housing is also sensitive to the needs of an ageing population. The guidance clearly demonstrates how older people should have a wide choice of options when moving to specialised housing. This will be done through plan-makers considering the size, quality and location of dwellings for older people in the future or for them to move to more suitable accommodation. The guidance sets out possible criteria for site selection. Despite this, some larger facilities may still be viable and attractive for older persons despite not being close to nearby facilities and amenities (paragraph 013). There is little guidance on the matter of Use Class and makes no mention of the application or otherwise of affordable housing requirements to developments of specialised accommodation for older people (paragraph 014). The guidance states that the need for older</p>
LPR-B-672	DLP Planning for Inspired Villages	Option 22	<p>Cherwell is located on the Oxfordshire knowledge spine, which includes investment across a ‘knowledge spine’ which includes ‘Science Vale’ in the south of the County, Oxford and Bicester. The Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine was identified within the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan, which prioritises growth in three areas along the spine for growth potential in population, employment and housing. Along this spine Bicester is identified as one of these areas. Bicester is relatively an unconstrained nature of the town in terms of landscape sensitivity and lack of Green Belt designation. For these reasons, Bicester is within an ideal location to accommodate further expansion and growth for both employment and residential development, including specialist housing accommodation for older persons. Within the District there is a housing demand and supply issue, resulting in an issue of affordability for the younger generation. The Council should seek to maximise the benefits and flexibility of existing and future allocated sites to achieve specialist housing for older people. This has been recognised by the Government in paragraphs 4.42 to 4.44 of the White Paper ‘Fixing our broken housing market’, which acknowledge that helping older people to move at the right time and in the right way can help their quality of life as well as freeing up more homes for other buyers. Under-occupied homes could then be released onto the market where they would be particularly attractive to those in younger age groups in need of larger houses to raise families. The provision of specialist housing more suited to the needs of older persons is likely to encourage them to move and would make a valuable contribution to overall housing needs which should be weighed in the balance. Having greater flexibility on strategic policies will allow for the appropriate development to be delivered as per the local, regional and national needs. Housing growth at Bicester should therefore allow for greater flexibility to allocated site as it will assist in maintaining and developing a sustainable economy; meet the challenge of climate change; and assist in healthy place shaping.</p>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 1	No. Generally in agreement

LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 2	We generally support all of the draft objectives. Whilst almost all are worthy objectives, we most strongly support those that are positive towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cherwell's urban centres</li> <li>• The natural and historic environment</li> <li>• The challenges of climate change</li> <li>• The need for well-built affordable and social housing; this includes KO6, KO7, KO8, KO9, KO10, KO12, KO13, KO14, KO15, KO18, KO19, KO25 and KO27. Please do not forget transport (at present only KO 29). Most pressing to Banbury are: a multi-modal interchange, and an alternative to the Inner Distributor Road (Upper Windsor Street – Cherwell Street) which is a misery to the town of Banbury: always clogged and which cuts the town in two. We have long espoused the Bankside – Jct 11 link <u>We are very keen that 'big sheds' do not continue to be built without photovoltaic or green roof:</u></li> </ul>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 3	We most favour options 1) and 4). We do NOT favour large-scale development at intersections on the M40. We also do NOT favour an assumption towards the redevelopment of previously developed land for employment use. Pre-developed land can be in unsustainable locations, or locations that are particularly visually sensitive and unsuitable for large footplate buildings. Employment should always be sited where it is most needed and where it <u>has the least environmental (particularly visual) impact</u>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 4	We generally favour mixed-use, but this needs to provide for lower-cost small / incubator units, particularly for high-tech and manufacturing, as well as larger-volume units. Where the current Local Plan has identified employment sites, these have almost invariably been developed with big (massive) sheds, often for lowemployment B8 (warehousing) uses. These seem to have been consented with little or no regard to supposed 'safeguards' in the relevant local plan policies regarding visual impact, landscaping, green infrastructure or green / photovoltaic roofs. Much more control over scale and <u>appearance is clearly required</u>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Supporting	Need to provide for lower-cost small / incubator units and units for high-tech and manufacturing
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 5	This question appears to be a leading question, as residential and other community and leisure uses are, and have always been, permissible in the town centre, subject to the caveat that residential uses are currently not normally permitted at ground level within the primary retail area. The question should probably more properly read "To support our town centres, should we 1) Provide more flexibility at ground floor level within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes 2) Maximise flexibility at ground floor level within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. The primary retail area is no doubt too large currently, but it provides an important protection for the historic character of Banbury's primary retail streets: Market Place, High Street and Parson's Street. We would be in support of a redrafting of policy for Banbury's town centre, but this should be based on a conservation-led assessment of the existing built environment, building by building and street by street
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	We would be in support of a redrafting of policy for Banbury's town centre, but this should be based on a conservationled assessment of the existing built environment, building by building and street by street
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Supporting Our Town	We would be in support of a redrafting of policy for Banbury's town centre, but this should be based on a conservationled assessment of the existing built environment, building by building and street by street
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 6	There is clearly a chronic shortfall of both affordable and social rented housing across the district, which the 30% / 35% requirement is signally failing to make any serious inroads into. How much affordable and social rented housing is built should be dependent on social need. The local plan should set out ambitious requirements for affordable and social rented housing to meet this need and, if the private sector is unable to meet this need, the local <u>plan should set out how it will be met by the Council or its RSLs</u>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 7	Yes, the Council should prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 8	The local plan should require all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard. This should normally be a minimum requirement, with minor exceptions allowed in the case of the reuse of historic buildings where substantial intervention might be required to precisely meet such <u>standards</u>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 9	Option 1
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Housing Policies	We would support policies that allow for temporary or modular homes
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 10	Option 3 - There is a pressing need for this to include 'big sheds'. It is simply tragic that Banbury's setting is disfigured by many hectaes of big sheds, yet <u>not one has a green roof or a single roof-mounted photo-voltaic panel</u>

LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Yes, very much so. Clear and easily-understood Policy is required and should be sent out to all building owners. This should look first at where the easiest and cheapest gains may be accrued (loft insulation and draught-proofing, including windows) and where interventions are of much more dubious benefit (short-life upvc double-glazing). Money spent on roof-mounted photo-voltaics may be much better spent on an off-site community solar park. Policy may be needed to discourage external wall insulation and encourage internal wall insulation, not just within conservation areas, but also in areas where external finishes are critical to local character or visual amenity.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 11	Either. Probably option 1), subject to the identification of sites being based on a criteria-based assessment of the appropriateness of proposals
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Clear policies regarding the increasing likelihood of flood risk
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 12	Probably 2- Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused This is based on the assumption that this is where the BNG gain is likely to be of greatest benefit
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 13	Option 2
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 14	Option 3
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Local Green Spaces	1 - Why only in Bicester, Kidlington and Fritwell? 2 - Thought needed
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Generally those in accordance with the NPPG. Oxford Canal. We would strongly support much more robust policies for the non-designated heritage assets , buildings on the Local List and buildings / areas subject to Article 4 Directions The Banbury Conservation Area Appraisal contains a list of buildings protected by Article 4 Directions, yet we understand that this part of the adopted Appraisal is not adopted
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Robust Cherwell Design Guide, supported by appropriate policies. The design guide to include advice on historic buildings and conversions / extensions as well as new builds
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes, subject to the proviso that "we should take our approach further than the guiding principles to refine the transport user hierarchy to support low emission vehicles, both public and private, and recognise the contribution potential of a wider type of vehicles. Including provisions for electric bicycles and electric scooters in urban areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-modal interchange at Banbury railway station.</li> <li>• On-street charging points for electric cars.</li> <li>• Better provision and encouragement of electric bicycles and electric scooters</li> </ul>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 16	Yes to all three options
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Transport Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-modal interchange at Banbury railway station.</li> <li>• On-street charging points for electric cars.</li> <li>• Better provision and encouragement of electric bicycles and electric scooters</li> </ul>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 17	Options 1 and 3
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-modal interchange at Banbury railway station.</li> <li>• On-street charging points for electric cars.</li> <li>• Better provision and encouragement of electric bicycles and electric scooters</li> </ul>
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 18	Option 2
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 19	None of the options are supported



LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-185	Oppose. no more development east of the M40
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-198	Oppose. no more development east of the M40
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-034	Oppose. no more development east of the M41
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-168	Oppose. no more development east of the M42
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-150	Oppose. Woodland. BNG will be impossible
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-152	Oppose. No reasonable public access. Open countryside. Eastern part is flood plain
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-141	Oppose. Public water supply reservoir and sailing club. Unsuitable for any development except perhaps watersports.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-205	Support
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-154	Oppose. Open countryside. Adverse effect view looking north from South Bar, looking to fields to the north of Banbury. Adverse effect on views at crematorium.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-047	Oppose. Open countryside. Adverse effect view looking north from South Bar, looking to fields to the north of Banbury. Adverse effect on views at crematorium.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-185	Oppose. keep Wykham Lane rural
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-116	Oppose. keep Wykham Lane rural
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-027	no objection
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-007	Support existing travellers site.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-007	Oppose new travellers site at Poundland 1-6 Malthouse Walk. Within conservation area. Inappropriate location.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-007	Oppose new traveller site at PR Alcock and Sons Ltd, Castle Street. In conservation area, with locally listed buildings. Inappropriate location.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-007	Oppose new travellers site at 3 west bar street, In conservation area, with locally listed buildings. Inappropriate location
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-129	no objection
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-150	no objection
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-152	Object. Open countryside. Setting of Listed building
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-159	Object. Open countryside
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-107	Object. Open countryside
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-166	Object. Open countryside
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-182	Object. Open countryside

LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-203	support
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-149	support
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	LPR-A-170	support
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Important views of Banbury	Option 1 yes. • The view north from Oxford Road, looking over South Bar to fields on the north side of Banbury • Views of and from the east side of the Cherwell Valley • View of St Mary's Church and eastern side of Cherwell valley from Church View
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 20	Option 1 yes. Option 2 no.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 21	Option 1 yes. Option 2 yes. Option 3 Absolutely NO. Much of the area is a conservation area and it contains a number of Listed and locally listed buildings. Its environment is too precious and has too much potential for it to be designated an enterprise zone or regeneration area with limited planning control
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Banbury's open spaces	Toilets and a café in People's Park
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Addressing Inequality in	Far better family hub network required. Provision of community performance and arts outreach hub, probably in Castle Quay, incorporating a new Mill
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	• Multi-modal interchange at Banbury railway station. • Better provision and encouragement of electric bicycles and electric scooters
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 24	Option 1 yes. Option 2 no.
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 25	why is this question not asked for Banbury?
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	Former railway network at Graven Hill for heritage use
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 29	Because of the uniqueness and critical Cold War heritage of Heyford Park, any further development areas must be the result of heritage led assessment. It may be that capacity has already been reached Conservation Area and Heritage buildings within Heyford Park, and their settings, must be respected
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 31	option 3
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Option 34	Probably a mixture of the two. As some landscapes are rarer or more valued than others, it would be helpful to have hierarchy of valued landscapes and applicable policies
LPR-B-673	Banbury Civic Society	Question - Development Management Policies	Article 4 directions and policies, both in Banbury and the countryside / villages Local List policies

LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 1	<p>The bland statement that Cherwell will “achieve our climate action targets” is unlikely given that the possible development increases across the already overdeveloped County can only make climate destroying construction and huge reductions in biodiversity, green space, farming, tree and hedge cover even worse than it is today. It is notable that no housing numbers are identified as the plan is to use the work of the County Oxfordshire Plan 2050 numbers set out in the recently produced and seriously flawed OGNA. That document must be peer reviewed before being used. Item 4 suggests there is a choice of energy efficient, well designed market and affordable homes to meet our needs. This might happen if the building regulations or the Cherwell LP Review seriously toughen up the requirements to at least Scandinavian standards from the last century. Of course all the homes being constructed in recent years and in the near future are to the very bad standards of the present building regulations meaning this item might only apply to new homes from 2023 onwards. Item 6 suggests the District has “good transport links and sound infrastructure” whereas the facts today are of gridlocked roads, inadequate footways and cycleways, an over capacity motorway and two main line railways that are not electric. East West Rail promoters are now sending out publicity that their railway will be “electric from the start” but it isn’t! As to providing more diverse employment, Bicester has now become warehouse town with so many appalling giant sheds blighting the landscape and providing few real jobs. The town was promised high tech’ spin off industries from the Universities but we only have storage and distribution. Item 10 is a desire that so far has been the direct opposite! The natural environment is being rapidly taken in the unproven ‘need’ for ever more housing and employment. Cherwell does not maintain its rural character as the failure to protect the villages from overdevelopment caused by that wording in the ‘Villages’ section of the present LP allowed developers to swamp many with more to come. Item 11 you cannot prove regarding biodiversity as the figures from scientists show that there has already been a serious loss of biodiversity across the south of England. Item 12 suggesting Banbury, Bicester and especially Kidlington have not had chance to adapt to the massive disruption caused by the present LP. They are no longer attractive as they are being swamped by overdevelopment and, in the case of Bicester, giant sheds surrounding the town and decimation of the old town centre. Kidlington is yet to be covered in the supposed Oxford unmet “need”. Item 14 suggests that the rural communities are better but with mass overdevelopment and the appalling state of the road structure plus no bus services the vision is not good.</p>
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 2	<p>It is interesting that you start with “maintaining and developing a ‘sustainable ‘ Local economy” as that is what has so far created destruction of the countryside, the rural character of the District, the coalescence of villages such as Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington as future suburbs of Oxford City and far from ‘sustainable’ growth in the already over congested area. The more obvious most important objective is second in your list, that of attempting to meet the challenge of Climate Change! You then start this section with the very things that have helped create Climate Change in the District of yet more “growth” but with lots of nice to have buzz words to try to justify more loss of rural areas, biodiversity and farms by adding more humans and their carbon footprints into the already congested area! Most of the “KO” items are a contradiction as adding more developments across the District is taking away all the other “KO” items relating to retaining the countryside and enhancing whatever “Natural Capital” is supposed to mean. KO 17 is interesting as it is possible to save precious potable water by insisting on new developments to incorporate the use of ‘grey water harvesting’. This really requires the building regulations to change but the government has allowed Councils to work beyond these in order to improve environmental aspects of new developments. Will this Council do so? I suspect not! KO 20 is interesting as it suggests there is a “need” for more housing but this is only the case if the plan is to add more people to the already overcrowded south east. There is a “need” for truly affordable housing but the last round of the LP just produced masses of housing for London commuters and large 5 bed houses that did nothing to meet the real “need” of those who can’t afford to live in the area. The population growth data shows the UK to be 1.58, which means that the population is reducing. Is this review trying to say people will move from wherever they are presently living to the new housing supposedly built for Oxford’s unmet need? KO 27 suggests that continuing to build more and more houses will somehow “maintain or enhances the local distinctiveness of Cherwell’s settlements” whereas adding more to the last round of overdevelopment in many of the villages and towns is destroying that very requirement. Rather cynically, stating that the proposed new developments are well connected is very likely, as they will coalesce many villages and nearby towns. KO 28 suggests we can have it all but ignores the obvious fact that Cherwell has a limited and finite land supply that plundering it for everything is just not practical!</p>
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 3	<p>This question assumes that I might agree with the premise that the District can accommodate even more employment and of course the associated work force and the resulting housing you will then suggest is required. As I do not agree with the premise I cannot answer the question. It is however notable that the employment developments on Bicester 1, Eco Town, were promoted as being start up industries from the spin off from Oxford University and especially the green developments that would be then trialled on the Eco town housing. What we have actually got is more giant storage and distribution sheds! I would however strongly suggest that before any land is allocated at Junction 9 of the M40 /A34 / A41 for any development that it is changed to a full clover leaf to try to alleviate the already gridlocked roundabout. The junction must be the only one anywhere that has a motorway and a major trunk road with a roundabout and traffic lights! The A34 is supposed to be “improved” and certainly at this junction it does require more drastic changes than adding a couple of lanes for people to park in! The real problem of suggesting any further employment is what type and how large is the building required. I would hope that massive storage and distribution sheds are not allowed anywhere near a village and as Bicester and Banbury already have enough of these giant sheds there is a real need for adding the high technology industries residents were promised in B1 and B2 sized developments years ago.</p>
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 4	<p>yes to B2 but a definite NO to any more distribution B8 sheds anywhere in the District! I should add though that it is time for most of the HGV freight lorries that travel up and down the A34 to have their loads put on the railway that runs parallel to the road all the way. This will of course be extended to the east coast when East West Rail is operational. If a rail freight interchange is required then as the military move out from Graven Hill, use definitely should be made of the rail freight interchange that has been established there for the last 70 years. Do not destroy the rail infrastructure across that site and do make use of the relatively new warehouses that are on the site. It would be sacrilege to destroy this facility just to make the Graven Hill development bigger. Separating out the retail and leisure from your terrible desire to keep adding B8 in point 2) means of course that this should be in town centres, urban areas and even some in appropriate locations in the rural areas.</p>

LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Supporting Employment	stop building anymore B8 storage and distribution giant sheds in this rural District! If you are not willing to listen to residents or my objection to any more giant sheds, at least change the ESD5 policy to say that ALL employment structure MUST have Solar PV across the whole usable roof areas. This is not for the occupiers but for the Country and should be completed prior to any further Solar PV "Farms". The operation of these roofs would be the same as the operation of the present Solar PV "Farms" in supplying and being paid for energy to the Grid.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 5	The answer to point 1) is a tentative yes. The answer to point 2) is not intensive residential if that means the loss of shopping sites but adding community and other leisure uses should be promoted.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	As more and more giant housing estates are approved and constructed the requirement for very frequent public transport becomes ever more urgent. The law of diminishing returns applies as these giant estates get further and further away from any town centre making residents feel the need to use their own transport as public transport becomes more and more unlikely to cover the increasing areas. Trying to get residents to walk and cycle might be a great aim but it really isn't going to work on an icy, cold, wet and windy day in winter when the resident has a nice warm car to use. This of course means that more free parking is required and so it goes on LP review after LP review. Reducing the rates for shops in the town centres has to be considered as increasing them to try to pay for services again has the law of diminishing returns as more close down.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Supporting Our Town	Encouraging a range of different shops and retail by low pricing must pay in the long term as more residents will use them.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 6	Although rather hamstrung by government ideas on what "affordable" means, within these rather ridiculous boundaries, the percentage is probably all that a developer can stand. I find the question a bit odd as it seems to be asking for the same thing in different ways? What is much more important is to insist that a developer who puts forward an application including "affordable" housing but then comes back to say it is not profitable and to get the officers to delete the requirement must stop. If the applicant's plan is approved by the planning committee then it should be built out as defined. If the developer then makes a loss, that is because they didn't assess the costs correctly and CDC must not assist them in their predicament. We "need" those supposed "affordable" houses, not the profits of a developer's bottom line.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 8	a policy for the nationally described space standard is definitely the minimum! This should also apply to conversions of employment sites for homes
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Separation Distances	You can't improve a street scene with banks of what to all intents are terrace houses. I agree with increasing density and terrace housing is one way of doing this
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 9	I would guess that the new building regulations will insist on accessibility standards otherwise they would be guilty of contravening the disability acts.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Travelling Communities	If the probably few bad members of the travelling community recognise they are still part of a community and have to live within the rules of the country then many sites close to residential areas would be accessible. However, because of the few who don't wish to be part of the rules of the UK they create a problem for all of their community.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Housing Policies	modular homes as that has to one of the best methods of construction for the future. Fast, energy efficient, probably to Passiv Haus standard with all services built in and constructed to a high standard that doesn't require work out in all weathers putting bricks on bricks. Annoyingly, that was one of the options suggested for at least one of those giant sheds on the Eco Town to on site manufacture future homes incorporating new technologies as the developments were built out – never happened of course as we just got more storage. Can CDC insist on developers using this method for all future developments around the Districts? I suspect not as they want to continue to build their appalling designs and construction methods with built in faults but high profits. Modular housing can be the ideal for excellent social or affordable housing as factory built can mean lower prices with higher build standards than "conventional".
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 10	Absolutely item 3)!! The Cherwell Local Plan MUST not have any of those "get out clauses" that are so prevalent in the present plans. ESD 3 and ESD 5 being classic examples
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Work with Historic England as each building will have different build and different requirements whilst retaining the history.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 11	The policy should be NO NEW Solar "Farms" until ALL employment buildings are covered in solar PV under the same contracts as the present Solar "Farms" receive payments for. No new vehicle park should be built without having a Solar canopy across the whole tarmac area. This energy generated should be stored in a nearby large battery store. Each parking space can then have an EV charging socket built into the uprights of the canopy to use the energy generated. The battery store providing energy during the evening. Ideally, retrofitting of canopies should be encouraged across the District on existing vehicle parks. These canopies have an added advantage in that they provide shade for the vehicles on hot sunny days. A win, win, win and MUST be encouraged.

LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Grey water harvesting should be part of the normal requirements for both housing and employment sites. Insist on the requirement laid out in ESD 5 for all housing of more than 100 houses to have solar PV AND battery storage. Remove the get out clause of only requiring a feasibility study. The battery is required for the occupiers to use energy generated during the day, whilst they are at work, to be used when they are at home in the evening when no energy is being produced from the Solar. Any driveways to have porous surfaces to allow water to drain into the subsoil and help prevent flooding and overwhelming the drainage systems. Consider Vehicle to Grid systems as part of the automatic requirement for EV recharging points. Increase the use of solar heating for hot water alongside the air or ground source heat pumps. Develop large community ground source heat pumps for housing estates.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Green Belt	There is an outstanding application for a Green Belt around Bicester submitted according to the rules of the NPPF by CPRE. This requires action in this review. As to the Oxford Green Belt, the excuse of “exceptional circumstances” to allow more and more housing is just plain wrong and needs to stop! Preventing urban sprawl is one of the major reasons for a Green Belt amongst others. All the politicians keep saying the Green Belt is sacrosanct and yet somehow we are losing more and more at each new LP. It is important to remember that the Green Belt is not there for the fun of residents but is mostly working farms producing food for the ever-increasing population of the area. Farming is an industry but seems to be forgotten in the desire to concrete huge areas!
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 12	Net Biodiversity calculators are a scam for developers! It is essential that CDC hire more ecologists to ensure the environment is looked after in future. If a biodiversity net gain cannot be proved on a site put forward by a developer, and I find this difficult, as we have already seen how they can fiddle the figures to achieve the impossible, then their application should be refused. A 20% net gain needs to be in the LP. The existing LP theoretically protects the CTA and this needs to be reinforced and carried over to the review
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 13	Nobody really understands what is meant by the term “Natural Capital” as it seems to be trying to monetise a stretch of land, which is so wrong. All major developments destroy the nature of the area and so any application can only show the amount destroyed and, worse still, if the site interrupts a wildlife route, it would destroy the surrounding area as well.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	The present policies require enormous strengthening to ensure the rural areas are protected from rampant development. There is a need for CTAs and especially Local Wildlife Sites to have policies to protect them from development. The worst case of destruction so far has been the LWS around Bicester aerodrome with the hotel, the technical centre and the 7 sheds along Skimmingdish Lane all destroying parts of this important type of LWS. Please note that because Bicester aerodrome was mothballed for years, plus the whole site has not been sprayed with any pesticides or other chemicals since around 1927, it is probably the greenest piece of land anywhere in the District. If this huge green asset is allowed to be built on it would be a huge loss of real biodiversity to Cherwell.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 15	Although now in the past, the failure to allocate Bicester Aerodrome as an area for sport in the present LP was wrong! The Windrusher Gliding Club successfully operated on the aerodrome for years and worked with Bicester Heritage / Motion. They were so successful that the site is now identified as a Significant Site for the Sport of Gliding by Sport England. It was therefore appalling that the owners of the aerodrome ‘intentionally’ failed to understand how the sport operated, a green sport of flying note. They constructively ejected the gliding club from the site! Some gliding does continue and some power flying but the asset that was of such importance to gliding in the UK has been lost in a desire for more carbon burning motorsport! The aerodrome is however large enough for a great many other sports if the LP would just identify it as a location for sport.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Local Green Spaces	Gavray Meadows Wildlife Site; Langford Orchard and the area connected between there and Mallards Way; and Oxford Road Sports Ground.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Ensure allowances are included for the continued operation of historic vehicles on the roads and exclude them from any ZEZs that may be approved. This applies to any historic machine from motorcycles and cars to buses and lorries. The strap line of the Federation of British Historic vehicle Clubs is very apt: “Yesterdays vehicles on tomorrows roads”. Bicester aerodrome is an extremely important historic site and the retaining of the large, circular ‘landing ground’ is important to retain.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Achieving Good Design & ‘Beauty’	Modular housing.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Please ensure that motorcycles are included in any transport planning, whether ICE or electric. Provision is made for parking cars, secure provision for bicycles but nothing is provided for secure motorcycle parking sites across the District. Along with secure motorcycle parking (to the government design standards) should be electric motorcycle recharging equipment. Motorcycles are part of the solution to congestion in both roads and in required parking areas and are very low emission or zero for electric motorcycles.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 16	The UK is somewhere around the 49th in the list of fast broadband; installing the best should be the normal.

LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Transport Policies	Although transport comes under the LTCP5, I was pleased to see you included London Oxford Airport, which the LTCP5 does not. Whether anyone likes it or not, the airport is a part of the infrastructure of the UK and needs to be supported. As the CDC Review goes to 2040, there may be greater need for a local regional airport to support the future developments in vertical electric powered taxi operations to and from the airport to the local areas. This needs to be considered. Equally, although you mention the canals, this too is omitted as a transport system in the LTCP5. Perhaps you need to have a greater input to that document as it evolves. Of course the major transport issue for the District is the failure of East West Rail to be both electric and not to include freight passing places as they construct the new line. The line from Marylebone to Birmingham also needs to be electric, but <u>that is more a government project.</u>
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 17	The main issue is that the infrastructure for the present plan can become not only redundant but even in the wrong location as any proposed new developments come into the review plan. Such items as the roads seem to working on what places were like, let alone how they are today and certainly not how they need to be in future. A good example of this is the dithering over whether Skimmingdish Lane should or should not be dual carriageway?! Cherwell is locked into both government edicts such as the Arc proposals or not plus National Highways plans plus the machinations of OCC Highways; none of which are integrated!
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Insisting on East West Rail being electric. Make full use of the rail freight infrastructure at Graven Hill. Trying to get Junction 9 of the M40 / A34 / A41 made into a full 'clover leaf' before the land is lost to further development
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 18	stop.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 19	What happens when you have filled any of the options? You will come up with a new plan in 2040 for more developments and ask where that should go! We live in a finite country and you have to stop somewhere or Banbury will be joined to Bicester, which will be joined to Oxford and the whole place will be unliveable!
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 22	Instigate the Green Belt already legally requested by CPRE
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 23	North would curtail any flying operations from Bicester Aerodrome and coalesce. Caversfield against the present LP South would coalesce Wendlebury and Ambrosden against the principles of the present LP. East is the CTA and should not be built on. It might also coalesce Launton against the present policies of the LP. West would coalesce Middleton Stoney
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 24	Yes to option 1
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	The whole conservation area around Bicester aerodrome requires protecting from development to retain its biodiversity and historic references.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Stop any further infilling on existing housing estates.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	It is extremely important for the Gavray Meadows site to be protected as it is a very rare example of ancient farming practice plus has flora and fauna not found elsewhere in the District. The London Road site is an important area of remaining green space near to the centre of Bicester town. Langford Orchard is developing well into a very good site for local residents and the community of Bicester.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	I only drive when distance to places without public transport are required or to carry stuff that is impossible by public transport. I do ride my motorcycle for fun sometimes; it would appear that fun is being eliminated from policies?!
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Kidlington Infill housing	Having destroyed the villages of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington, please leave some green spaces; even horribly manicured ones.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 26	There is no such thing as 'exceptional circumstances' where housing is suggested as one of the main reasons for a Green Belt is to prevent the very urban sprawl being suggested!
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Having destroyed the Golf Course, what else is left?
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 29	Ensure ex RAF Heyford has enough left of the important Cold War buildings and their position in the landscape to make the English Heritage identification worth having.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 30	Due to the failure of the existing plan to limit development in villages, they are mostly already overdeveloped.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 31	Organic growth rather than mass housing schemes in a rural setting
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 32	You are looking at this from the wrong end; organic growth is okay but any mass growth just destroys both the rural location and adds traffic to already badly maintained and narrow roads.
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 33	What an odd question as it mentions 'agriculture' but then asks whether I want to destroy that for more housing?! Agriculture is a business we all need.

LPR-B-674	John Broad	Option 34	Yes
LPR-B-674	John Broad	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Make sure any neighbourhood plan does not get over ridden by actions from developers such as at Hook Norton – twice!
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 1	The vision statement is, as is often the case with visions, full of good intentions but deliberately vague! E.g. this para: The district’s biodiversity resource is enhanced. Our natural environment is more diverse. Social, economic and ecological resilience provides the capacity to adapt to change, including minimising flood risk. Our heritage assets, visitor economy and vibrant cultural offer is further enhanced with improved access. Problem is nothing is quantified, and nothing is stated about what priority will be allowed to override another one.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 2	Key Objectives seem to named as themes which was initially confusing. I would judge Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change as the overriding one. As the plan acknowledges across the UK we must take significant action as soon as possible and ramp up efforts quickly over the next 5 to 10 years. I have read the document entitled: Sustainability Appraisal of the Cherwell Local Plan Review and was struck by the number of references to the need for more clarity in the message.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 3	This implies that we can go on expanding and creating extra jobs – rather than replacing old carbon intensive jobs with greener ones. At some point the challenge of aiming for continued growth will be acknowledged to be inconsistent with meeting the challenge of climate change. So partly it depends on what types of jobs are created but they should be located on previously developed land excluding less sustainable locations.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 6	Favours option 1
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 7	favours option 1). And make sure that developers are not allowed to water these requirements down on grounds of unaffordability in relation to their profits.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 8	favours option 1
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 10	Given the severity of the climate emergency and the knowledge that retro- fitting is so difficult, it is important to set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Cherwell should take a pragmatic approach and judge each case on its merits. However, sustainability issues should be to the forefront of these considerations. I am thinking here of allowing requests to add solar panels to some listed buildings, etc.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 11	Because of climate change and the known increase in renewable electricity that will be needed, Cherwell should Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Question - Green Belt	Kidlington has recently lost a large amount of greenbelt which has been assigned to residential development. It should not lose any more and neither should other areas within Cherwell. The Green belt should be protected – which is in any case supposed to be firm Government policy.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 12	This is what things always come down to. When other issues intervene biodiversity issues are pushed aside. There must be more priority given to biodiversity issues and where biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved on site, then developments being proposed should be ruled out much more often.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 13	Not option 3.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 14	Option 3 would bring improvements. There is an urgent need to improve facilities for children to keep them active.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 15	Keeping people local suggests more strenuous efforts should be made on options 1 and 2, and definitely not allow 3).
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Question - Local Green Spaces	Designating Local Green Spaces is a very good strategy. The more the better. I have read Kidlington Development Watch’s proposals for 2 LGS designations to protect Church Street Conservation Area and the setting of St Mary’s and at Bury Moor Fields. I know these areas and judge the proposals to be well argued and a fair statement in terms of their value to the local community. I therefore support these LGS proposals.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Question - Transport & Connectivity	On bullet point 3: Make sure when considering these issues Cherwell thinks about the needs of different age groups and individual degrees of mobility. Not everyone can reduce their need to travel by car, and some paths need to be designed for wheelchair users and children in buggies.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 17	Option 1

LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Question - Kidlington Infill housing	Cherwell does urgently need to develop such a policy. 1. The impact on traffic generation and management of such developments is important. 2. Adequate provision for parking on the site. 3. Good quality accommodation in terms of lighting and space standards. 4. The need for quality outdoor spaces associated with the developments is important – such as a shared garden and space for growing vegetables. 5. The visual impact of these developments on the local area should also be considered e.g. maintaining ‘house lines’ on streets such as Kidlington High Street, so that blocks of flats are not visually oppressive. I know CDC has insisted on this in the past.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 26	On 1) Absolutely not. There are lots of science parks across Oxfordshire and the various District Councils have already annexed far too much of the Oxfordshire Green Belt for Oxford City’s controversial housing needs assessment for Cherwell to even consider grabbing more of these ‘green lungs’ this time for employment purposes. Therefore... Stick to 2) and classify Kidlington as a low growth area. There will be many years of severe disruption experienced by the residents of Kidlington while the 4,400 planned houses are built around it. Do nothing to exacerbate the problems we now face.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 27	Kidlington village centre is quite small and currently has empty retail units, and a growing number of charity shops. In this situation you should opt for 2). On three, is the idea to build a walkway between Exeter Close and the Village centre? If so I expect the real rationale is to speed up traffic on the main Oxford / Banbury road which divides the area, and make life more difficult for those walking between the two locations
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	The pandemic has changed my travel habits. I used to regularly take the bus to Summertown, Oxford, the JR etc. Now I stay at home and order all my shopping online. So, I generate white van traffic. I gave up my bike about 5 years ago. What happens next depends on how I feel once Covid is more under control. More pandemics are anticipated! I am aware Kidlington has relatively exceptional bus services. Bus services need to be improved elsewhere across Cherwell.
LPR-B-675	Sonia Morgan and Ed Southern	Option 28	I think 1) is a brilliant idea. I have read the Kidlington Development Watch’s analysis of a possible linked green spaces around Kidlington in their submission to this consultation. This shows it is perfectly possible to make this a reality. So, I think Cherwell should just get on and implement this ASAP – no more endless time ‘exploring the potential...’ The world needs action now, so the local plan should include this proposal and add detail as to how it will be constructed. It would be important to ensure residents across Kidlington can easily access the linked green spaces for satisfying walks. We must all try harder to live local and the District Council’s policies should aim to nudge us in this direction
LPR-B-676	Richard Thomas	Sibford Gower	vehement disagreement with the CDC Local Plan for Sibford Gower. The development would: Damage valuable countryside; - Ruin an area of outstanding beauty; - Put even more traffic on roads that are totally unsuitable for the traffic that uses them; now; they are too narrow and have been reduced to single track in many places due to the appalling condition of the road surfaces- Put more pressure on the inadequate village fresh water and antiquated sewage systems.- Encourage street lighting in a ‘dark’ village. The proposed build would add to the carbon footprint of the area not only by increasing locally generated greenhouse gases but the natural carbon capture of the rural environment would be partially ruined. In summary, a 100% increase in the population of a village that can scarcely cope with its present size given the atrocious road system, inadequate infrastructure and local geography. In addition, the increase of CO2 generation would be unacceptable.
LPR-B-677	Lesley Green	Adderbury	Strongly object. village has had more than its fair share of development over the last few years and can not support any further new homes. roads, country side, heart of the community is already under strain but the constant new homes being built is causing more traffic, pollution and noise levels to our village. Constant building destroys our natural habitat, disruption to local wildlife, increasing surface water when it rains. Adderbury is known for flooding. very concerned about the large area of land East of Adderbury, 60 hectares, which has been flagged. This area is already larger than the original Twyford location. This would remove the current farming land, I do not understand why our farmers are not encouraged to keep planting and growing. Adderbury has no facilities which can support further development.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Call for Sites Promotion - Land off Bloxham Road, Milcombe	Land off Bloxham Road, Milcombe is promoted for housing. Update to HELAA186.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 1	Support Cherwell District Council’s vision, particularly the benefits arising from its location within the Oxford/Cambridge Arc as well as the need to satisfy environmental impacts arising from new development, as well as maximising any social and economic gains. Support is given to the provision of sustainable forms of development in the district, including the provision of new homes. New homes need to be built to the highest build quality using sustainable and environmental forms of construction, layout and design techniques. Importantly new development should bring about positive environmental, social and economic benefits to local communities. NLP want to ensure the Local Plan is fit for purpose in respect to providing the overall spatial strategy for the district, as well as the overall quantum of new homes opportunities. We understand that the need for new development in the district needs to carefully balance the environmental and technical impacts, as well as the delivery of appropriate means of mitigation. It also needs to provide the appropriate levels of infrastructure and address the issues of affordability. Focusing development within the rural communities should be a key priority for the Local Plan in order to level up the district. It is considered there are many sustainable villages within the district, that require new homes in order to boost their vitality and viability, as well as address issues of affordability. These new homes can also fund specific community requirements (e.g., new community halls/shops/services) or much needed infrastructure upgrades; these are often pre-existing issues which have already been identified by Parishes or set out within Neighbourhood Plans. It is also considered these settlements could easily absorb at least 10-20% sustainable growth based on existing household numbers, without undue environmental and social impact.



LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 2	It is recognised that the Local Plan needs to deliver on the objectives set out within the NPPF, these include: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes; Building a strong and competitive economy; Ensuring vitality of town centres; Promoting health and safe communities; Promoting sustainable transport; Supporting high quality communications; Making effective use of land; Achieving well design places; Protecting Green Belt land; Meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding; and, Conserving the natural and historic environment
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 6	It is considered affordable housing provision should remain the same as in the 2015 Local Plan.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 7	It is considered affordable housing provision should remain the same as in the 2015 Local Plan.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 8	We support the introduction of planning policy requiring dwellings to meet nationally described space standards. This policy stance has been adopted within Oxford City and other Oxfordshire districts and functions/operates well.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Question - Separation Distances	In other districts within Oxfordshire this varies between 20-25 metres.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 9	Building new homes which is exclusive to all and meets life time homes standards is supported but this should continue to be managed via Building Regulations.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Question - Green Belt	Green belt development should be seen as the last resort for new homes. The Oxford Green belt should only be built on once all other options have been fully exhausted.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Provision of masterplans and design codes/briefs are welcomed and are common place for large developments, as well as some outline applications in sensitive locations (particularly those that may affect the natural or historic environment).
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The creation of 20-minute neighbourhoods is supported on sustainability grounds, particularly where it reduces the need to use the private car. The need to drive up quality design and connectivity is also supported. Creating/delivering new local services and community facilities as part of the development proposals can also boost the sustainability of sites and meet policy requirements, particularly if the development is located some distance from existing services. The provision of new footways and cycle lanes/tracks should be supported and encouraged.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Question - Transport & Connectivity	There should be a requirement to reduce the need to travel, but this should not apply to rural areas. Where achievable, existing rural areas need to be made more self sufficient in terms of their sustainability, as well as the provision of new services/facilities. These measures should be supported by the provision of enhanced/new public and community transport. It is accepted that the use of private cars will be higher within rural areas, but measures need to be put in place which support the use of electric vehicles, and this includes adequate provision of public charging points and home chargers within new development. Provision of home offices, superfast broadband, and community work hubs should be encouraged. The use of online grocery deliveries also helps to reduce traffic movements within rural areas, and this should continue to be supported within the Local Plan
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Question - Transport Policies	We consider development within rural areas can help to deliver (or enhance) sustainable public transport links to the main urban centres of Banbury, Kidlington and Bicester as well as the larger villages. Such developments can increase passenger numbers and make existing bus routes more viable. Developments can also provide S106 money to help sustain routes.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 17	Cluster villages within rural areas that are located in close proximity to the main urban centres should be prioritised, particularly if there is a means of delivering (or enhancing) sustainable public transport links between them. This should take a hub and spoke approach to spatial development.

LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 30	Although Banbury, Kidlington and Bicester have been the main focus for housing growth for the last five decades we consider a fresh approach is required in order to level up the district. It is necessary to focus a greater level of new homes within the rural communities in order to level up the district. It is considered there are many sustainable villages within the district that require new homes in order to boost their vitality and viability, as well as address issues of affordability. These new homes can also fund specific community requirements (e.g., new community halls/shops/services) or much needed infrastructure upgrades; these are often pre existing issues which have already been identified by Parish Councils or within Neighbourhood Plans. It is considered these settlements could easily absorb at least 1020% sustainable growth based on existing household numbers, without undue environmental and social impact. It is considered Banbury, Kidlington and Bicester, the main urban centres within the district, have in recent years been overwhelmed by endless urban sprawl with little in the way of good urban design or place making, as well as poor social integration/cohesion. Although some form of development should take place within the main urban centres it is considered other spatial options should be pursued within Cherwell with a focus on rural delivery. We consider transformation growth as set out within the draft Oxfordshire 2050 Plan is considered the best scenario for the county, and indeed Cherwell, because it continues the levels of housing required to meet the Oxfordshire Growth Deal and fully aligns itself to the Government's emerging Spatial Framework for the Arc. Transformation growth will see a continuation of the levels of housing required up to 2031 to meet the Oxfordshire Growth Deal. This requirement was established to address the issues of affordability and economic growth up to 2031. Based on current evidence there is no suggestion that this level of growth should not be maintained for the remainder of the plan period. We do not consider the Standard Growth scenario can be justified as an option because the numbers are simply too low. Progress has now been made on the Spatial Framework for the Arc, and supports the Government's aspiration to realise the economic potential of the area. This is likely to have a material consideration in the establishing the housing requirement for the county and indeed Cherwell, particularly in the need to boost job creation and economic investment as well as the much disputed 1,000,000 new homes. If the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan does not continue to seek delivery of the level of homes established in the Growth Deal up to 2031 there is a risk this could undermine the Government's aspirations for the Arc and be a backwards step.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 31	Parish Councils should be encouraged to accept new development, and this should ideally be done through Neighbourhood Plans. Housing numbers will need to be in accordance with the development plan. If Parish Councils do not wish to undertake Neighbourhood Plans a policy mechanism needs to be put in place that ensures Cherwell District Council can allocate houses within a Sites Allocation document or Local Plan Part 2.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 32	It is considered there are many sustainable villages within the district that require new homes in order to boost their vitality and viability, as well as address issues of affordability. These new homes can also fund specific community requirements (e.g., new community halls/shops/services) or much needed infrastructure upgrades. The hierarchy within the Local Plan should therefore focus on the opportunities arising from new home development that can deliver either new/enhanced services and facilities, particularly within villages that currently have poor provision (and ranked low in the local plan's sustainability rankings). School capacity/provision and the opportunity to expand existing schools should also be considered. These proposed measures should help to improve rural communities as well as level up the district.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 33	If rural areas are to be a focus for new homes an appropriate level of new employment land is required in order to reduce the need to travel and to make rural settlements more sustainable.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Option 34	It is considered the Countryside and Landscape character of the district should be conserved and enhanced but policies need to be sufficiently flexible enough to allow new housing development on the edge of existing villages. Proposals that are laid out and designed to respect the setting of existing villages and countryside setting; and comprise appropriate levels of landscaping and green buffers should be deemed acceptable forms of development.
LPR-B-678	Bidwells for Neptune Land Promotion Ltd	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Parish Councils should be encouraged to accept new development, and this should ideally be done through Neighbourhood Plans. Housing numbers will need to be in accordance with the development plan. If Parish Councils do not wish to undertake Neighbourhood Plans a policy mechanism needs to be put in place that ensures Cherwell District Council can allocate houses within a Sites Allocation document or Local Plan Part 2. It is considered the existing arrangement of designating Cherwell District Council Neighbourhood Planning officers to Neighbourhood Plan areas should be retained. This should assist Parish Councils prepare their Neighbourhood Plans in accordance with Planning Law/Procedure. Financial grants should also be given to Parish Councils to enable Neighbourhood Plans to be adequately financed in their preparation.
LPR-B-679	Adam Varney	LPR-A-119	Object to proposed housing. This piece of land is invaluable to the village as a green open space (used for village fetes, hosting charity events, serves as a walking route). Field is home to a variety of wildlife; to consider destroying habitats is outrageous. Access to the site is non-existent; surrounding roads are single track width. Oak Farm is currently being developed next to the site which have destroyed vast amounts of green space and habitat; further development would damage this area of the village beyond repair. water pressure in the village has dropped from a result of the new home and sewerage system has not been upgraded - suggests these cannot cope with more homes. Milcombe currently has a small shop and pub; with further development would need to consider upgrading these with a possible primary school and better local health facilities
LPR-B-680	Harrison Davis	Bodicote	Objects to development between the Dukes Meadow estates and Hanwell village. The village is already under threat from the numerous estates and developments that have seen the identity of the village eroded considerably. The village has become a 'rat-run' for traffic passing from the A422 to the A423 and vice versa (Warwick Road/Southam Road). The existing infrastructure cannot cope with the burden of all the developments. The village is seriously under threat of ceasing to exist as it has for centuries and becoming absorbed as a suburb of Banbury which must not be allowed to happen. The establishment of yet another development that encroaches yet closer to the village is a disgrace, destroying conservation areas, replacing them with yet another estate that contributes towards traffic chaos and pollution.

LPR-B-681	Tania Quin	LPR-A-119	Objects to proposals. Points for objection relate to: access: parking is an existing issues, traffic congestion on the main road, adding more houses will make the problems worse and increase emissions. Infrastructure: existing facilities have not been upgraded following the provision new housing and are not coping. Community: field has been used for many years for village gatherings and provides a space for exercise and dog walking. Wildlife: many vairities in the fields, breeding and resting sites protected by law. Village life would be forgotten is all pieces of land are built over and the heritage of the villages removed.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 1	There is an Oxfordshire Strategic Vision and a Draft Oxfordshire Plan Vision (July 2021) within the Consultation Document. Creating a separate Vision for Cherwell could be confusing and it could duplicate what is within the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050. We suggest the strategic element is left to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Support the Draft Oxfordshire Plan Vision (July 2021) in particular we would highlight our support for the following part of the draft vision: " <i>A wide range of secure and good quality housing options are within reach for all. Existing and new communities are well connected, integrated, distinct, attractive and desirable places to live; their design and layouts facilitate healthy lifestyles and sustainable travel options.</i> "
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 2	The Consultation Document includes under the Vision part, five spatial strategy options, which are then expanded upon in subsequent sections. This does not fit comfortably with the questions set-out in the representations form. Clarity is needed in the next consultation so that question numbers/references are consistent with the relevant parts of the Consultation Document. As an overarching point we would comment that the emerging Local Plan will need to meet the tests of soundness within the NPPF and this includes being consistent with the emerging Arc Spatial Framework and the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050. The latter includes spatial options for the entire County and it acknowledges that ultimately through testing, the preferred approach is likely to comprise a selection from among the spatial options within the consultation document. These options are included in the section on vision for the emerging local plan and so will need to be kept under review. We agree with the Themes contained in the Consultation Document as these follow on from the previous consultation version, which the University & Colleges supported. Ask for further explanation as to how the vision will be extended into measurable targets and objectives. For example, the vision for new development to be built to high energy efficiency what does this mean in practice over a plan period? The Cherwell District Context plan on page 24 is useful representation of certain key assets within the District and in particular the key settlements of Oxford and edge of locations, Banbury and Bicester. This plan is not intended to identify allocated development sites. Support KO1: This is agreed and indeed is essential to provide support for the living standard within the County and relates well to the vision for the District. Support the other objectives proposed including raising the value of the local economy, support for the growth of all sectors to create an inclusive economy, increase in education, training and skills, research and development/innovation sectors and encouragement of local companies to invest in the local workforce. KO23, locations, we would comment that this should explicitly include reference to sustainable urban extensions and planned expansion on the edge of the urban area of Oxford. The spatial strategy, whilst likely to comprise a combination of options under the emerging plans for the area, is likely to have a focus on edge of Oxford growth given the specific requirements of the city and the sustainability advantages its provides being such a wellconnected location.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 3	Employment land should be well-connected to centres of population, both existing and proposed and be well-connected to transport hubs, provision etc. This arrangement is key to creating the type of interactive environments that are so key to successful businesses, specifically the benefits of clusters, as well as providing the greatest level of access to the available workforce. This spatial option can give rise to a number of forms of new development, including regeneration within the urban area, sustainable urban extensions and planned expansion of existing settlements. This can take the form of <u>co-operation across local authority boundaries, guided by the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.</u>
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 4	The answer to this must be led by the evidence on need for employment land and looking at reasonable options for identification of land for employment development. There needs to be a mindset shift away from a focus on traditional B-uses (accepting the change in the land-use class for former B1 Business uses) such that the value of employment from education uses, community uses and small-scale even micro-scale businesses are acknowledged. It is likely that option 2 out of this narrow range is most appropriate reflecting the fact that business activity is increasingly undertaken as a continuum of land uses rather than distinct categories, for example the co-location of research activity and associated manufacture. The input of the Oxford and Oxfordshire LEP and business community will be relevant here.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Supporting Employment	Paragraph 81 of the NPPF is especially relevant here. The emerging Local Plan should set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to Local Industrial Strategies and other local policies for economic development and regeneration. This needs to be integrated with the emerging content of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework and the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	Town and village centres are vitally important to communities and whilst there has been significant shifts in the way the population shop and undertake recreation, the principle of taking a positive approach to the growth, management and adaptation of such centres is supported. To facilitate adaptation to the changing requirements of town centres, the University and Colleges support a more flexible approach to the range of uses that are accommodated in town centres. In addition, a range of measures will be relevant to maintain healthy town centres over and above spatial planning and planning policies. Increasing sustainable connectivity to town and village centres which comprise choice within a high quality environment will be key to maintaining and creating successful places.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	We would refer to the NPPF policy at section 7 and in particular paragraph 86. Limits this paragraph are very relevant and could form a series of criteria or checklist to guide planning policies for town and village centres. We would suggest co-ordination across local authorities in respect of policydevelopment in this and most other relevant aspects of plan-making. It is likely to be the case that a set of planning policies to support the vitality of centres in Cherwell District could apply in other authority areas and hence save time and effort by establishing one set of policies.

LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 6	The answer must be led by the evidence on need for housing, both market and affordable housing and viability testing to understand what the market can sustain. The latest position as published is the Oxfordshire Councils Growth Needs Assessment also known as OGNA. This and any evolution of the July 2021 publication is intended to help shape the appropriate level and distribution of housing and employment in Oxfordshire over the period to 2050. In this regard it is considered relevant to first digest the outcome of consultation on the Oxfordshire Plan 2050, continue to be part of the strategic-level discussion on the range of growth and options for delivery of the growth. Levels of affordable housing has to be tested through viability appraisal so as to avoid an adverse impact on housing delivery in the context of housing targets and placemaking within the vision and objectives for the plan. The viability testing is also necessary in the context of new emerging policy requirements placed on the provision of new development, for example in relation to carbon targets and provision of biodiversity net gain. As a general approach, affordable housing need is infrequently met even in authority areas where the overall housing requirements are met in some of the accounting years. This suggests that models of delivery of affordable housing must extend beyond s.106 provision as part of market-led housing development. Exception to Policy development rarely features fully in local plans and yet the NPPF requires planning policies to identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. This includes provision of a range of affordable housing types and tenures and small sites. It is likely that a range of affordable housing levels is appropriate across the District to reflect variations in the local market and this needs to be set within development viability appraisal work and whether the Council intends to rely solely on s.106 as the mechanism for securing contributions without introducing the Community Infrastructure Levy.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 7	Again the answer to this question has to be evidence-led and there will not be a one-size fits-all solution. The NPPF seeks a range of housing types which includes variation in different forms of tenure. The definition of affordable housing in NPPF, under Annex 2: Glossary and relevant policy advice and guidance from Government is relevant here. This seeks by and large to expand the range of tenures defined as affordable including affordable housing for rent, discount market sales and starter homes. These must feature within policy or guidance within the District. As it is so difficult to plan for delivery over such a plan period it might be more appropriate not to define a tenure split in policy but refer to evidence guiding discussions on sites set within preparation of supplementary planning guidance on affordable housing.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 8	Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements that exceed the minimum national standards set by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Local authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether additional standards in their area can be justified, with evidence to support the policies in their Local Plans. Affordable housing, we see this issue as being Oxfordshire-wide and not one that should be decided upon by each local authority in the County. The Oxfordshire authorities, possibly led by the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan Team, should consider the impact of applying NDSS or above. In considering the costs relating to optional Building Regulation requirements or the NDSS, authorities may wish to take account of the evidence in the most recent Impact Assessment issued alongside the Housing Standards Review.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Separation Distances	This is a matter that should be considered county-wide not on an individual local authority level. Minimum separation standards should not be set in development plan policy as this is too prescriptive and cannot take into account different site circumstances. For example topography and boundary features. A separate supplementary planning guidance could be prepared Countywide, which deals with residential design including separation distances.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 9	Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements that exceed the minimum national standards set by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Local authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether additional standards in their area can be justified, with evidence to support the policies in their Local Plans. Affordable housing, we see this issue as being Oxfordshire-wide and not one that should be decided upon by each local authority in the County. The Oxfordshire authorities, possibly led by the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan Team, should consider the impact of applying NDSS or above as part of the Local Plan viability assessment. In considering the costs relating to optional Building Regulation requirements or the NDSS, authorities may wish to take account of the evidence in the most recent Impact Assessment issued alongside the Housing Standards Review.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 10	Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements that exceed the minimum national standards set by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Local authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether additional standards in their area can be justified, with evidence to support the policies in their Local Plans. Affordable housing, we see this issue as being Oxfordshire-wide and not one that should be decided upon by each local authority in the County. The Oxfordshire authorities, possibly led by the Oxfordshire 2050 Plan Team, should consider the impact of applying NDSS or above as part of the Local Plan viability assessment. In considering the costs relating to optional Building Regulation requirements or the NDSS, authorities may wish to take account of the evidence in the most recent Impact Assessment issued alongside the Housing Standards Review.

LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Support the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in order to tackle Climate Change. The focus of this effort should be on developing strategies that go beyond development plan policy and that turn sustainability targets and commitments into reality. We support the principle of sustainable design and construction, subject to seeing the proposed detail including the specific targets and appraisal of the targets in deliverability and viability terms. This is a matter, we feel, for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. The bigger challenge in terms of reducing carbon emissions from built development is to address existing stock; both residential and non-residential. The Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Plan should contain policies that allow for enhanced sustainable design for regeneration and refurbishment of existing buildings, including those with heritage value. Support the principle of increasing the capacity of renewable energy sources, and note the content of the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050, which has a target for 100% of energy needs for major developments to be met from renewable energy sources. We have expressed concerns about this objective as it is not clear on what scale this would apply i.e. those renewables to be provided within the administrative area of the County. Decarbonising the grid is a national objective and includes sources of supply that are offshore. A more localised approach is not therefore appropriate. The objective should be set on a phased basis, subject to an impact assessment and reflecting national objectives. We question whether there are sufficient technical solutions available at this time that are affordable to all for all major development (assumed to be 10 dwellings and above and 1,000 sq.m and above) to be supplied solely by renewable energy sources. Further viability analysis is therefore required in order to establish a realistic and achievable target. In relation to Water Efficiency, we request a technical assessment be undertaken of the potential to reduce further levels of usage below 110 litres per person per day. Whilst the objective has merits given the effects of Climate Change, there are concerns about the impact on deliverability of homes
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Green Belt	The NPPF provides the policy framework on Green Belt at section 13. We have responded to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 consultation on this and other matters. Importantly we consider that the 2050 plan should include the option for land currently designated as Green Belt to be released from that policy to allow for the development and other needs of the County to be met in a sustainable way. The NPPF identifies that such a review of the Green Belt should be undertaken in exceptional circumstances. In both South Oxfordshire and Cherwell Districts, such changes to the Green Belt to allow for the expansion of the urban area of Oxford was shown to be a sustainable option, thus meeting the test of exceptional circumstances as endorsed by both Local Plan inspectors. The opportunity to enhance the usability of land retained in the Green Belt through measures such as improving accessibility and enhancing the character of land is supported.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 12	This is another matter which could be dealt with County-wide and is included in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Welcome the aspiration within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 for Biodiversity Gain. The proposed target of 20% biodiversity net gain as a benchmark for the whole of Oxfordshire goes beyond Government's currently stated intention as set out in the Environment Act 2021. We have requested that further analysis is provided along with greater detail of the policy and how it is intended to operate. The 2050 Plan is able to set a more aspirational target than that set in national legislation, but any such increase needs to be fully evidenced to show it is achievable and will not adversely impact on the viability and hence delivery of development at the target levels required. An alternative policy option which we advocate is to consider a phased introduction of the policy, with increasing levels of net gain over the plan period, subject to monitoring outcomes.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 13	This is another matter which could be dealt with County-wide and is included in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Welcome the aspiration within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 for Biodiversity Gain. The proposed target of 20% biodiversity net gain as a benchmark for the whole of Oxfordshire goes beyond Government's currently stated intention as set out in the Environment Act 2021. We have requested that further analysis is provided along with greater detail of the policy and how it is intended to operate. The 2050 Plan is able to set a more aspirational target than that set in national legislation, but any such increase needs to be fully evidenced to show it is achievable and will not adversely impact on the viability and hence delivery of development at the target levels required. An alternative policy option which we advocate is to consider a phased introduction of the policy, with increasing levels of net gain over the plan period, subject to monitoring outcomes.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	This is another matter which could be dealt with County-wide and is included in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Welcome the aspiration within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 for Biodiversity Gain. The proposed target of 20% biodiversity net gain as a benchmark for the whole of Oxfordshire goes beyond Government's currently stated intention as set out in the Environment Act 2021. We have requested that further analysis is provided along with greater detail of the policy and how it is intended to operate. The 2050 Plan is able to set a more aspirational target than that set in national legislation, but any such increase needs to be fully evidenced to show it is achievable and will not adversely impact on the viability and hence delivery of development at the target levels required. An alternative policy option which we advocate is to consider a phased introduction of the policy, with increasing levels of net gain over the plan period, subject to monitoring outcomes.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 14	The solution is likely to comprise a range of options based on practical experience of provision, use and management of children's play areas in new development. An exercise to assess what works and what does not could be undertaken to inform policy development. It should also be considered that whilst management arrangements might vary, by and large, this policy development area can equally apply to other Districts in the County and so there is merit in looking to avoid multiple policies across different local plans in the County. Supplementary planning guidance might be more appropriate to underpin development plan policy.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 15	The solution is likely to comprise a range of options based on practical experience of provision, use and management of children's play areas in new development. An exercise to assess what works and what does not could be undertaken to inform policy development. It should also be considered that whilst management arrangements might vary, by and large, this policy development area can equally apply to other Districts in the County and so there is merit in looking to avoid multiple policies across different local plans in the County. Supplementary planning guidance might be more appropriate to underpin development plan policy.

LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	The NPPF, in particular section 16 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, is relevant for this topic. Policy can be set out at the County-level, avoiding duplication of the policy guidance within the NPPF.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The NPPF, in particular section 12 Achieving Well Designed Places, is relevant for this topic. Policy can set standards and this can be illustrated/explained through supplementary planning guidance at the County-level.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Agree with this concept but implementation needs exploring.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Transport and connectivity are vitally important aspects of place-making for sustainable development and to realise objectives of net zero. Spatial options for new development influence performance from the outset. Land on the edge of urban areas which are well connected or can become well connected through public transport and walking and cycling are typically preferable to options more difficult to connect up to higher order settlements with the range of services and amenities.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 16	This is a matter which applies County-wide and could be left for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Question - Transport Policies	This is a matter which applies County-wide and could be left for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and Local Transport Plan.
LPR-B-682	Savills for the University and Colleges	Option 17	A costed and consulted upon infrastructure delivery plan is necessary but only where it takes a lead from the work put in for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. This must be cross-boundary and look to deliver on the set of core objectives to deliver the plan vision.
LPR-B-682	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at North West Bicester	Land at North West Bicester is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-683	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Question - Housing Policies	Comments in relation to Section 5.4: welcome the references to the importance of high-quality design and sustainable methods of construction. In our view this should include specific reference to the positive contribution that can be made both in sustainability terms and delivery terms, by Modern Methods of Construction (or MMC); note the reference to the demand for social rented homes in the District. This will ultimately have to be considered in the context of the wider demands of any development control policies, site allocation policies or SPD provisions, and will be subject to viability testing. Paragraph 5.4.4 – it will be essential to understand how the trajectories for housing delivery for Oxfordshire as a whole as described, will have an impact on the number of homes required in Cherwell. Based on the increase in numbers at County-wide level, it is assumed that there would also be an increase in Cherwell. These figures need to be set out in more detail. Comments in relation to Section 6.3 - Paragraph 6.3.7 – it should be noted that the delays in delivery at North West Bicester have related to viability challenges
LPR-B-683	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Option 7	Paragraph 5.4.10 – the percentage of affordable housing being sought should be in line with national policy, and will be subject to viability testing in accordance with the NPPF; and e. Paragraph 5.4.11 – the potential role of Build to Rent as a tenure and product should be recognised within affordable housing policy
LPR-B-683	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Option 10	Paragraph 5.5.10 – we welcome the acknowledgement of the fact that the application of local standards which go beyond those standards set by central Government would need to be considered against the usual viability tests
LPR-B-683	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Option 17	We recognise the need for strategic key infrastructure to support the delivery of new development. Such infrastructure should be designed and costed in full in order to enable proportionate contributions to be made to that infrastructure as the phases of development come forward
LPR-B-683	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Option 22	support the continuing focus of new development towards existing or new settlements. If greenfield sites are to be considered in order to assist CDC in achieving what are expected to be higher levels of housing need, it is our view that the Council should seek to maximise the development potential and the investment made in new infrastructure at the new settlement locations, and focus further new development around these existing strategic allocations – including North West Bicester.
LPR-B-683	Barton Wilmore for Firethorn Trust	Option 23	support the continuing focus of new development towards existing or new settlements. If greenfield sites are to be considered in order to assist CDC in achieving what are expected to be higher levels of housing need, it is our view that the Council should seek to maximise the development potential and the investment made in new infrastructure at the new settlement locations, and focus further new development around these existing strategic allocations – including North West Bicester.

LPR-B-684	Ross Flatt	Adderbury	Strongly objects to development in Adderbury. Neighbourhood plan is being ignored; affront to the democratic process and lets down residents. The proposed expansion of housing and population in Adderbury would create an urban commuting location where the social connectivities and neighbourhood roots of this size of historic village would be lost for ever. Cherwell is driving expansion fuelled by Section 106 funding and by identifying sites where landowners are eager to profit from and sell to developers. For example New College Oxford appears to be happy to remove tenancies and economically benefit from the sale of agricultural land. Pollution (including light) would reach unacceptable levels (especially near the school) and traffic would hugely increase in and around the village. The drainage flood control and sewage infrastructure is inadequate now let alone with an expansion of building and reduction in green fields. After heavy rain contaminated water gushes down from farms on the north of the Aynho Road into the lakes and streams. Sewage bursts through manhole covers near Sydenham Close. The drainage in and over the land next to Wallin's Road is essential to protect houses in the area. Economic growth should not be at such a high social and environmental price.
LPR-B-685	Dr Sam Lipworth	Islip	Strong opposition to proposed plans for Islip. The plan as it stands would completely ruin the character of the ancient village and increase its size by a factor of ten. This is completely unacceptable and the destruction of previous greenbelt land would completely ruin the village and surrounding countryside. The infrastructure in the area is totally unsuitable for the proposed development (e.g. there is no safe cycling route between Islip and Oxford, East West rail trains are not going to stop at Islip and Islip bridge is known to have structural weaknesses), pollution would likely increase to unacceptable levels and the fragile ecology of the area would be ruined for the sake of cheap commuter housing. Such a development would inevitably increase traffic and pollution around the already congested roads into Oxford. Much of the proposed development area floods on a regular basis (and this is only likely to get worse). The land encompassing the proposed development is home to a rich array of protected species; the resulting habitat loss and ecological disturbance is completely unjustified. The development would inevitably also disturb migratory species on the neighbouring Otmoor reserve. Furthermore Islip is an historically important village, it is the birthplace of Edward the Confessor, the site of the Battle of Islip Bridge, home to a Roman Villa and medieval manor house as well as several other archaeologically important sites. These would be destroyed forever by a development of the scale proposed. The focus of growth should be in existing urban areas with affordable high-density housing being developed in these localities rather than ruining local village communities. Low density expensive housing in villages such as Islip will not serve anyone's interests except wealthy commuters and the pockets of the Church of England and does not provide the housing stock which is required by local people in the county. The proposed development by the church commissioners in Islip is clearly completely inappropriate and must be ruled out.
LPR-B-686	Helen Lilley	Islip	Strongly objects to proposals. Green Belt - development is located on GB land and would destroy the rural character of the village and surroundings and remove important countryside on the edge of the nationally significant RSPB Otmoor. The proposals contradict the prime ministers message for new housing to be on brownfield sites. The proposals would multiply the village population by a factor of 10. Flood risk - The vast majority of the sites proposed for development around Islip flood regularly, several times per year. Any housing built on these sites would be at clear risk of regular flooding. Heritage and Historic Environment - Islip is a village of great historical significance as the birthplace of the Saint and King Edward the Confessor, as well as having played host to the Civil War Battle of Islip Bridge. Its character as a small village with narrow roads and a historic bridge would be greatly threatened by the scale of proposed development. Transport- East-West rail trains are not planned to stop at Islip and there is no safe cycle route between Islip and the city of Oxford. This lack of sustainable connectivity is a barrier to development and will increase road traffic in both Islip and Oxford.
LPR-B-687	Jocelyne and Charles Bangham	Islip	Concerns re proposal to develop land between Oxford and Bicester, and in particular around Islip, for major housing schemes; this is not the correct strategy for Oxfordshire or for the country as a whole. There is a strong need for two major strategic developments in infrastructure in this country over the next generation. Firstly, the need to build more houses and secondly, the strengthening and redevelopment of the social and economic structure of the north of the country. The southeast continues to receive a disproportionate share of the investment in infrastructure, including roads, housing, industry, and schools; and despite much talk there is still little concrete action to invest in the north – the so-called levelling-up strategy. These should go hand in hand: the current rapid changes in manufacturing in particular, such as electric cars and mini nuclear power stations, provide enormous opportunities for investment in industrial development in the north, with accompanying balancing of the population and of prosperity between north and south. The proposed developments around Islip for approximately 3000 houses would place enormous strain on the local roads and road bridge which are already frequently overcrowded, the shops and school. In addition, flooding of the River Ray and Cherwell is occurring more frequently with climate change and floodwaters cause disruption in the village. Vast new housing developments would generate significantly more runoff, and put even more pressure on water supplies and sewage treatment. Furthermore, the green belt, would be irreparably damaged.
LPR-B-688	Nicky Brimmer	Hanwell	Already seen a big increase in traffic both in cars and walkers through the village and are very concerned that the large number of houses will increase traffic near to the village even more. In addition the close proximity of housing with no doubt impact on the destruction of wild life
LPR-B-689	Blanka Geszti	Option 1	Vision should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Planning for residents to be able to walk or cycle from their homes to other areas of the town, as a norm rather than as an exception to driving. Walking and cycling as a normal way of getting around on a daily basis leads to better health and less pollution, less traffic and more sociable public spaces.</li> <li>● Keeping in mind children and young people who do not drive, but for whom it is essential to be able to walk or cycle safely in order to get to school, social occasions etc.</li> <li>● A greater emphasis on green spaces and pedestrian areas, where cars are not allowed. The whole town image would benefit greatly from this, it would look much more attractive without cars everywhere.</li> </ul>
LPR-B-689	Blanka Geszti	Option 3	Employment land should be where it is possible to access it by walking, cycling or existing public transport.
LPR-B-689	Blanka Geszti	Option 5	The town centre would greatly benefit from a concentration of attractive, useful and affordable shops and restaurants. For our elderly residents it is a social hub that cannot be replaced by an out-of-town retail park.

LPR-B-689	Blanka Geszti	Option 14	The priority should be to ensure that residential areas are safe and quiet enough so that children feel safe playing independently on the streets, eg playing football, cycling up and down the streets, playing games, with the occasional car slowly passing by. This is the traditional and ideal state of a residential neighborhood, and one that attracts families to small towns like Bicester.
LPR-B-689	Blanka Geszti	Question - Development Management Policies	It would be helpful to have a plan for promoting walking and cycling in towns and villages, and for connecting towns and villages.
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 2	The question had me reaching for Jane Jacobs' classic analysis of the need for diversity in development – in terms of Banbury town centre in particular where I would want to focus on diversity in urban character, including provision for small scale activity and in some cases safeguarding what appear to be marginally viable businesses. It's paradoxical, but if 'we' allow comprehensive development to take place then this puts greater pressure on those small businesses which 'we' all need at some time! key question is how can Cherwell through the local plan process achieve development of a human scale – it's not just transport – we need policies which will create development solutions where pedestrians are 'at home' in their environment (Others may describe this as the 'retail experience'). Not for example, the windy open spaces of the Gateway scheme
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 4	I strongly support integration with existing mixed uses we all need the electrical appliances, individual clothes shop or motor mower repairers at some time! Retail sheds are only one aspect of the urban fabric- and one which tends to favour the motor car.
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 5	The town centre must have an environment-context where people feel comfortable. It's in large part a matter of scale /materials/spaces/etc. On the related topic of retail and the historic environment, who said that "a town without old buildings is like a man without a memory" People feel more at home in an environment where there is a mix of building types and the scale of buildings does not overwhelm them. How can the policies of a new local plan achieve the attractive complexity of a York or a Chester and translate it into a Banbury context?
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 6	There is clearly a chronic shortfall of both affordable and social rented housing across the district, which the 30% / 35% requirement is signally failing to make any serious inroads into. How much affordable and social rented housing is built should be dependent on social need. The local plan should set out ambitious requirements for affordable and social rented housing to meet this need and, if the private sector is unable to meet this need, the local plan should set out how it will be met by the Council or its RSLs
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 7	Yes, the Council should prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 8	These have been woefully degraded since the days of the Parker Morris Reort, and leadership is needed from District Councils, such as Cherwell, to push back the line to improve space standards for the next generation of home owners
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 10	Option 3 - There is a pressing need for this to include 'big sheds'. It is simply tragic that Banbury's setting is disfigured by many hectares of big sheds, yet not one has a green roof or a single roof-mounted photo-voltaic panel
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 18	Yes to 2 but surely the preference must be, in the wider picture, to concentrate development in/around the larger centres where facilities are concentrated? For example, in the adjacent authority of West Northants there has been an almost total elimination of satellite GP surgeries in the last few years. Residents now must all travel much further to see their GP involving more vehicle trips
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 19	Cherwell site 15 was a huge mistake, and there must be no further development east of the M40. Allowing easy drift is a negation of a well thought out land use plan.
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 20	Article 4 Directions: I am surprised that CDC has not implemented an effective and active policy for the use of Article 4 designations.
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 21	Canalside: Sub option 2 strongly preferred. This is a huge potential asset for Banbury in character & attraction terms- maximum benefit must be achieved for Banbury in drafting planning policies to secure benefits without any loss of that elusive element 'character'
LPR-B-690	Thomas Forde	Option 34	Probably a mixture of the two. As some landscapes are rarer or more valued than others, it would be helpful to have hierarchy of valued landscapes and applicable policies
LPR-B-691	Gail Seward	Milcombe	Objection. Concerned and disappointed to see vast areas of potential housing in a village so small without any significant infrastructure. If the huge volume of housing were to go ahead the effect of this on our village would change where we live forever and the village would become unrecognisable
LPR-B-692	Shutford Parish Council	LPR-A-004	The parish held a meeting so residents could discuss the sites. It was unanimously concluded that whilst there is no objection to development, the identified sites do not reflect the lack of infrastructure or facilities that support the village. The sites are entirely inappropriate for development. There is restricted infrastructure in terms of road access, water, drainage or sewage. The stone which the village is built on has made even small development difficult, whilst lack of access led to the decision to deny permission for further quarrying. The road network could not cope with increased traffic from further homes. There is little street lighting in the village and none on the approach roads. Even if all this could be overcome, any development should respect the green belt and environmental issues and consider brown field sites before encroaching outside the present village boundary.



LPR-B-692	Shutford Parish Council	LPR-A-171	The parish held a meeting so residents could discuss the sites. It was unanimously concluded that whilst there is no objection to development, the identified sites do not reflect the lack of infrastructure or facilities that support the village. The sites are entirely inappropriate for development. There is restricted infrastructure in terms of road access, water, drainage or sewage. The stone which the village is built on has made even small development difficult, whilst lack of access led to the decision to deny permission for further quarrying. The road network could not cope with increased traffic from further homes. There is little street lighting in the village and none on the approach roads. Even if all this could be overcome, any development should respect the green belt and environmental issues and consider brown field sites before encroaching outside the present village boundary.
LPR-B-693	Pat Thomas	LPR-A-178	Object. The sites are outside the settlement boundary as set out in the neighbourhood plan, which states that development will not be supported unless they enhance, or at least don't harm the landscape character. These sites are currently open green fields and therefore any development would damage landscape. Development on this site would double the size of the village. Part of the site is in the AD5 local gap between Adderbury and Bodicote/Banbury. This is an important area to the village to prevent coalescence with Bodicote/Banbury, physically or visually. The recently approved plans for development of south of Bodicote/Banbury make this even more important. An new estate along the lines of Longford Park or the John Harper Road site in Adderbury are simply not in keeping with the village. Twyford Road already struggles with traffic and extra traffic arising from this development would overwhelm an already busy junction.
LPR-B-693	Pat Thomas	LPR-A-081	Object. Twyford Road junction cannot sustain any more traffic around that junction. It is already dangerous, where sometimes you have to pull out quickly in order to get onto Oxford Road. This site is also outside the settlement boundary
LPR-B-693	Pat Thomas	Adderbury	It is environmentally unsustainable to continue to build on greenfield sites. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Banbury and wider Oxfordshire which should be developed first. There is no employment for people who would move into these houses, which will drive more people into commuting. Adderbury does not have a public transport network and the only bus goes through older part of village. If there is need for affordable housing, it should be restricted to families already in Adderbury. There is lack of suitable housing for the elderly. There isn't infrastructure for increase in housing, the Christopher Rawlins school will be at capacity in the next year or two. If there does need to be extra housing, it should be to south of village in order to keep greenfield gap with Banbury. Banbury itself cannot cope with the existing levels of development, without increasing development in the surrounding villages.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 1	There's nothing in it that I would disagree with. However, without prioritisation there is no way to allocate resources optimally.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 2	KO2, KO5 and KO25. The economic objectives must focus on delivering a robust, growing, efficient economy to provide employment and generate revenues to pay for all the other nice objectives. Without this, the plan will fail to deliver other objective
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 3	1 and 3
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 4	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Supporting	Support for rural industries including farming.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 5	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Means to attract people to town centres must be considered, otherwise purely retail shops will not survive.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 6	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 7	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 8	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Separation Distances	No, individual planning applications should be considered on their merits.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 9	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 10	1, there's a risk of increasing housing costs which reduces affordable housing.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Take each case on its merits.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 11	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Support charging infrastructure for battery and hydrogen powered vehicles.

LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	I think it's unrealistic and unhelpful for a Cherwell plan, and risks prioritisation of the wrong objectives.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Transport & Connectivity	I would strongly argue that support for efficient travel in low emission and low carbon vehicles should be significantly increased. Seeking to reduce travel materially is unrealistic
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 16	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 17	Numbers 2 and 3
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 18	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 19	Number 3
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 20	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 21	Number 3
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Provide access to the M40 without having to drive through the town centre.
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 22	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 23	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 24	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 25	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	No
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 26	Number 2
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 27	Number 3
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Access to the M40 at junctions 9, 10, 11
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 28	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 30	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 31	Number 3
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 32	Number 1
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 33	Number 3
LPR-B-694	Colin Watson	Option 34	Number 1
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 1	<p>Vision should include: Economic growth should be sustainable, encourage health and well-being goals, especially safe and convenient active travel provision and not car dependent development. Priority given to ensuring walkers can get around and car routes are designed around this.</p> <p>Car dominance, noise, pollution, risk and inefficient use of space by cars in town centres is reduced by making town centres pedestrian only. Better allocating of parking would make more space for parks, gardens, cafes and restaurants and bike parking</p> <p>Rural communities should be linked to urban centres with safe and direct walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>Neighbourhoods should be primarily connected to each other and facilities by direct and safe walking and cycling routes. People should be able to maintain their health and fitness by using safe and convenient walking and cycling routes.</p>
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 2	<p>KO1 - Space requirements can be significantly reduced by addressing the space hungry needs of parking and roads. Urban sprawl will be in direct contradiction to the stated climate mitigation objectives of the council. So-called 'gentle density' is counterintuitively more attractive and practical. KO10 - The carbon emissions of housing developments should be included in the definition of net zero.</p> <p>KO11 - Reliance on fossil fuel should be ended, not reduced.</p> <p>KO16 - active travel is essential, but should also be integrated into development and transport planning, rather than being separate. KO28 - key amenities and facilities should be within a 15-minute active travel or public transport distance.</p>

LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 3	Employment land should be situated in places where it is feasible to provide walking and cycling or public transport options, not outof-town car dependent locations. This should mainly be at urban centres and significant transport interchanges. This should not jeopardise existing green spaces however.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 5	Development in town centres such as Bicester should be focussed on ensuring that people are able to walk and cycle (including by ebike and cargo bike) to meet their key needs. This involves 15-minute neighbourhoods, high concentrations of development in single places, reduction of wasted road space for car shortcuts, and better use of public spaces. There should be no more out-of-town or edge of town retail development.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	Town must be directly accessible by safe, direct and attractive footpaths and cycle paths, focus on bigger, wider and fater roads is wasteful. Cars should be prevented from driving through middle of town centres so as to avoid wasting space and creating danger, pollution and noise. This is stifling economic growth and tourism. Cars should be encouraged to take routes around town centres. Secure and convenient parking for bikes and electric bikes should be offered. Out of town drive and park only development should be prevented. There should be no 'no cycling' areas.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Separation Distances	Minimum separation distance should not be suggested. 'Gentle density' can ensure attractive and sociable place while also supporting walking and cycling where residents can fulfill their needs within 15 minutes of home. Terraces and flats are significantly more efficient than detached houses due to less heat loss.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 9	All new homes should have secure and convenient bike parking for their own bikes as well as those of guests.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Housing Policies	Sufficient land should be allocated for self-build homes.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 11	Solar farms should be positioned on the warehouses, not across the countryside.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Less reliance should be placed on electric vehicles, as they do not solve many of the challenges that we face with climate change. Rather, emphasis should be put on ensuring that everybody can walk and cycle as a first choice. Transport is a huge polluter, yet many short car journeys could effectively be eliminated with proper infrastructure.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 12	Greater efforts should be made on identifying conservation areas for protection from development.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 14	Historically, children were able to play on the streets. Nowadays, due to the size of cars, together with the effect of google satellite navigation, these opportunities have been removed. Streets should be designed to prevent cutting through and fast speeds, such as by the use of 'low traffic neighbourhoods'. More streets should be pedestrianised, particularly where there are alternative motor vehicle routes
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 15	Sports facilities should be walkable or cyclable for most users. The proposed use of Chesterton instead of Oxford Road demonstrates a major failure of planning, and that insufficient land has been allocated for sports provision close to housing development. Strategic sites should be protected and developed, for example so that there is sufficient provision (two or more artificial pitches in close proximity) to support specialist sports hubs and clubs such as hockey, football, rugby, and tennis. Historically, Bicester sports clubs have been let down by inadequate sports provision, meaning that they are playing way below the level they should be given the size of the town.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Local Green Spaces	LPR-A-196 must be protected as a Green Space for sports pitches. They are centrally located where most people have historically walked and cycled to watch and play sport. They are accessible to most, and walking and cycling to the site minimises traffic, noise, and pollution and encourages gentle exercise. The Oxford Road sports pitches are of massive significance for the residents. They were bought by public contributions and put into trust by a committee of notable residents and sportspeople in order to safeguard them from development and in the longterm interests of Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options Representation Form 17 future generations, thus demonstrating a clear importance and value. Many, many residents have sport there or watched friends and neighbours representing their town. The sports pitches have historically been used for local, public, events such as the notorious 'donkey derby'. LPR-A-125 - This is a local wildlife site and should be a local green space. Gavray Meadows are an exemplary example of floodplain lowland meadow, of which very little remains in the country. It typifies the historical Oxfordshire landscape as illustrated by the historical hedgerows that date back to at least the 1881 map surveys. It has very high biodiversity, with a range of rare species and richness of wildlife. It is one of the very few areas in Bicester that remain unspoilt, and it is a huge asset to the local area. Given the rapid expansion of Bicester and the surrounding areas, local pocket of green space such as this are immensely valuable. It is local in character and not an extensive tract of land. LPR-A-204 - Strongly support the retention of the community orchard as a local green space. The orchard was designed and set aside as an integral green area when the Langford Village housing estate was built. It is a modest-sized, but vital and much-loved orchard that offers a wide variety of opportunities to local residents. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	A fundamental criterion of good design is to avoid areas being dominated by cars (such as the awful Bicester Market Square, which is a traffic gyratory and carpark). Cars have their place, but better to focus on attractive, safe, public spaces, greenery and footpaths and cycle paths.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods are a great idea, and need to be supported by sufficient concentrations of shops and facilities, together with safe walking and cycling provision.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Neither CDC nor OCC have ever really implemented the transport hierarchy. Current focus is only on increasing motor vehicle travel and numbers of cars on the road. It is hopeless. Huge effort needs to be put on reducing unnecessary car trips. Active travel needs to be properly prioritised. Rural areas can now be connected to towns with the electric bike. There should be dedicated, safe, convenient, and off-carriageway routes for electric bikes to get into towns from outlying villages. Some connecting roads should be limited in speed and / or closed to cars.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Transport Policies	A detailed Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure plan is required for all key towns and villages. This needs to set out exactly what pedestrian and cycle measures need to be implemented so that development is coherent
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 17	Infrastructure delivery is backward and exaggerates previous policy failures. For example, if people do not walk and cycle because it is too dangerous to do so, this is often taken as evidence that no active travel infrastructure is required. Better would be to look at the proximity of destinations to determine whether active travel provision is needed.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Walking and cycling delivers more benefits than any other infrastructure, and should therefore be the number one priority.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 22	Development in Bicester must be sustainable, ie walkable and cyclable. Higher density development would assist with this.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 23	Strongly against suggestion of development the Oxford Road sports pitches as this should be retained as Local Green Space.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 24	Bicester town centre is being destroyed by the amount of motor vehicles driving through or around the town centre. The Market Square is a disaster area. It is like a mini Birmingham from the 1960s. It is a tragedy, because the buildings are beautiful and there is plenty of history to attract the tourists. It needs to be pedestrianised with high quality materials as a priority. There is no need to waste it as a carpark. There is plenty of carparking in Bicester town centre behind Wilkos and in Chapel Street. Traffic should be routed around the Market Square, not through it. This is a massive policy failure. Similarly, Church Street and the Causeway are hugely beautiful, but ruined by constant ratrunning. They should be closed to through traffic
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 25	Bicester needs a cultural centre like a museum urgently.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	The Oxford Road Sports Ground has huge significance and should be preserved.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Green spaces should be protected and enhanced by connecting them with safe and direct walking and cycling routes.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Bicester should be ideal for walking and cycling because it is small and flat. The obstacle is lack of safe walking and cycling routes. Highways in Bicester are a disaster, junctions are oversized and not suitable for people. Cycle routes should be made accessible to the disabled and those with less usual bikes. The London Road level crossing should be closed to cars but made accessible to pedestrians with a safe and convenient underpass.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Option 32	key weight should be placed on sites that could be made accessible for walking and cycling.
LPR-B-695	Paul Troop	Question - Development Management Policies	It would be helpful to have a plan for promoting walking and cycling in towns and villages, and for connecting towns and villages.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Neighbourhood Plans are important and reflect perceived local needs and should be taken note of in development proposals.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 30	As Cherwell District Council has already signalled it is pro-development by signing up to the government's Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal I am extremely concerned about the effects this decision will have in the rural areas in Cherwell. This agreement was without any prior consultation with its residents. I note that earlier Local Plans have focussed developments on Banbury, Bicester and to some extent Kidlington, which are all much better served by services and existing infrastructure. Infrastructure is frequently overloaded in rural areas of the District, with water and sewage services stressed, and most of road network is inadequate. Employment opportunities are minimal and are concentrated in the conurbations and as a result there is considerable travel by car where bus services are not available. Former natural boundaries have been fast disappearing due to developments in villages. Such a boundary recently was one in Deddington, which was planted to denote the village edge back in the 1990s. It is now just a separation between the then new village edge and the recent new development.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	LPR-A-054	Government have indicated that development of greenfield sites should be avoided with brownfield ones utilised. Only LPRA-054 seems to be a brownfield site in the Deddington parish profile and the remainder listed are green field

LPR-B-696	A Todd	Deddington	Page 4 of the Deddington profile lists a number of hospitality businesses that no longer exist (Otters Restaurant, May Fu 2 and The Crown and Tuns Public House.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 2	KO23 - Brownfield sites must be identified and always be developed in preference to cutting the first sod at green field locations. KO25 - There are many attractive villages in North Oxfordshire and they must be protected at all costs for future generations.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 3	1 and 3 are much preferable. Any rural sites chosen should be sustainable and to meet a proven local need as much development has already taken place adjacent to transport interchanges.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 5	Town centres need rejuvenating after too much out of town development.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 6	Difficulty with economic viability of sites, have existing targets been met? Local authority housing might well be the only means of achieving this as developers will find this unattractive.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 7	Social renting is probably the better approach.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 8	Separation distances are appropriate.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 12	Should be option 1 as most likely to replicate conditions at original site.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 13	Option 2 probably fits the bill and the way forward.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 15	Reduction in the need to travel is priority - so option 3 is appropriate.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 16	Developments away from centres of employment will not discourage travel to work from rural locations where fewer opportunities exist, thus carbon emissions targets will be exceeded.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 17	Criteria used at 1 urgently needs reviewing before any conclusions and lasting decisions can be made.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 18	Not attractive nor desirable propositions.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 30	Option 1 is preferred. Village life is much different to that in towns and cities and adjustment to it can be difficult. Concern with Option 2 that there will be problems with environment, road congestion, pollution and pressures on infrastructure
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 31	Option 2 is preferred and coincides with government policy.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 32	No one size fits all answer. Some villages have particular essential facilities but there are sometimes already overloaded and not easily accessible. Public transport does not necessarily cater for such journeys.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 33	Well thought through criteria based policies as at 1 are to be much preferred.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Option 34	Both are viable options with the second re-enforcing the objectives of the first.
LPR-B-696	A Todd	Question - Local Green Spaces	Green spaces currently feature strongly in many village structures. I do not mean just play areas which are often incorporated into development designs. Such existing green spaces should be not be built upon but left to provide lungs, natural habitats and important features. Historic environment. This should not be overlooked and must remain in current state if not improved.
LPR-B-697	Georgia Connor	Milcombe	Object. Approval of any of the proposed sites in Milcombe would cause demand for services and facilities in the village and currently there is barely any services and facilities in Milcombe that would cope with more demand. There is only one small shop in village and more development would put more pressure on schools and nurseries in the area.
LPR-B-697	Georgia Connor	LPR-A-138	The site is directly behind the house I am in the middle of purchasing, there is a big electricity pole in the middle of next door's garden and if a site was to be built on this field then I am not sure how the infrastructure would be able to cope with more developments and the need for gas/electricity. The poles are so close to the proposed site and run close to houses as it is. The development would result in a potential loss of privacy and, as a young couple in their twenties with a baby, new housing development might put us off staying at the property for a long time due to noise disruption and building work. It would be a shame to drive families away from older homes.

LPR-B-698	Teresa Wilkinson	LPR-A-086	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. If developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large-scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. Few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to the residents of St Mary's Road being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5-year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-698	Teresa Wilkinson	LPR-A-041	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5-year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-698	Teresa Wilkinson	LPR-A-146	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5-year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>
LPR-B-698	Teresa Wilkinson	LPR-A-218	<p>Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5-year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.</p>

LPR-B-698	Teresa Wilkinson	LPR-A-258	Strongly object. Site falls outwith the residential settlement boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues such as speeding; proposed development site will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The proposed development site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The large scale developments proposed for site LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. Development will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply. Rush to develop green spaces in and around our Banburyshire villages appears to be motivated solely by the financial interests of a few, and will provide no benefits whatsoever to the majority of residents of these villages.
LPR-B-699	Sam Donaghy	Adderbury	Objection. Adderbury is a beautiful historic village and has limited facilities compared to surrounding villages, which would be better equipped to sustain level of development proposed. The level of development proposed will double the size of the village. A 60 hectare site on the eastern side of the Oxford Road in Twyford would seriously upset the natural balance of development within the village. The proposed development contradicts a number of Cherwell's own planning policies.
LPR-B-700	Jonathan and Elizabeth Williams	LPR-A-077	Objection. Development of the scale envisaged would be unwise and would run contrary to much of the Adderbury Local Plan. Development within Adderbury will fundamentally alter the character of the village, the number of sites identified in Adderbury is greater than most. Development could cause further coalescence between Adderbury, Bodicote and Milton. There is little transport from Adderbury by bus, hourly at most to Oxford and Banbury. Travel to a from the village is heavily reliant on private cars. Adderbury is already something of a bottleneck due to the narrow stretch of the A4260. The Council has exaggerated the amount of amenities that Adderbury does actually provide. There is only one small shop, no doctor or dental surgery, one post office and one primary school. Although the proforma for LPR-A-077 states that there is good access, Croft Lane is not wide enough to accommodate two cars passing, let alone construction vehicles. The junction of Croft Lane into the main High Street has obscured views. Croft Lane is widely used by pedestrians, including children, and an increase in traffic would be dangerous. The site is deemed flat, but much of the area proposed drops away to steep gradient and the field at the bottom of this plot fully floods every year. Building homes here would reduce the ability of fields to absorb the rain. The landscape of the Sor Brook has significant value and development would impact key ecology in the area. The public footpaths in the larger field which are part of the Adderbury Circular route must be respected. The smaller plot of land sits within the conservation area and would have to follow very strict rules.
LPR-B-703	Jessica Doidge and Family	North Newington	Object. I agree with the response led by the Parish Council. I am concerned about the risk of flooding of the village houses. After heavy rainfall, the water cascades down the road and has flooded the driveways. On one occasion it rose and came under our floorboards. Adding more houses, would only remove soil and trees that helps to absorb the water. The drains at the top end of the village, do not cope when we experience heavy rain.
LPR-B-703	Sarah Holford	Option 30	The plan proposes the extension of a number of rural villages in the area. One of the attractions and characters of the Cherwell area is the traditional villages, many of which have retained their original character. Many of the rural villages have maintained and developed strong communities. It is crucial to retain this character and not to expand all villages to the point where that community dies. I understand the continual and growing need to expand housing, particularly affordable housing and am encouraged and support the plan's approach to make this sustainable, in particular with regard to transport links, sustainable living, local community development such as local shops, playgrounds etc.
LPR-B-703	Sarah Holford	North Newington	Object. North Newington is a category C village, limited by lack of facilities. While only a few miles from Banbury, we have no local transport links and any access to services, shops etc requires car journeys. We are a small village but have seen some growth over the last few years. This growth has been managed ensuring that the character and nature of the village is protected. There is no public transport within the village and any trials of bus routes have proven unviable. No safe cycle routes out of the village and no paved pedestrian route out of the village. Any expansion to the village will result in a significant increase to the car journeys made from the village. In parts of the village there are no paved pedestrian footpaths and those that do exist are uneven and in places very narrow. Significant expansion of housing in the village would require extensive work to ensure that the area stays safe and is accessible for any disabled residents. There are limitations to the water and drains in the area. Water pressure for several houses is low and an increase in houses will cause further difficulties for existing residents. There is flooding during heavy rain and the site in the field behind Main Street will increase the risk of flooding and potentially risk flooding to the houses on Main Street due to the incline in the field. The road in North Newington is narrow in many places and there are issues with street parking. Development within the village and to villages beyond North Newington will increase the traffic using these areas increasing the risk. The maintenance of existing footpaths is very important and retaining the value that people from many areas place on the quiet nature of the village.
LPR-B-704	Julian and Abigail Bernard	LPR-A-175	Object. Development would take away the charm of Wardington, being a Category B conservation village with many listed properties. It would extend the village boundary and there are no services to make this sustainable. The A361 is already a pragmatic road, adding this extra construction and general traffic to an already busy area would worsen the situation. We will lose the 'living in the countryside' feel if the remaining land is populated with new housing.
LPR-B-704	Julian and Abigail Bernard	LPR-A-034	Object. The location for these warehouses is already a problematic area with local traffic. This would add to the congestion and worsen the traffic. It would detract from the countryside feel that Banbury currently has. It would direct more traffic to the A361, an already dangerous road.

LPR-B-705	Simon and Jemma Parker	Adderbury	Object. The proposals for Adderbury are excessive and to a degree unnecessary. Adderbury Neighbourhood Development Plan has been approved and adopted by Cherwell DC, the blurring of the boundaries between Adderbury and the adjacent areas of Banbury and Bodicote, and the continued loss of significant green space and connectivity for native wildlife species. Disagree with the proposed proportions of land to be available for development. The amount of land to be lost to development is excessive. It is especially high when compared to that which is proposed in other nearby and comparable villages, and even Banbury itself. Hook Norton with approximately 19 ha, Bodicote with approximately 4.5 ha, Bloxham with 62 ha and Deddington with approximately 37 ha. The character of the village will be lost if more development is allowed. Adderbury is an extremely community focussed, cohesive and celebrated village with characteristics which would be entirely lost should the village gain more residents, traffic congestion and pressure on local services. The Cherwell plan makes note of this with its vision that Oxfordshire will enjoy a historical environment with internationally recognised heritage assets. Adding more houses immediately adjacent to the historic conservation areas will do nothing to enhance the region. We would like Adderbury to remain an asset to the area and retain the appeal and charm of a small village not a growing offshoot of Banbury.
LPR-B-705	Simon and Jemma Parker	LPR-A-041	Some of the smaller "infill" type plots within the existing village boundary would be more palatable but these must be sympathetic to the surroundings give priority to local residents and achieve the requisite net gains for biodiversity
LPR-B-705	Simon and Jemma Parker	LPR-A-002	Some of the smaller "infill" type plots within the existing village boundary would be more palatable but these must be sympathetic to the surroundings give priority to local residents and achieve the requisite net gains for biodiversity
LPR-B-706	Cllr Hugh Pidgeon	Sibford Gower	I was particularly impressed by the evident care that went into drawing up the Parish Profiles. You said in the documentation that you had listened, and it was very evident that you had. You even summarised succinctly the controversy that has been generated ever since the planning decision was made to group the two independent Category B parishes of Sibford Gower and Sibord Ferris together as a Category A village. We are already seeing the consequences of that in the speed with which the development companies have moved in on the village. We need more lowcost housing in the area, but this was a major error on the part of the council.
LPR-B-706	Cllr Hugh Pidgeon	LPR-A-107	Object. The Council has made a gross misjudgement, a misjudgement that will compromise all the good will and regard for the Planning Department's judgment I believe we have built up in these last 4/5 years. I urge you to go out of your way to re-examine the scale of what it is that you propose to do to this very precious small rural settlement in the heart of an area of truly outstanding natural beauty. It flies in the face of all the planning criteria and principles which you have outlined.
LPR-B-707	Derwent Green Residents Group	Question - Local Green Spaces	Derwent Green, Bicester and open space and ornamental gardens on the Greenwood Homes estate, Bicester are proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan is included within the submission.
LPR-B-708	Simon Constant	Wardington	Object. It is totally out of proportion to the current proportions of the village, (doubling the size). There are no exceptional reasons why this should be built on a conservation area. Piecemeal applications are fine being considered on a one to one basis. There are no infrastructure nor facilities available to service this proposition (schools, shops, public transport), nor could there be. The land 'pencilled in' for a long awaited by-pass could not be used. To add a small housing estate to Banbury, or re-develop some brown-field land is a far better and more acceptable solution for all concerned.
LPR-B-709	South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Council	General	South and Vale Councils are not responding. I have reviewed your Duty to Cooperate Background Paper. I can corroborate that the correct strategic matters have been identified and have no further comments to make on the Paper.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at Junction 10 M40, Ardley	Land at Junction 10 M40, Ardley is promoted for employment.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 1	The suggested vision is broadly supported. Support the recognition of Cherwell's position within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and its excellent links. Greystoke are promoting land at Ardley which lies off J.10 of the M40 for high tech employment uses. There is a need to unlock the economic potential of the Oxford – Cambridge Arc and Cherwell clearly has a role to play, as could our site
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 2	Broadly supported, however we would suggest they are rationalised down into a lesser number. KO1 and KO2 are the most important.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 3	At both the main urban centres and significant transport interchanges. Our land at Junction 10 of the M40 falls into the latter category.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 4	To provide for key sectors of the local economy it is important to provide sites that meet these requirements on accordance with paragraph 83 of the NPPF. The proposal at Land at Junction 10 M40 would align with Key Objectives 1 and 2. It is proposed that the site could accommodate a development of ½ million square feet of floorspace at Jn 10 M40, designed to accommodate high value jobs within the high tech manufacturing and scientific/research and development sector, would make a significant contribution to the local economy. Specifically would help unlock the potential of the Cambridge/Oxford-Cambridge Arc as one of the world's premier growth corridors and deliver high value jobs. It has the potential to support other sectors of the economy and unlock opportunities for jobs and economic growth. The site is mid-way between Oxford and Milton Keynes and could provide a strategic site enhancing the economic strength of the sub-region. The site at Jn 10 Ardley would assist in realising the aims of the Oxfordshire Local Industrial Strategy in ensuring a sufficient supply of employment land.



LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Question - Supporting	We consider that the other policies in the Plan should be capable of delivering the objectives.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 10	Support for high-tech manufacturing, and research and development proposals that would contribute to managing climate change, for example the development of adaptive technologies.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 13	The natural capital assessment if required should be carried out at the Plan making stage rather than through the development management process. Many aspects of natural capital are already considered through other guidance and legislation. It is for the Local Plan to set policies informed by the evidence relating to natural capital, including for example biodiversity net gain
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Our proposal at Junction 10, M40 would provide employment opportunities at close to thenew community at Heyford Park and Bicester. New technologies can also play a part in reducing emissions in conjunction with other measures that can be used to reduce car travel
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 16	We would generally support enhanced digital connections and infrastructure.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 18	We support further urban extensions at Banbury but also consider there to be a need for a range and choice of sites beyond Banbury such as the land at J.10, Ardley.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 19	East of the town (including to the east of the M40 Junction 11).
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Question - Addressing Inequality in	Realising employment opportunities is part of the solution to addressing inequalities in Banbury.
LPR-B-710	Greystoke CB	Option 29	Our land at Ardley could assist in delivering employment development close to Heyford Park.
LPR-B-711	Carter Jonas for Philippa and Georgina Pain	Call for Sites Promotion - Land north of Green Lane and east of The Hale, Chesterton	Land north of Green Lane and east of The Hale, Chesterton is promoted for housing.
LPR-B-711	Chris Morgan	Wardington	Strongly object. Wardington is a conservation area and a new development this size will drastically alter the size and appearance of the village. The levels of traffic which often struggle to pass each other on the A361 has caused and continues to cause congestion and damage despite the recent widening of the road. The best option for a bypass is through the proposed site. The schools will struggle with capacity. The public service has been reduced drastically and does not serve the village well. The sewerage system regularly struggles.
LPR-B-713	Shenington with Alkerton Parish Council	LPR-A-229	Object. There seems to be no filtering process as to the suitability of proposals and it encourages developers to target greenfield sites which should be discouraged. We will take a keen interest in the effectiveness of the Planning Committee in considering it, especially given the reported debacle of the Wroxton Motex application earlier this year.
LPR-B-714	West Northamptonshire Council	General	West Northamptonshire Council welcomes the progress made on the Cherwell Local Plan. In respect of Chapter 3 is noted along with its references to the Oxford- Cambridge Arc and the work of England's Economic Heartland. West Northamptonshire shares a boundary with the towns and Bicester and Banbury both providing key services and amenities for our residents who in turn contribute to the economy and functioning of North Oxfordshire. Recognition of this both within the document itself and during the development of the plan is essential. We would also ask that the plan now includes references to West Northamptonshire instead of the former sovereign district councils, with mapping etc updated as necessary. It is agreed that future housing and employment generating development is required along with that which will deliver thriving town centres, recreation and leisure facilities and noted that the Oxfordshire Plan is currently considering a range of scenarios and housing numbers for you to adopt which range from between c3,000 to 5,000 per annum for Oxfordshire as a whole. Such growth needs to be carefully considered and West Northamptonshire Council wish to remain engaged in this process. The 2015 Cherwell Local Plan focused employment growth at Banbury as it sought to build on the town's assets including its manufacturing base and transport connections and allocated land for just over 60 hectares of employment land near to junction 11 of the M40. The call for sites submissions that would see the continuation of such a development focus and caution against the impacts that this and developing to the east of the M40 could have on West Northamptonshire and its residents. Proposals for development at Junction 10 of the M40 would have a significant impact on the highway network and the character and functioning of the area with it and the south western corner of West Northamptonshire which it directly adjoins being rural in nature, character and appearance.
LPR-B-715	Mark Pougatch	Sibford Ferris	Object.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Kidlington	Our principal concern at this stage is with the emerging plan and sustainability appraisal apparently not contemplating the sustainability of Kidlington as a strategic location for housing and employment, with the resultant Green Belt review
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Sustainability Appraisal	Our principal concern at this stage is with the emerging plan and sustainability appraisal apparently not contemplating the sustainability of Kidlington as a strategic location for housing and employment, with the resultant Green Belt review

LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 1	<p>Vision has overlooked the housing and economic potential of Kidlington and the need for a Green Belt review. Endorse the strategic policies and evidence reviewed in Section 3, notably the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, England's Economic Heartland, the Oxfordshire LEP's Local Industrial Strategy, the Oxfordshire Growth Board's Growth Deal and the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050. All of them support growth in Kidlington (paragraph 3.5.5). There are clearly strong 'top down' policy pressures that give rise to an overall thrust of growth, not just for its own sake or for local needs, but in the national interest; especially in places such as Kidlington, where the Partial Review has further endorsed the strategic importance and sustainability of this location, including in relation to University-related growth. Given the Partial Review was adopted as recently as last year, it is difficult to see how the established direction of policy could or should change now with the full review of the Local Plan. We have consistently maintained, for example throughout the policy promotion of Oxford Technology Park, that growth in Kidlington, so closely connected to Oxford, is essential to the growth and prosperity of Cherwell. The growth and success of Bicester is all part of this process – being considered alongside Kidlington, with spatial options that are not an either/or, but both. In light of the above context, it follows that many of the possible solutions to housing and economic growth (and environmental protection) are probably already known, even though they have not been planned for to date. Much of the evidence is already in place, as is the policy framework. We feel the case for Kidlington is all but inarguable, not least given the key points established in the evidence examined through work on the recently adopted Cherwell Partial Review. To paraphrase: It is important to ensure that Cherwell's growth does not take place in sensitive, less sustainable locations. Kidlington is not a sensitive location. For example, its context is not sensitive to the UNESCO World Heritage Site at Woodstock, of such concern to the Inspector who led the examination of the Partial Review. Kidlington is a community with a clear local housing need that needs to be met, not ignored as it was through the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1. The recently completed Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review met Oxford's needs and not Kidlington's local housing need. These needs have not been addressed all century, despite Kidlington being Cherwell's 'third settlement', about five times the size of Cherwell's next largest settlement, Bloxham, and four times the size of Begbroke and Yarnton combined (with populations of 783 and 2,545, Census 2011). There is a need for affordable housing in Kidlington, an area of high-cost housing to purchase and to rent due to its proximity to the very high-cost Oxford housing market. The development allocated through the Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review adjoining the University Research Centre at Begbroke will support the University not the local community, being accommodation planned for the University's needs. This is separated from Kidlington by the railway and canal, and there is no direct link northwards to the Langford Lane Employment Area. It is clearly important to strengthen both the employment and housing component of the town. New growth at Kidlington will not generate significant new infrastructure needs as infrastructure is already provided and planned. Kidlington has well established public transport links, with the potential to strengthen connections to the City of Oxford by bus as housing grows, notably through the Rapid Transit along the Banbury Road, which features as a policy objective in both the adopted Oxford City Plan and the Cherwell Local Plan. New housing growth in Kidlington can be supported where public transport is already available, ensuring that the Kidlington area remains highly sustainable. The proximity of the Oxford Parkway Station, and ease of access south of Kidlington (directly off the Banbury Road, with a bridge and bus lanes over the A34), makes Kidlington a sustainable location for broader travel to work patterns. There is an urgent need for renewal initiatives to strengthen the economy of the town centre, which has been weakened through Covid and lack of proactive public sector support and funding. New housing close to the town centre will provide additional footfall that will assist local shops and services to survive and thrive. Additional housing growth should be considered at Kidlington; such as The Moors, which is close to and can link with the employment sites to the north west of the town centre; eg the Langford Lane and Station Road Employment Areas.</p> <p>There is the potential to expand opportunities for walking and cycling as a means of securing integration. There are no major accessibility barriers between The Moors, the town centre and other local amenities and services (in contrast to main roads like the A44, the railway line and canal to the west). There is an opportunity to provide for improved access to the countryside and new green infrastructure. The Moors provides for good foot and</p>
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 2	<p>Object to the reference to "local" economy as this is not consistent with the strategic policy context and we do not feel that housing should be conflated within this objective. The Kidlington area is a nationally significant location – endorsed as recently as 2020 through the adoption of the University-led growth provided for by the Partial Review. It remains unclear whether, for example, Key Objective KO7 applies to the 'village' of Kidlington as the reference to "urban centres" is vague and, more generally, there is no locational/settlement references in the objectives. We are unclear why a Green Belt review and establishing long term defensible Green Belt boundaries is not an objective of the plan.</p>
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 3	<p>At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Support employment development in Bicester, Banbury and Kidlington, noting that the latter is both on the "Knowledge Spine" and 'City Fringe'. We have been saying for years that Kidlington offers the highest value-add employment potential in Cherwell. 2. On the employment land strategy generally, we would urge flexibility in the policy structure as the economy and markets are often fast moving, requiring a rapid response from the planning authority, unconstrained by policy details, to secure investment. No one expected the 2008 financial crash, few predicted the pandemic, Oxfordshire was unable to accommodate Astra Zeneca in 2014 (and the district is now wrestling with interest from Siemens). These matters all require policy agility – ie speed and flexibility, as well as an overarching positivity when it comes to considering inward investment. There should be a specific policy that encourages positive and flexible planning around employment and innovation.</p> <p>This would avoid the situation where projects such as our Oxford Technology Park and Bicester Innovation Community were considered to be contrary to policy, yet then granted planning permission <u>unanimously at Committee – such uncertainties and risks have a strong, negative influence on investment and entrepreneurship, notably among SMEs</u></p>
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 5	<p>We agree with the sentiments expressed at paragraph 5.3.3 – the centre of Kidlington, in particular, is under pressure, and planning policy must set a framework to ensure regeneration, renewal, future viability and vibrancy. The Partial Review sites may assist the town centre with footfall, albeit in the face of poor accessibility (across the railway, canal and A44, and with the closure of Sandy Lane) but, in addition, it is important to set a strategy that links peripheral growth with funding via s106 contributions for town centre improvements including, for example, a Town Centre Manager to help deliver a Town Centre Regeneration and Placemaking Strategy. Such s106 requirements should extend to include contributions from the Partial Review sites (PR7, PR8 and PR9) linked to the adopted SPD 2016. This opportunity for funding should not be lost.</p>

LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District). Support the existing percentage of affordable housing set out at Option 6. As the mix of tenure is concerned, there seems to be a typo, as it should be 30% intermediate (not social). There is also a question here around what constitute "Affordable Rent", as the existing Tenure Strategy 2017 has been applied to conflate Affordable Rent with LHA rents. This is not consistent with national policy and is a matter that the review of the Local Plan should clarify – in a specific policy. The point here is that the lower (LHA) rents are useful sometimes, but it is equally useful for Registered Providers to charge slightly high rents (up to 80% Market Rent) to create funding to improve the affordable housing stock including, for example, fitting energy efficiency measures. Hence policy must provide for this flexibility – not mandate LHA rates.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 7	Existing policy is 70% affordable rent, 30% intermediate. We support that.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Climate change is a key theme of the Oxfordshire Plan. It is right that it has similar status in the Cherwell Local Plan. But it does not follow that a moratorium on development achieves sustainable development and this should not therefore be considered as a policy option. A balance needs to be struck, to include the delivery of economic growth, affordable housing, infrastructure, new schools and town centre regeneration, much of which is now funded by s106 agreements linked to new development.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Question - Green Belt	Given the very strong locational advantages of Kidlington, for housing, employment and sustainable transport, and the fact that the Partial Review sets out agreed 'exceptional circumstances' for a Green Belt review, we feel that Sub-section 5.6 ought to be more specific about development in the Green Belt. The review at paragraph 5.6.4 needs to be completed (not least because Oxford Technology Park is now on site, yet still in the Green Belt) and we would urge Cherwell to finish off the Green Belt review undertaken for the Partial Review in four key respects: The establishment of defensible boundaries and green infrastructure across the 'Area of Search' – to endure and stand the test of time. An example here is the western boundary of PR9, west of the A44. This is a high impact part of the Green Belt with a particularly vulnerable countryside edge. Definition and protection of the Kidlington Gap and Begbroke Gap through a defined area/designation on the Local Plan Proposals Map. This would be a layer of protection on top of the general Green Belt and it would help to inform how the policy operates and how 'very special circumstances' (and future 'exceptional circumstances' cases) are considered. The Gaps are important strategic components of the Green Belt and need to be defined. Paragraph B.260 of the adopted Local Plan 2015 seeks to "protect the vulnerable Kidlington Gap" – this cannot really be achieved unless the Gap is recognized in the plan and defined spatially on a plan. On the adopted Local Plan, we also note that paragraph B.256 states that "... the character of Oxford in a rural setting cannot be maintained without the protection of the spatial relationship of Oxford with nearby settlements and the maintenance of the character of the intervening countryside". This long-established position essentially refers, in particular, to the glimpses of the countryside as you head in or out of Oxford on the A44 and the A34. We consider that this is a strategically important component of the Green Belt and should be treated as such (and retained) as part of any further Green Belt review. This policy objective could be achieved by a notation on the Proposals Map alongside the A44/A34. d. So far as our site at The Moors is concerned, housing development on this land offers less harm to the Green Belt, as assessed by LUC than any of the sites allocated and released from the Green Belt by the Partial Review. The Moors has been assessed as "Moderate" harm to the Green Belt, as opposed to "High" harm for sites along the A44 such as Begbroke (PR8) and land west of the A44 (PR9). This "Moderate" harm to the Green Belt at The Moors balances with strong sustainability and accessibility credentials.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 12	We fully endorse the approach advocated by the consultation draft. We have included a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment with this submission (and our pre-application, 21/02441/PREAPP). We have suggested limiting the net developable area of our proposed 21 hectare site to around 11 hectares in order to provide for suitable green spaces buffers and a new public park.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Option 13	Support the principle, but consider that the natural capital assessment (if any) should be undertaken at the planmaking stage in order to underpin site allocations and to provide clear, specific and sound policy guidelines on the scale and form of development and any design or environmental factors that need to be taken into account in the preparation of a planning application
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The tools for delivering good design are now generally well known. The process starts with a pre-application submission, followed by the appointment of the right architect/master planner, and then continues through an engagement process that includes constraints and opportunities, a series of options, and then a design brief (including draft codes). Often the best schemes are delivered by SME developers; ie those that put design, beauty and value above the cost-driven model of the volume housebuilders.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	We support the principle of '20 minute neighbourhoods'. The Moors in Kidlington provides a very good example, probably the best in Cherwell.
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Question - Transport Policies	We support the general approach, but note that the Rapid Transit along the Banbury Road through Kidlington appears as a policy objective in the Cherwell Local Plan 2015 (and the Oxford City Plan) and should be retained. This is much simpler to deliver than, for example, rail infrastructure (including the proposed station at Begbroke).

LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Bicester	<p>These representations on Bicester are short because our hotel at Bicester Gateway (Phase 1A) is now open for business and we have outline planning permission for the Innovation Community (Phase 1B). However, because of the risk and continuing opportunities associated with this groundbreaking project (see plans over page), we feel that the emerging Local Plan might consider amending the current Policy Bicester 10 criteria to reflect: 1. A wider set of uses than Use Class B1, 2. The potential for more scale and height, Other ways of reflecting the gateway nature of this site, including a specific 'gateway' notation on the Proposals Map. This is not to say we won't implement the outline permission exactly in its current form, but things change and, as Bicester grows, it would be typical for civic ambition to grow too. Moreover, the Bicester Town Master Plan and other initiatives have had the effect of giving investors confidence in the town, meaning its growth trajectory could accelerate over the life time of the new Local Plan. In short, there are likely to be continuing opportunities for innovative planning in Bicester; in fact, this may become a defining characteristic of this town. Bicester has assembled a remarkable set of assets – Bicester Village, Bicester Motion, Graven Hill, the EcoTown, OYAP, Bicester Gateway, Catalyst and more. There is now every reason to set an ambitious plan for the town. This must include support for the town centre. It follows that, in addition to amending Policy Bicester 10, the spatial strategy for Bicester could include a refreshed Town Master Plan and it might include an overarching general policy seeking to support investment, positive planning and innovation in the town. Our thinking here is that, to the best of our knowledge, assets such as Bicester Village, Bicester Motion and Bicester Gateway were not the result of (or predicted by) planning policy. Specifically in relation to Bicester Gateway, both Phase 1A and Phase 1B were considered contrary to policy, yet both were approved unanimously at Committee. Apart from causing stress and uncertainty for the applicant (never good for investment) we feel an overarching, positive policy would help settle the balance of a range of policies broadly in favour of any particular, innovative proposal. This would lead to faster and more certain decisions on planning applications – as well as sending out the message that Bicester is 'open for business'. We hope these representations assist the debate about the future of both the district and Bicester. We would be delighted to open a dialogue with officers on possible revisions to the policy framework.</p>
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Kidlington	<p>It is remarkable that this parish received only c100 of the 4,400 houses allocated by the Partial Review for the 'Kidlington Area of Search'. This may explain why the Partial Review did not link the proposed new University-led development to a strong place-making and regeneration agenda for Kidlington, combining with infrastructure improvements along the A4260 Corridor (Banbury Road). Cherwell Local Plan is the right place to provide a framework for redressing this imbalance given the countywide potential of this area and the needs associated with such strong accessibility to Oxford. The Alan Baxter work on Kidlington from 2012 is a good place to start. There is scope for a further 700 or more homes in Kidlington, across some smaller, more deliverable sites than the major sites proposed in Cherwell's Partial Review. Kidlington is a settlement that has strategic importance; ever since being referenced in the Regional Spatial Strategy, and whilst this led ultimately to the compelling case for our Oxford Technology Park, Kidlington itself has received very little new housing this century, despite its sustainability credentials, and much of the new growth released via the Partial Review is on the other side of the railway and canal to Kidlington, and some is the other side of the A44, with much being 'Universityrelated' housing. This presents a challenge that needs to be resolved through focused and positive planning endeavors</p>
LPR-B-716	Bloombridge LLP	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>We find the terms of reference and findings of Cherwell's Sustainability Appraisal to be surprising. We would go as far as saying, with respect, that the terms of reference are wrong – generally, and in relation to Kidlington. The findings have not considered a Green Belt review or housing needs in Kidlington as 'reasonable alternative' policy options because, according to the AECOM SA, the consultation on the Local Plan defers these considerations to the Oxfordshire Plan – this means that the whole SA (and next steps) is skewed. Put another way, the SA has applied "no decision" on a Green Belt review and housing growth as a negative when defining and choosing between options. This is a false assumption – ie it is without foundation or evidence, and it lacks pragmatism. This must be addressed. For example, at a baseline level, the SA needs to consider (as an input/option) the potential for development in the Green Belt, and long term defensible Green Belt boundaries, not least because this is one of the functions of a local plan review (NPPF21, paragraphs 140- 142). We note that Section 2.11 of the SA refers to difficult choices around employment allocations but does not mention a Green Belt review, which is already part of the consultation paper and surely inevitable given Oxford Technology Park is under construction (still waiting for the Green Belt designation to be lifted). We find the evidence in support of more social housing at paragraph 2.15.2 over simplified and unconvincing. This is best dealt with at the application level, depending on local circumstances – for example, there is no point providing social housing in a rural area or Kidlington if the resident being accommodated works in Banbury (being a settlement with notable areas of deprivation, per paragraph 2.18.1). It is not the function of the SA to propose policy solutions at this stage in the planmaking process. It is difficult to see what authority the authors of the SA have in choosing alternative options for assessment, notably options which exclude a reconsideration of the Green Belt, which was reviewed, partially, as recently as last year; including a set of 'exceptional circumstances' listed at paragraph 5.17 of the Cherwell Partial Review, adopted in 2020. These 'exceptional circumstances' are still highly relevant. Moreover, the Partial Review itself is a very significant material consideration to the SA, given the £1 billion investment now being made by the University at Begbroke Science Park – this is internationally significant and, axiomatically, offers locational advantages for further local investment in housing, employment and community facilities. In short, a Green Belt review ought to be a fundamental term of reference for the plan and SA. Paragraphs 6.4.1 to 6.4.10 of the consultation paper set out a range of circumstances for Kidlington that make this a reasonable and somewhat compelling course of action. It is an opportunity for positive planning where 'reasonable alternatives' such as The Moors have already been assessed and considered favourably by Cherwell alongside a substantial evidence base. T. Either a Green Belt review should have been SA'd, or the findings heavily limited in their scope to ensure all reasonable options remain open for consideration. To add further weight to these arguments it seems truly remarkable that an SA by LUC could support the release of Green Belt land in Begbroke and Yarnton to accommodate more than 4,000 houses in 2020, yet the potential of this area, notably Kidlington itself (ie Cherwell's 'third settlement'), could then just be set aside by AECOM's SA less than a year later – ie with no growth plan. It is hard to see how this assumption in the SA is fair, reasonable or proportionate, and we feel it must be addressed to avoid skewing the consideration of the whole local plan. . Strongly recommend that it is reviewed and reissued, specifically in relation to the approach to growth around Kidlington.</p> <p>The rationale for action on this now, which is hard to ignore, is that Kidlington appears in all five of the Oxfordshire Plan spatial options.</p>

LPR-B-717	David Moore	LPR-A-204	Support. Langford Community Orchard is a valuable green space, one of the few wild spaces left within the Bicester boundaries. Many have discovered it walking/cycling to and from town, or as part of the Langford 5k "Blue Line" health route. It is unusually tranquil for a place so close to town and main roads. This and the wide variety of types of trees and shrubs makes it a haven for wildlife, in a town that has lost so much green space.
LPR-B-717	David Moore	LPR-A-125	Support. It is a wonderful wild walking area for walkers and dog walkers. When the fields beyond the A4421 disappear under housing, Gavray Meadows will be more important. Gavray Wildlife Meadows is a precious remnant of the countryside that used to surround Bicester. The site has varied small ancient meadows bounded by hedgerows dating back to medieval times. It has magnificent mature trees, two ponds and lots of wild flowers in spring and summer. Gavray Meadows is a Local Wildlife Site due to its biodiversity and rare species of butterflies and newts. The site is also part of the Upper River Ray Conservation Target Area which is protected as an area where action to improve biodiversity should be focused.
LPR-B-718	Jane Moore	LPR-A-204	Support. Langford Community Orchard is a valuable green space, one of the few wild spaces left within the Bicester boundaries. Many have discovered it walking/cycling to and from town, or as part of the Langford 5k "Blue Line" health route. It is unusually tranquil for a place so close to town and main roads. This and the wide variety of types of trees and shrubs makes it a haven for wildlife, in a town that has lost so much green space.
LPR-B-718	Jane Moore	LPR-A-125	Support. It is a wonderful wild walking area for walkers and dog walkers. When the fields beyond the A4421 disappear under housing, Gavray Meadows will be more important. Gavray Wildlife Meadows is a precious remnant of the countryside that used to surround Bicester. The site has varied small ancient meadows bounded by hedgerows dating back to medieval times. It has magnificent mature trees, two ponds and lots of wild flowers in spring and summer. Gavray Meadows is a Local Wildlife Site due to its biodiversity and rare species of butterflies and newts. The site is also part of the Upper River Ray Conservation Target Area which is protected as an area where action to improve biodiversity should be focused.
LPR-B-719	Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	General	The table on page 11 – perhaps a tick could be added for the Environmental Agency under Health Infrastructure and Local Facilities? We are mindful of the work being done to reduce pollution which affects health, and the Public Health colleagues who are seeking to have Oxfordshire as a smoke free zone. If this is not applicable then please disregard this comment. The table of partnership meetings on page 14 – It is good to see the OCCG / CDC meetings included. Perhaps it could be included that the meetings are held every 2 months as this is usually when they take place.
LPR-B-720	Maureen Hayward	LPR-A-125	Support. It is a wonderful wild walking area for walkers and dog walkers. When the fields beyond the A4421 disappear under housing, Gavray Meadows will be more important. Gavray Wildlife Meadows is a precious remnant of the countryside that used to surround Bicester. The site has varied small ancient meadows bounded by hedgerows dating back to medieval times. It has magnificent mature trees, two ponds and lots of wild flowers in spring and summer. Gavray Meadows is a Local Wildlife Site due to its biodiversity and rare species of butterflies and newts. The site is also part of the Upper River Ray Conservation Target Area which is protected as an area where action to improve biodiversity should be focused.
LPR-B-721	Maureen Hayward	LPR-A-204	Support. Langford Community Orchard is a valuable green space, one of the few wild spaces left within the Bicester boundaries. Many have discovered it walking/cycling to and from town, or as part of the Langford 5k "Blue Line" health route. It is unusually tranquil for a place so close to town and main roads. This and the wide variety of types of trees and shrubs makes it a haven for wildlife, in a town that has lost so much green space.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 1	I would like to maintain the rural villages as a part of banburyshire without subsuming them into the growing boundaries of Banury. I would like to maintain their attractions; appearances; attractions for tourists and wildlife. Already the units next to Junction 11 on East of the M40 are starting to spoil neighbouring villages, more refuse and general ambience.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8).
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Question - Housing Policies	Rapidly adopt green policies - use of new boilers ;insulation etc
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Question - Travelling Communities	There are several travelling sites dotted in the area. I don't think we need more, particularly in the Cropredy area where there was a recent explosion at a disputed site
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas

LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods is an admirable proposal but the amount of building has already swamped primary care facilities which have not been part of the plan and overlooked.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. The views of St Mary's Church should be protected.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. We need to work to make it more attractive current phase 2 of Castle Quay have spoilt the ambience which was created by the phase 1 Debenhams etc building encourage more recreational activity and wild-life
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Some villages have already-infilled and had small developments. The problem is by just building more housing its spoiling them, reducing tourism.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 32	Develop a rural hierarchy - walking/ Cycling.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Question - Settlement	We should have settlement boundaries. There is a possibility if speculative land proposals are adopted the villages will all coalesce.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	LPR-A-155	Object. The speculative sites around Cropredy are unsuitable. The site by the railway line proposed by Brasenose college has been attempted on at least 2 other occasions and failed at appeal. Problems with flooding and drainage; problems with traffic congestion, damage to wildlife and habitats and spoiling the village. The land between the marina and the edge of Cropredy was previously a vibrant wildlife area. It's already been damaged by the marina construction. Building would blight the housing already there but the land floods in Winter. A third site by the plant production company is down a private rural track that sees mass congestion as it provides access to the school. This is massively congested with vehicular traffic. it would be exceptionally dangerous but the land would blight the canal ambience and also floods. Development will overwhelm the village. It break the agreement made with the village not to develop other industries .Both parcels of land flood.
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	LPR-A-202	Object. The speculative sites around Cropredy are unsuitable. The site by the railway line proposed by Brasenose college has been attempted on at least 2 other occasions and failed at appeal. Problems with flooding and drainage; problems with traffic congestion, damage to wildlife and habitats and spoiling the village. The land between the marina and the edge of Cropredy was previously a vibrant wildlife area. It's already been damaged by the marina construction. Building would blight the housing already there but the land floods in Winter. A third site by the plant production company is down a private rural track that sees mass congestion as it provides access to the school. This is massively congested with vehicular traffic. it would be exceptionally dangerous but the land would blight the canal ambience and also floods. The area will spoil the canal. Access is dangerous and is only really fit for the occasional lorry. It would be on a floodplain and increase risk of flooding to other properties built years ago on Station road (which are already feeling the effects of climate change).
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	LPR-A-044	Object. The speculative sites around Cropredy are unsuitable. The site by the railway line proposed by Brasenose college has been attempted on at least 2 other occasions and failed at appeal. Problems with flooding and drainage; problems with traffic congestion, damage to wildlife and habitats and spoiling the village. The land between the marina and the edge of Cropredy was previously a vibrant wildlife area. It's already been damaged by the marina construction. Building would blight the housing already there but the land floods in Winter. A third site by the plant production company is down a private rural track that sees mass congestion as it provides access to the school. This is massively congested with vehicular traffic. it would be exceptionally dangerous but the land would blight the canal ambience and also floods. Development would spoil both villages and create more congestion on the adjoining road. It would spoil the green belt and would be at odds with all the proposals to reduce climate change whilst also increasing flooding and being a blot on the landscape
LPR-B-721	Debra Broadbridge	LPR-A-090	Object. The speculative sites around Cropredy are unsuitable. The site by the railway line proposed by Brasenose college has been attempted on at least 2 other occasions and failed at appeal. Problems with flooding and drainage; problems with traffic congestion, damage to wildlife and habitats and spoiling the village. The land between the marina and the edge of Cropredy was previously a vibrant wildlife area. It's already been damaged by the marina construction. Building would blight the housing already there but the land floods in Winter. A third site by the plant production company is down a private rural track that sees mass congestion as it provides access to the school. This is massively congested with vehicular traffic. it would be exceptionally dangerous but the land would blight the canal ambience and also floods. Development would affect drainage into the valley and increase air pollution and traffic; overwhelm local services and destroy the outlook of all the pre-existing residents in the area whilst again joining up the two distinct villages of Great and Little Bourton.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 1	The vision is wide-ranging and noble. Nonetheless aspirations do not necessarily relate to realities, given top-down driven targets for housing growth in particular. The vision, and strategy overall, place great emphasis on developing the towns of Banbury and Bicester and protecting the rural environment. However there is scant reassurance in the document about protecting the needs of villages located on the edge of the towns, villages that have already experienced a significant amount of development, or villages that are becoming ever closer to the towns as a result of expansion. This group of villages should be considered as a separate category with its own section in the plan, as the needs of these villages are different to both the towns and the more remote rural areas of the district. A form of Amendments submitted.

LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 2	The objectives appear mostly sound, if numerous. KO1: 'Allocate sufficient land to meet our housing and employment needs' should be redrafted to take account of working with local communities and paying due regard to the fairness and appropriateness of allocating land. We are pleased that the strategy places such emphasis on climate change. KO16: Pleased that the prioritisation of active travel and public transport is highlighted in the strategy, and the reduced use of the private car as a mode of transport. We have not seen any real attempts in approving recent housing development to take transport and infrastructure issues into account. We would like this to be taken more seriously in the future otherwise transport links will continue to be increasingly congested. KO26: Support access to green and blue infrastructure so that residents can enjoy the benefit of the natural environment on their physical and mental health. This vital. For Bodicote, it is imperative that the countryside around the village be maintained to its current extent. Bodicote is not a large parish, and following recent loss of much of our parish land for development, it is of the highest importance that villagers are permitted doorstep access to the green spaces remaining to them.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 3	It makes sense for employment land to be developed in areas which can be most easily accessed. This includes the principal towns but could also include significant transport interchanges and use of existing business parks. However consideration needs to be given to the transport infrastructure leading to these areas. Many roads in urban centres are overburdened. Public transport needs to be strengthened likewise. No doubt a combination of options will be needed. The document notes that more people are working at home. A reevaluation of the amount of employment land needed may be sensible.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 4	Whatever land is allocated for employment purposes, proper consideration must be given to the transport infrastructure providing access to that land, regardless of its type.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Supporting	All forms of employment and work should be considered.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 5	Each town should have the capacity to decide what works best for its own needs. Good quality residential development should sit alongside urban regeneration more widely. Maximum flexibility based on an understanding of each town centre's users should be key
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	Entrepreneurs who wish to set up viable small businesses within the town centre should be helped and encouraged. A diversity of shops gives much needed character to a town. While popular national chains have a place and are welcomed by many, so too do unique outlets that cannot be found elsewhere.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 6	Every opportunity should be given to young and new homebuyers to move into houses of good quality in the areas where they wish to live.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 8	This choice needs to be underpinned by evidence. But it would seem correct to insist that dwellings meet a decent standard of indoor space, and outdoor space and proximity to adjacent dwellings are further potential considerations
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	A balance needs striking between providing the needed number of dwellings and giving residents a feel of having their own space, and providing character to a development. But this needs to be done in such a way as to avoid large housing developments growing even larger so as to keep the same number of houses as a result of adopting such a policy.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	Housing and transport need to be taken together in developing policies and approving developments. This has not particularly been the case to date.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 10	Cherwell should set itself the highest standards it can afford and encompass, and at a minimum commit to national standards.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	The bespoke approach laid out in the document seems sensible.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 12	Initially, Secure as close to the site as possible, as close to the site as possible so that benefits are realised locally where feasible. Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused and Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district should be as close to the site as possible where there is a choice.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 13	Either Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; or Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Where proposals impact negatively this should be brought to the attention of interested parties, and developers should be required to adapt or otherwise offset such negative impacts.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 14	A combination of approaches would be best. Large developments do seem to include younger children's play areas as standard. Facilities for older children such as trickier obstacle courses and appropriate skateparks merit consideration too.

LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 15	Sports hubs would most usefully be found in areas that are easy to access, such as in towns. But large developments should continue to set aside space for sport and outdoor activities. A combination of approaches would be best, dependent on local need and practicality. The council still wishes to move Banbury FC to Bodicote, despite no real assessment of the impact of such a move on transport networks, or of noise pollution for nearby households. It is already dangerous turning out of the rugby club/fitness club onto the Oxford Road, and there is already significant congestion heading into Banbury, which is compounded by all the new housing that has been built in the area without corresponding upgrades to the transport infrastructure. All in all we would advocate a rethink, and would very much appreciate discussing such issues before any move takes place.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	All open land within Bodicote parish to the west and south of the village should be designated a Local Green Space (or receive some form of recognised protection), extending in an arc from Wykham Lane around the bottom of the village to the Iron Stone Place estate. No housing development should take place on this land. This is countryside of vital importance to the residents of the village and to the character of the parish. A form, site location plan and photographic assessment have been submitted to request that the land is designated as a Local Green Space.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The approach appears sound and any attempt to encourage residents to make greater use of public and active transport is to be welcomed. The present necessary reliance on private transport, and in particular in the rural areas across the district where residents have no real choice other than to use their own vehicles, makes the attainment of this goal challenging. It would help if when granting approval to large housing developments, proper requirements are made to incorporate transport links as conditions for approval. To the south of Banbury, thousands of new homes have been built with barely any additional road infrastructure, and barely any improvements to public transport. This leads to more traffic on the existing roads, consequent harm to the environment and health: surely, a failure of planning policy. How can the council continue to expand Banbury without any new integrated transport plans agreed.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 16	Future proofing as much as possible given the swiftly changing nature of communications technology.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 17	It would seem prudent to continually update methodologies to reflect current needs. Some form of catchment approach would seem beneficial in preparing the IDP, given the way residents move about the district, and particularly in relation to the towns
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 18	Strongly opposed to any further expansion of Banbury to the south that would lead to further significant change to the established identity of the villages there. We consequently favour limit development. At least to the south, would be destructive for quality of life, village integrity, natural habitat, access to countryside, and have detrimental impacts on transport links. Focusing development at existing settlements would place undue burdens on the particular settlement chosen. We do not seek to object to development for the sake of it. Bodicote wish to protect the identity of the village, stand up for the needs of its residents, and safeguard the surrounding natural environment. To date, the housing that has been built here west of the Oxford Road has been placed in areas that have not encroached on the vital western and southern aspects of the village, other than the Cotefield/Iron Stone Place developments which have been sensibly built close to the Oxford Road. But there should be no further extension of these developments into the fields to their west or south, indeed no other developments permitted in Bodicote at all given what little space remains to us. If Banbury extends any further southwards, the village would be enveloped leading to a high level of coalescence with the town, and the villages of Adderbury and Bloxham. We will oppose any attempts to take parish land from Bodicote into Banbury that would seek to claim developments are being built not in the village but in the town.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 19	We are resolutely opposed to any further development to the south of the town that impacts on the rural integrity and independence of existing parishes and that fails to answer the question of how to deliver such a vast amount of housing with no thought to corresponding transport links. We note that there has also been development to the north and west of the town, although in some aspects not as extensive as development to the south. We would consequently request that CDC start to look seriously at expanding Banbury to the east, regardless of the M40's positioning. That this area is within a different county should not present an insurmountable obstacle.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 20	It would be prudent to consider further use of the town centre to provide relevant sites. Indeed many people prefer to live in town centres close to amenities and public transport links. We do not consider that developers should be able to convert businesses into homes without some form of oversight, in order to be sure the town centre retains the services people use and does not suffer detriment to its character. We would adopt a liberal interpretation of option 1 that avoids stringent restrictions but which provides assurance that planning in the town itself will be well managed.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 21	If Banbury requires more housing it would be prudent to use this canalside land to deliver needed dwellings. It may be that a more flexible mix of residential and commercial areas would allow the zone to develop into a wharfside mini-village that would be a shopping destination in its own right bringing people into the town. We would prefer Banbury FC either to remain where it is or move somewhere other than the proposed relocation site, in order to avoid transport problems along the Oxford Road on match days. Relocating the football club with no regard for these issues will compound the problems already created by approving large scale developments like Longford Park without significant corresponding improvements to infrastructure. We are not aware of any recent attempts to keep the village or parish council updated on progress with the plans to move the club, despite the earmarked land being in Bodicote parish.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Spiceball sometimes feels unsafe and isolated. Any move to improve this area would be welcome.



LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	More frequent public transport continuing into the evening. While it is possible to walk into Banbury from Bodicote, this is unfeasible for many. We do have the B3 bus but it takes a long and circuitous route, and stops operating early. A more regular and direct bus link would speed up access to the town and provide a more comparable alternative timewise to the car. The decision to build the train station car park where it is, requiring drivers to wait at the Bridge St traffic lights if coming from anywhere other than Grimsbury, and then a further set of lights, must be one of the most bizarre made in recent years. It clearly leads to increased traffic congestion in that area. The former Tramway car park was in a better position for railways users arriving from Banbury's southern side. A proposed link road from the Tramway area to the train station without the need to go through the town centre should be commenced as soon as possible. Proper cycle lanes should be included with all new large scale housing developments and where possible alongside existing roads into the town. The new cycle lanes on Bankside are narrow and in some places unusable as local residents park in them. Creating specific cycle lanes apart from the roads would be preferable where possible. It is still only possible to reach the M40 by driving through the town centre if coming from the south, which means anyone wanting to access the motorway is forced through the town. Options for avoiding this should be explored. This could include working on ways to simply reduce the amount of daily traffic in the town centre so there is less congestion in the first place, and revisiting the sequence of lights at both the Bridge St and Warwick Road/Castle St junctions in case they can be made more efficient
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 30	Section 6.6.1 of the consultation makes clear that Bodicote is considered to be a settlement in a rural area. And yet on land that belonged to Bodicote parish at the time of planning approval, many hundreds of houses have been built. The council's strategy for ignoring this inconvenient reality has been to take land from Bodicote and place it into Banbury after homes have been constructed, against the wishes of the parish and after homeowners had moved into their new homes believing they were buying property in Bodicote. This unacceptable and unseemly landgrab. Even discounting the land at Longford Park that has been removed from Bodicote, a significant number of housing developments have completed or are in progress within the parish. Another 150 homes are to be built in the north west corner of the parish, immediately adjacent to the existing Pavilions. Taken together, these developments are adding in the region of 500 new dwellings to the prior village, an increase of near 60% on the housing stock. We contend that a) the council's words on protecting rural areas rings somewhat hollow, at least where Bodicote is concerned – and looking at the proposals suggested for Bloxham and Adderbury in the call for sites, may well ring hollow for our neighbouring villages too – and b) that Bodicote has accepted more than its fair share of development already. We will resist the possibility of any further development in the parish, and so must object to the proposal for development contained in this consultation to the south of Wards Crescent. We cannot agree to any further land being removed from the parish, which is already one of the smallest in the area. We note the concurrent review into parish boundaries taking place under the name of Community Governance Review. It is our strong conviction to oppose any move to diminish our parish in any way. We will not accept enforced transfer out of the parish of the land where the Tapper's Farm, Whitechapel Gardens, and The Pavilions developments are being built, or the land earmarked for the extra 150 houses adjacent to The Pavilions, particularly as these all fall south of the Salt Way. We note that the relevant developers are marketing these developments as being within Bodicote. Our answer is a combination. We do not think individual villages should be made to shoulder the overall rural housing allocation disproportionately. Bodicote is on the periphery of Banbury and have been prepared to accept a good share of new housing developments on this basis. But there comes a point where enough is enough, and we are steadfast in our wish to maintain the parish as it now is and in particular to protect its western and southern aspects. These are cherished landscapes beloved by the village and which give the parish its rural character. It will be wholly unacceptable to us to see this historic natural environment altered. We consider that developments in rural areas must meet local needs and be proportionate to the size of the village in question. We also believe, nonetheless, that rural areas should be required to take some of the share of the district's housing allocation, especially when concentrating so much on the edge of the more urban areas spills over to an excessive degree into the adjacent rural landscape. But all villages should be equally and fairly considered in doing so. There are some villages, such as Bodicote and Bloxham, that have witnessed an astonishing amount of development in recent years. No amount of administrative rejigging of boundaries can hide that fact. With thousands of homes having been built, or being built, to the south of Banbury already, it is time to look again at alternative options for development and not merely follow the same pattern of the last decade, taking plans forward in a joinedup, sustainable and transparent way, working closely with residents and parish councils.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 31	Working with communities is imperative and each area will have different needs and different views on suitable sites. Parish level figures are meaningless however if the district council is prepared to avoid them by transferring homes built in one parish into another after they have been built
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 32	All relevant matters should be considered. Settlements closer to urban centres may be asked to take an increased share of the rural allocation. We do not agree that this should come at the cost of eroding that settlement's identity or of reducing that settlement's remaining natural landscape still further. The presence of certain services within a village might give additional weight in forming any hierarchy, but we would also contend that new housing developments might be an opportunity to bring those services into areas where they did not before exist. We are uncertain whether we support the definition of additional settlement boundaries within parish boundaries. Unless these have legal protection
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 33	These proposals need to be fleshed out as at this stage they are quite vague. Criteria-based policies seem sensible in theory, although would presumably often lead to the selection of specific sites meaning the two choices are interlinked

LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 34	The council should do its best to conserve the overall character of the district while singling out particular areas for special valued status. Each parish will have particular landscapes it considers to be of particular beauty and the people who live in each parish will be those best placed to identify them. Strongly support the definition of 'valued landscapes' where the presumption would be that these would never be built on. We would be happy to work with the district council in defining valued landscapes for Bodicote and the surrounding areas. Within the parish we consider the fields to the west and south of the village stretching from Wykham Lane around to the Iron Stone Place and Coteheld estates to be valued landscapes that allow the parish to retain its rural identity and which provide immediate access to the countryside for residents. We consider that the approach to Bodicote along Wykham Lane is a valued landscape as this provides the only remaining rural approach to the village. We consider the landscape within the triangle defined by points at Bodicote, Adderbury and Bloxham to qualify for a form of special status, as this is of a genuinely rural nature; features numerous rights of way; has spectacular views to the village churches, the Bodicote windmill, over the farmland and along the Sor Brook; provides a large area of countryside for residents of all three villages and Milton to enjoy; and which ensures coalescence between settlements is avoided while allowing each village to share the same bucolic north Oxfordshire landscape.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	The Neighbourhood Planning process is time consuming and resource intensive. It would be helpful to know that at the time a parish notified CDC it was starting work on a plan, that undetermined large-scale planning applications and applications submitted during work on the plan's compilation would not be approved or rejected until after the plan was ratified – within a set time period, of course. Otherwise much work could be undertaken to no purpose.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-091	Object. It seeks to extend the built-up area of the village into its valued southern aspect, that have numerous rights of way regularly used, and which provide the southern extent of the village with an undisputedly rural and beautiful outlook. It is of the highest priority to the parish council that the rural land to the south and to the west of the village be kept free of development. This is not just agricultural land, or a collection of fields. This countryside is as integral to the identity of Bodicote as the builtup village itself. Villagers make daily use of this countryside, and generations have grown up calling it part of their home. Here are significant and cherished views. This countryside is Bodicote. We view it as part of our charge to protect it. We will seek every opportunity to register our wishes that the vital southern and western aspects of our village remain intact. This countryside be designated a valued landscape as described in the consultation document, and we request assurances that it will be protected accordingly. We note paragraph 2.2.2 of the consultation document which states: 'In response to our previous Community Involvement Paper, you have told us how important it is to be able to access green and blue spaces locally for mental and physical wellbeing.' The countryside around the village provides that vital access, and particularly in the light of the Covid-19 pandemic, when it has proven an incredible boost to the village. Over the past several years, hundreds of houses have already been built on what is, or what at the time of planning approval was, Bodicote parish land. Even discounting the land to the east of Oxford Road that was involuntarily removed from the parish, Bodicote has grown through what will be over five separate housing developments and the additional houses to be built in the north west corner of the parish adjacent to The Pavilions. This represents nearly a 60% increase in the village's housing stock going from about 850 to in the region of 1350 dwellings. We have welcomed these new developments and are glad that the people who have moved there have chosen Bodicote to live. We are fully aware that being on the edge of Banbury, Bodicote has by some degree of contiguous necessity taken a larger share of recent housing developments as a result. Bodicote has taken its fair allocation and that there should be no further development in the village at this time. We will resist any attempt to shrink the parish further than it has been. Having lost around a full half of our parish to Banbury, we would hope the town and district councils would now respect our remaining integrity and agree that the developments currently being built on Bodicote land should stay with the parish, and not move boundaries after housing has been built either to excuse additional development in the village. We wish the parish to coexist in harmony with the town, and not be treated as convenient parcels of land that can be distributed away when it suits either council's plans.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Option 30	On page 18, the consultation makes plain that Cherwell DC has up to now chosen to 'focus most of the proposed growth in and around Bicester and Banbury.' This inevitably leads to those villages closest to the towns taking almost the entire burden of housing development. While we agree that towns have a need to expand, we are concerned that this expansion fails to take adequate consideration of the needs of the affected nearby villages, which wish to retain their individual identity as much as other, more remote, villages seek to do. Such villages as ours that fall within a certain radius of Banbury's and Bicester's boundaries could well be served by their own separate section in the new Cherwell plan. The current strategy has also sought to 'limit growth in our rural areas and direct it towards larger and more sustainable villages.' As Bodicote, Bloxham and Adderbury are three of the largest villages in the district, this adds another disproportionate burden on our specific area. We have been happy to take our share of housing developments, but again contend that we have reached our fair limit and furthermore worry that the continual construction in the area is affecting residents' quality of life. Villagers have been subjected to continual noise pollution from development after development, and should finally be permitted to live in an environment something akin to that of the rural parish the consultation acknowledges Bodicote to be.

LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Parish Profile - Bodicote	We note that the census information contained in the profile necessarily dates from 2011. The usefulness of the profile is perhaps limited as a result and we offer to work with the council in drafting a new profile that reflects the current village make-up. We dispute the assertion under 'Housing completions and commitments' that between 2015 and 2021, 153 houses have been completed in the parish. While apparently correct under current parish boundaries, many hundreds of houses have been built on land that formerly belonged to Bodicote parish at the time of construction. We contend that this figure of 153 hides the true impact of housing development on the village in recent years. There are a few corrections needed to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: It defines the eastern edge of the village as the A460 Oxford Road, when in fact even on present boundaries the parish extends to the east of there, including the rugby club and fitness centre. Many houses within the village on Oxford Road, Merlin Close and Canal Lane are also east of the Oxford Road. It understates the amount of housing development around the parish, which can now be increased from just Longford Park (significant in itself) to include the conclusion of the Cotefield and Iron Stone Place developments, the Pavilions and Whitechapel Gardens developments, and soon the additional houses to be built adjacent to the Pavilions and the Tapper's Farm development. While it correctly contends that 'the close proximity of Banbury to the north results in intervisibility between the settlements', the assertion that this is particularly so 'when approaching Bodicote from the west along Wykham Lane' is bizarre. In fact this western approach is the only approach to Bodicote without a built-up feel, and where a rural sense is maintained. We are in agreement with the following sentences in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: <i>The western extent of the village in the historic core and land beyond the village boundary is considered highly sensitive in providing the setting for the village. The open nature of the south and west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting.</i> As stated above, it is of vital importance to the parish that these western and southern aspects of the village be preserved. Too often the impression given is that Bodicote is viewed as a convenient site for Banbury's housing allocation and we worry that if left unchallenged, future developments may be permitted even here.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-185	If approved, LPR-A-185 would extend Banbury significantly to the south and taken together with the approved developments to their immediate north would constitute a massive amount of new housing that would extend Banbury as far around the western periphery of Bodicote as Longford Park has extended around the east. We believe this would present a significant threat to the integrity of Bodicote as an individual entity, contrary to the assertions in this and previous plans that have sought to reassure parishes that they are valued and independent. The approach to Bodicote from the west along Wykham Lane is the only approach remaining into the village of a rural nature and is a critical part of preserving our identity as a village. This development would forever mar that precious and historic aspect. Proposals would lead to an irreparable loss of natural habitat. Construction would endure for several years, bringing yet more disruption to the area in terms of noise, traffic problems, and construction vehicles through the village. Residents have had to endure year upon year of this already. This proposal impacts so strongly on the village and one of its principal approaches that we have a very significant stake in its approval and ask to be kept informed at all stages of its assessment.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-116	If approved, LPR-A-185 would extend Banbury significantly to the south and taken together with the approved developments to their immediate north would constitute a massive amount of new housing that would extend Banbury as far around the western periphery of Bodicote as Longford Park has extended around the east. We believe this would present a significant threat to the integrity of Bodicote as an individual entity, contrary to the assertions in this and previous plans that have sought to reassure parishes that they are valued and independent. The approach to Bodicote from the west along Wykham Lane is the only approach remaining into the village of a rural nature and is a critical part of preserving our identity as a village. This development would forever mar that precious and historic aspect. Proposals would lead to an irreparable loss of natural habitat. Construction would endure for several years, bringing yet more disruption to the area in terms of noise, traffic problems, and construction vehicles through the village. Residents have had to endure year upon year of this already. This proposal impacts so strongly on the village and one of its principal approaches that we have a very significant stake in its approval and ask to be kept informed at all stages of its assessment.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-152	This land is presently within Banbury but until the forced transfer of land used to form part of Bodicote parish. As such we have a legacy interest. The designation of this proposal as 'Community/Leisure/Recreation' rather than 'Housing' and as such await further details before making any comment
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-107	As these do not impact directly on our immediate area we will await further details before commenting. No housing developments have yet been built out from the town in this direction.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-129	As these do not impact directly on our immediate area we will await further details before commenting. No housing developments have yet been built out from the town in this direction.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-150	As these do not impact directly on our immediate area we will await further details before commenting. No housing developments have yet been built out from the town in this direction.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-159	As these do not impact directly on our immediate area we will await further details before commenting. No housing developments have yet been built out from the town in this direction.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-166	As these do not impact directly on our immediate area we will await further details before commenting. No housing developments have yet been built out from the town in this direction.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	LPR-A-187	As these do not impact directly on our immediate area we will await further details before commenting. No housing developments have yet been built out from the town in this direction.

LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Adderbury	Adderbury would surely transform into something other than the historic village due to the development proposed. In particular, the proposals for north and east of Twyford at 60 hectares are immense and would leave scant separation for the village from the soon-to-be-commenced extension to Longford Park to the north. In Bodicote, with the developments scheduled at Tapper's Farm and underway north of the cricket club, it is too late to maintain a separation from other parishes in this respect.
LPR-B-722	Bodicote Parish Council	Bloxham	We hope that the council will hold true to its continual assertions that it wishes the villages of north Oxfordshire to retain their individual rural identities. Bloxham has seen a huge increase in the size of the village over the past decade, and with the 1000 home development to be built on the A361 adjoining the Salt Way, we are significantly concerned that CDC and BTC seem set on expanding the town with insufficient regard for the consequences for any other nearby parish in terms of coalescence, environmental impact and regarding the impact on traffic congestion and transport.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 1	Cheaper parking in banbury town centre is a must.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 3	A combination of all options.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 4	A combination of all options.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Question - Supporting	Reduction in rates as incentive to move to Cherwell for 3-5 years.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Reduce business rates for small start ups.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Encourage farmers markets and other markets by much reduced rates.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by National Government. All large developments (over 50 houses) should have green energy included in the design, such as solar panels, heat exchangers etc.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Only those with real historic value should be protected, old buildings should not be protected just because they are old.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Question - Local Green Spaces	Extend canal side green space north and south of Banbury, provide for public access to the Cherwell and clean up the river in Banbury.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	More public consultation on developments and robust management of developer promises such as shops, pubs and parks.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The process needs to be modified such that infrastructure is put in place before development and not years after.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Fibre to the premises should be mandatory for all developments above 50 houses and to all industrial sites, paid for by the developer.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are for infrastructure delivery. Infrastructure should come first not lag years behind development, banbury is a case in point.
LPR-B-723	Paul Christmas	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Investment in infrastructure should be a primary case for allowing developers to plan and build.
LPR-B-724	David Price	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington.
LPR-B-724	David Price	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8).

LPR-B-724	David Price	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-724	David Price	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-724	David Price	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-724	David Price	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility.
LPR-B-725	Craig Young	LPR-A-229	Object. Development of this scale would adversely affect just about everyone in both Shenington and Alkerton. The addition of some 60 newlybuilt houses, concentrated in one development would push our village infrastructure towards the untenable. As there would likely be an additional 100150 cars associated with any such development, our narrow roads would be overloaded, greatly impeding everyday access to and from our villages. The daily drop-offs and pick-ups from the Shenington School are already disruptive. Development would likely result in greatly increased car commuting to nearby large urban centres, much of it along narrow roads through the villages. Shenington has increased in size due to the completion of circa 1012 newly-built houses and conversions. These have for the most part been thoughtfully constructed, and have been incorporated into the fabric of the village nicely. A further 60 houses would equate to something in the region of a 50% increase to the size of our village, and would change it considerably; ruining much of its charm and character. Shenington has been assessed as a Category 2 village. I am aware that there have been previous attempts to circumvent these edicts in our village
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 1	Too much development causing ecological destruction and blighting rural areas.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 2	Not enough green space.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the options. Brownfield sites only for employment.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 5	Town centres should not be changed to residential zones. Unused buildings should be used as community centres.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Free parking for Cherwell council tax payers. Introduce a new 10% loyalty card discount card for money spent with shops In town centre.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Question - Supporting our Town	Reduced rates. Allow shops to become restaurants during the evening and vice versa.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 6	Affordable housing is a made up term, house prices can change. Instead insist on shared ownership schemes for 10% of new homes.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 7	Avoid mixing areas. Have separate social and affordable.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 8	Stop building on greenbelt
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Question - Travelling Communities	Services should be available to those who pay council tax only.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Question - Green Belt	Stop building on the green belt.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 12	Stop the development
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Stop all development in the green belt
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Stop building on green belt.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Wider pavements. Connected cycle routes would encourage less driving.
LPR-B-726	Faye Kinh Pho	Option 16	Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development. New ugly towers are popping up everywhere. These should be relocated to stop visual pollution
LPR-B-727	Stuart Roussel	Option 30	No development on greefnfield sites and good agricultural land in rural areas.
LPR-B-727	Stuart Roussel	Option 31	Use a combination of options.
LPR-B-727	Stuart Roussel	LPR-A-139	Object. It appears that they are now coming forward with a phase 2 style development/extension to the already approved development. If this intention had been declared up front maybe the case officer and the appeals officer would have looked upon this large scale development in a different light, as it would have required a greater number of council housing as part of the scheme. Further development in this adjoining field is unnecessary, disproportionate, undesirable and unsustainable development

LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 4	Mixture of all options.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Question - Green Belt	Green belt land should not be built upon. It is detrimental to environmental targets, wellbeing of citizens and is not required when there is brownfield land.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are for infrastructure
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 19	No green belt land should be developed upon. There are Urban dwellings in need of development and we must protect our rural communities. Furthermore, Banbury does not have the infrastructure to support further development.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes, retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 31	Combination of options.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 32	Yes - Primary School; Local Shop; GP Surgery; and, Regular Bus services. More weight should be given to the accessibility of a settlement.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	LPR-A-004	Object. Shutford would be unable to support 4.79 hectares of development. The village has no shop, GP surgery, primary school or other amenities. Roads are of poor quality and designed for only one car. There is an infrequent bus service. A development of that scale would be detrimental to the whole community and future residents. It would be on green belt land and so against environmental targets.
LPR-B-728	Katherine Graham	LPR-A-171	Object. Shutford would be unable to support 4.79 hectares of development. The village has no shop, GP surgery, primary school or other amenities. Roads are of poor quality and designed for only one car. There is an infrequent bus service. A development of that scale would be detrimental to the whole community and future residents. It would be on green belt land and so against environmental targets.
LPR-B-729	David Thompson	LPR-A-012	Object. Draw your attention to the covenant signed and sealed on April 26th 1989 between Cherwell District Council and Albert Ernest Phipps. In particular to paragraph 7, 'The Covenant': The owner hereby covenants and undertakes with the council that he the Owner: (a) will forever hereafter retain the Land in agricultural use and (b) will not claim any compensation in respect of the provisions hereof. You will also note that in paragraph 6, 'The expressions "the Owner" and "the Council" shall include their respective successors in title and assigns.' A scanned copy of the document register which will allow you to find the document in your archives can be emailed separately. I do not want to publish it on your site. You will understand that being the current owner of the house that all this relates to, I am not only very surprised that the Council regards this plot of land as suitable for future development, bearing in mind the covenant they expressly and understandably agreed, but that you will understand that I bought this house with the knowledge of this covenant, feeling secure in the knowledge that a covenant such as this, was drawn up, signed and sealed by a public body. We need the Council to allay our very real fears and anxieties that this land will not be built on, and that the covenant remains in force in perpetuity.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land. To reduce commuting out of these centres and make them more vibrant, the employment offer needs to be varied, not just warehousing like seems to be everything at Banbury and Bicester nowadays.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).

LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Councils to make sensible decisions about appropriate town centre opportunities. Duplicating stores out of town when there's the same shops in town is pointless as they'll all leave. Letting Castle Quay 2 have a bowling alley when there's already one in town is ridiculous. Why not do indoor crazy golf or a climbing wall, or more cultural options.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Question - Supporting our Town	Stop duplicating the same shops in town and on retail parks. They'll end up leaving the town centres. Creating more visual and modern art areas like sculpture trails and official street art - these bring in more visitors and create cultural areas amongst the shops and activities
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District). Affordable housing in Oxfordshire and Cherwell isn't what most people would call affordable due to the generally high prices, but by adding really low cost housing it needs to fit into the area, and also be for people who're local rather than from elsewhere
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	All new warehouses/business buildings, and housing to have solar panels where feasible.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. North Oxfordshire is severely lacking in sports facilities accessible to all, and what there is (e.g tennis courts) aren't used properly by the public- e.g Banbury people's park has mostly kids cycling and scooting on the courts. There needs to be more facilities provided, cycling routes/tracks available through country parks/parks and tennis facilities that have some way of being looked after as well as increasing. North Oxfordshire tennis centre was approved around Banbury in 2019 as part of an LTA/government extension programme, but despite all the other development happening, and sites for sale for businesses that aren't required, there's been no more mention of this tennis centre coming to fruition. This would be a great benefit to the area, and provide jobs.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Better roads are essential - pothole patching is a waste of time on roads that haven't been resurfaced properly in over 10 years. Most of the smaller rural areas, the 20 minutes neighbourhoods isn't going to help them because there's no room on the roads, and the roads haven't been maintained well enough to add cycle lanes from them to another larger village or town
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Question - Transport & Connectivity	There's no option to travel by car for most people in smaller rural areas, so telling people to get on bikes or the bus isn't feasible. There's also less opportunity for electric charging in rural areas. There's no bus stops nearby, so driving is the only option apart from walking/cycling to the park. Until electric car prices go down, there are more places to charge, and there's better range for the vehicles, they're not an option.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Question - Transport Policies	Banbury is really clogged up and getting worse. There's no park and ride option. Having all the different retail parks hasn't been helpful because to do a decent shop, you now need to go to the town centre and potentially 2 other retail parks, all by car unless you want to spend a day going in and out on the buses.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 19	To the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11).

LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes. Canalside is a floodplain- we're building too much on floodplains and this is going to cause issues elsewhere if not with any houses or buildings built here. There needs to be flood protection in place and thought about in other areas that will be impacted.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Include more set play and sport areas like multipurpose grounds and indoor tennis centre, cycling tracks.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Having more shops in the centre rather than split across all the different retail parks. There's no buses and timetables wouldn't be flexible enough for people to rely on.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 30	There's too much building in rural areas joining them up to towns rather than repurposing buildings in the town centres- options there for infill. What about changing the use for the end of Castle Quay, where Debenhams was, into flats. And moving the remaining shops further up into the centre. Planning in small villages is proposed to often changing the feel and character of villages for the workse and no benefit for locals. Infrastructure doesn't keep pace with the town's building, and amenities and facilities, and village schools are over capacity
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 31	Combination of options.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery and Regular Bus services. More weight should be given to accessibility of settlement.
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 33	Development should be lower but across more areas. And not growing small rural areas with so many extra houses that it changes the character of the village. e.g Shenington is a small village, it's had 4 new houses infill, and has some being proposed on the edge of the village. This isn't a ridiculous number and the village can cope with that. But now we've got 30+40 houses proposed- this will grow the village by nearly a quarter, and similar villages round by us are also seeing such out of proportion growth. There won't be benefit to the local with an influx of people, with no road improvements, no amenities, cars will increase as well as building traffic, there'll be more pressure on the surgery and schools
LPR-B-730	Emma Tustian	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 1	Much of the vision is vague - the fact that there is so little doesn't give me a lot of faith that anyone involved in drafting it is taking the idea of 'good transport links and sound infrastructure' very seriously.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land. At the larger villages
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	Genuine street sweeping would be the place to start. Banbury Town centre pedestrianised areas are scattered with litter and not well maintained. Some solution must be found for retailers garbage bags and bins put out for collection. Either in enclosed receptacles or in back. Piles of garbage sit in front of shops.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Make better use of the space in market square the random placement of 3 or 4 benches does nothing to enhance or encourage the social use of the space. Add green with planter benches, use mobile units that can be moved and arranged for different uses and events.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Approach should be different for rural areas. It isn't detailed enough for me to agree to or not. It is in many ways as much lip service as the 'bike lane' recently added to Bankside. A box ticking exercise that involves no disruptive changes. By putting 'reducing the need to travel' at the top of the list as opposed to 'increasing better options' you are taking the position that isolation is better than engagement. This is neither helpful or healthy for huge swathes of the populace and doesn't do much for boosting footfall in town. Safer, more robust cycling infrastructure- genuine well marked lanes that were honoured by drivers, lanes that genuinely linked up between popular and useful destinations across the areas; secure places to store bikes at destinations. Well maintained pavements.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).



LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 19	North of town.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Question - Important Views of Banbury	St Mary's Church is a lovely building and has historic importance but I don't see that it makes a huge difference one way or another whether views of it are protected.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Proper pedestrian and bike links between them should be prioritised.
LPR-B-731	Deborah Simmons	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Genuine, robust cycling infrastructure
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 1	There is much talk of efficient sustainable and efficient housing in the suggested vision, which I agree with. Where new developments fall over appears to be the transport infrastructure associated with these said developments. If we consider the statement that neighbourhoods (paragraph 3) are sustainable and well functioning. It could be argued that most new developments, especially around Bloxham, are not sustainable. the new developments utilise existing road networks, local schools (unexpanded) and undeveloped retail premises. They have not improved any of these items to help alleviate the higher demands associated with growth. The retail areas are restricted in size and location in Bloxham. No development have improved this. Schooling is at capacity, especially primary education. No current proposal aims to rectify this. The main road runs through the historic village centre. This is very busy with areas of reduced pavement and no crossing points. Increased demands due to more housing have put a major strain on an already busy area.. In theory, cars can park along the whole main road, but traffic demands have mean the council request for this not to occur. In that context, how would adding more building without addressing fundamental road and pedestrian access. Housing further from the village centre and lack of pedestrian access means driving local amenities. Restricted parking means this is not viable. On this main, busy road we have shops, a cafe, pubs, a church, a nursery, a museum and residential properties. It is currently a dangerous road and further development without some form of infrastructure change would worsen this situation. The above would contradict with paragraph 5. The historic nature of Bloxham is not valued by Cherwell. If the road network was improved to include a main village bypass, parking could be generated in the village centre, pavement widths could be increased, so access to local amenities improved.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 2	KO 1 - In Bloxham many sites submitted run along the western boundary. this backs onto countryside. A simple bypass could be run to the west of these developments. KO 2 without improved village centre access, the local economy could not be built upon. KO 7 - Not a large urban centre, but with village expansion, it could sustain a growing economy, if traffic flow was reduced. KO 8 - Again, improve infrastructure to support a sustainable economy in the village. Poor pedestrian access and poor parking results in little chance for economic growth, KO 16- How could this be achieved in areas outside main towns? People will rely on personal transport, so more houses means more cars, putting a strain on local road networks. KO 24- If this is achieved in an expanding village, then developments are welcome. Again it would require a rethink on the village road network. KO 25 Again, increased traffic would have a huge impact on the historical nature of the village. Change and growth are needed, but it needs to interact with the environment. Not only do the new developments need to consider the points raised in KO 28- prime consideration for the whole village, including existing areas and be part of the wider development plan. Currently we would appear to balance environmental improvements made within new developments with a reduction in the established areas. This does not provide sustainable growth and general improvement.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 3	A combination of the options. With improved infrastructure, could spread the employment land, allowing economic growth through the whole district. Employment re separation could reduce the need for travel, often associated with centralised employment regions. If central regions are used, these need to be considerate to the surrounding road links and villages.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). Infrastructure sustainability is key. There should be a focus on local employment to support local communities
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. We need to consider the smaller communities. We see that many towns in the area have more pedestrianised areas around their centres. Given the district's consideration for pedestrian and non vehicular dependency, this policy should be applied to other built environments, especially larger villages.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. We tend to rely on large developers to balance expensive housing and affordable housing. This can often drive prices up in villages. Open market housing is used for valuation purposes, so local property prices are dictated by these. The open market houses on new developments tend to be larger (3 or 4 bedroom) and expensive, so not easily obtainable in the current economy. More areas need to be set aside for self build. currently we have Graven hill, but that does not enhance the local village communities, as it is a centralised area. As the district is a pioneer in the field of self build, why can't the programme be expanded to other identified land? Self build is government backed and is often seen to provide better quality homes at a lower price point. This would fulfil the more affordable aspect in housing as well as providing more efficient and sustainable houses. It would also provide varied architecture to an area, as most modern developments have house of standard designs. Looking at the historic town and village centres, buildings were diverse in design.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.

LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes. Self build with council backing to reduce development costs. Lower density properties would enhance the rural aspect of some communities and keep the green spaces.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Housing Policies	Self build with council backing to reduce development costs.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Separation Distances	Lower density properties would enhance the rural aspect of some communities and keep the green spaces.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Green Belt	Green belt should be considered if the development enhances the surrounding area, be it improved facilities, infrastructure, or provide affordable housing.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	We need to respect the historic environment with any new development. As a reward to the community for providing development, not only should local facility improvement be part of the trade, but any improvement in the historic environment where the development would have a negative impact, such as increased traffic flow.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	I support a more diverse design that rather than attempt to replicate the older style of building and materials, utilises modern and sustainable materials. Varying designs could provide architectural interest to new developments.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20 minute neighbourhoods gives the community a suitable infrastructure (walking, cycling etc.) to enable the community to be self sufficient. New developments need to incorporate these ideals as part of a whole neighbourhood plan. Town and village infrastructure improvements will be witnessed. We shouldn't allow the development of small, self contained developments on village perimeters. These will not sustain the development's supporting village.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The transport hierarchy lists the car as the lowest priority. I agree that we should encourage the use of alternatives, but this is far less practical. Even if the local communities had alternatives, traffic passing through would not be altered. This accounts for the majority of road use. Imagine the impact it would have if we closed the main A361 through Bloxham to non essential traffic for a day. Instead of providing alternatives that are not sustainable, surely a policy of reducing their impact on the built environment would be in order. For vehicle efficiency, constant speed is beneficial. The stop start nature of our current small A and B road networks hinder this. Improving current road network to avoid the smaller roads, so bypassing towns and villages would support the drive for efficient transport links. Village bypasses would speed traffic flow. Having the ability to safely cycle and walk around the village of Bloxham. Reducing the road size through the village and providing a cycle lane would be beneficial.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 19	Comination of options.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Important Views of Banbury	These sites are historically significant and our part of our heritage. Areas need to be defended, so future generations can enjoy them as we do.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 30	Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 32	Yes - Both
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 33	Use a combination of the above

LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Option 34	We have a rich history in this area, but many villages and towns are losing their historical nature due to lack of infrastructure provided by new developments. concentrate on making the village centres a place to be able to walk to and cycle to. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance.
LPR-B-732	Mark Gilmore	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Communities should have more say in neighbourhood planning.
LPR-B-733	KeepOxfordRdGreenforSport	Option 1	All proposed Green Space remain, and are not subject to development.
LPR-B-733	KeepOxfordRdGreenforSport	Question - Green Belt	The protection of all Green Belt land is paramount in providing a sustainable future for all communities. As instructed by the National Planning Policy Framework 13. Protecting Green Belt land (138).
LPR-B-733	KeepOxfordRdGreenforSport	Option 12	All local authorities should without prompting be seen in the utmost to be conserving and protecting the environment, including Biodiversity, Geodiversity, and Ecosystems.
LPR-B-733	KeepOxfordRdGreenforSport	Question - Local Green Spaces	The Oxford Road Site Bicester has been proposed as a Green Space, is very much at the 'heart' of the town. The site was used by the community of Bicester for the pursuit of sport and recreation. The swathe of 'open green space' alongside the Cherwell District Council asset Pingle Field has in recent times acted as an important green 'buffer' as commercial and retail development on a large scale has been witnessed on the outskirts of that side of Bicester. The potential loss of such an important Green Space (Oxford Road) cannot be emphasised strongly enough, not only from the perspective of the environment, but the impact on the mental and physical health of the community. The World Health Organisation (WHO) have documented Urban Green Space and its relevance, including the increased likelihood of both air, and noise pollution. WHO promote the importance of Green Space in the enhancement of local resilience while increasing and sustaining the communities lifestyle and improving both health and well-being. The protection of any green space should be paramount, but the Oxford Road site and location, should not be considered for development - as this should be seen as detrimental to the mental health and physical wellbeing
LPR-B-733	KeepOxfordRdGreenforSport	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	No development should take place on the current network of green space, including sport and recreation areas, unless enhancing the current sites in the direction of sport and recreation.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 1	It is a vision at the moment. The next section reveals the difficulties of reality.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 2	KO 5 and KO 9 are the most important. What about the infrastructure for all this expansion. Roads, sewage, water, and Health Local Centres will all be required and expanded in capacity.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land. Stay away from beautiful countryside and historic places.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Supporting	More training for out of doors employment. NVQs will make a career progression and more pay possible. Conditions and pay for staff working out doors make it a very unattractive career.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes More artisanal shops. eg. bakeries, cookies etc High quality home baked. Wood carving, furniture for outdoors etc Art shops, materials and sales of pottery. and paintings.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Parking (unfortunately) but probably not get much footfall without some car parking.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. Affordable housing required in villages especially. At the moment new houses in desirable places are very expensive. New houses must be in keeping with the older houses and should be reserved for local people.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement. Maybe by now a study (separate small room) should be provided as standard. It is difficult to legislate for a minimum number of bedrooms because family size varies. Kitchen is very important.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Separation Distances	No. People should have gardens. However, if every house is separated at the sides there will far too much land taken up.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes. Disabilities need to be provided for.

LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Housing Policies	Modular homes seem to have worked well for Graven Hill. Should be adopted more widely. Use less concrete and less CO2.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Travelling Communities	There seems to be real prejudice against travelling communities which is very unpleasant to hear. They are probably happiest away from houses due to unwarranted abuse from us. Minibus runs to primary school and health centres.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Area is already above average in building new houses and roads. What of shortage in concrete and other building materials Houses like the ones in Graven Hill are more sustainable (in both construction and insulation).
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Historic buildings are a special category. They can be insulated from the inside, so as not to spoil appearances.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation. The need for energy should not lead to solar farms all over the country. They are themselves eye-sores, take up land.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Disposal of all building rubbish which will not cause degradation or pollution of the environment, either in this country or other poorer countries.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Green Belt	Since 1975 there has been continued encroachment on the Green Belt. The latest plans for round Kidlington are not small scale. Where once people stepped outside their houses to walk in the countryside, they now have to get in their cars.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. If creatures like great crested newts are transported to a new site, it must be made as safe and favourable to their survival as is possible. Dumping them in a piece of land near by will not do. Their release must be optimised for the animal's (or plants) survival. New habitats could be created or enlarged at the release site.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Light pollution and its effects on Circadian Rhythm: The new LED street lights may have hither to unknown effects on wildlife right down to insects and plants. The light/dark cycle of the 24 hour day affects all life, including humans, in a fundamental way.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Local Green Spaces	Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site is an exemplary example of floodplain lowland meadow habitat which is being rapidly lost. 97% since 1935. This rate of loss is unsustainable. Gavray Meadows typifies Oxfordshire landscape and can be recognised on old maps back to 1881 by the hedgerows still present. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Agricultural landscape policy. They were major employers of labour and important members of the community. Farmland birds and mammals are now decreasing rapidly in numbers because there are no farms left. There should be some attempt of saving a record of the farming community.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	New building should fit in with the landscape and not over whelm it like many warehouses etc do now.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods would enable people to walk and exercise more rather than using car.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Rural economy is where our food is grown/reared. It must be supported adequately. The people working in a rural economy are quite different fom incomers looking for a nice house with a nice view. Remember that animals have to be transported in good conditions, vets need to visit, crops harvested, seed transported. Special arrangements must be made for the rural regions or we will have food shortages etc. Essential services closer would reduce car usage.

LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Transport Policies	Motor vehicle charging stations. Most people living in older houses have no where to charge a car. This prevents them from investing in an electric car.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure Delivery- Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Bicester is a town split in two physically by the East West railway development and rail connections to London/Birmingham. This pertubates the natural growth of Bicester and makes more growth undesirable.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 23	A combination of the above
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission. The weekly market is a great attraction. This increases the vibrancy.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester. Better, cleaner community and cultural facilities required.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Very important that they should be maintained in a healthy state. NVQs for ground staff to make them more knowledgeable on the environment, habitats etc.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	Church Street. Some of the cottages past St Edburg's Church are ready to fall down! The priory ruins should be better displayed (sign-posted and labelled). How about trying to attract Bicester Village shoppers into the oldest parts of Bicester? A lot more could be done for the Historic Environment.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	More frequent small buses running between housing estates and food shops.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 31	Comination of options.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery and Regular Bus services. More weight should be given to accessibility of settlement. Old people cannot be expected to walk/cycle long distances, especially in winter.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Question - Separation Distances	Settlement boundaries are important to prevent urban sprawl.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	LPR-A-125	The submitted proposal for Gavray Meadows is out of date. The stakeholders have agreed in principal to LandQ Estates proposal that a narrow strip of land with houses can be allowed along Gavray Drive at its east end, in order to progress the conservation of the LWS 52W01. I have re-submitted the application (dated 17/10/2021) with a new outline for the area. Please communicate with the LandQ Solicitor about this adjusted submission. A location plan has been submitted. To the north of the old (Grade 2 listed) Langford Farmhouse (OX26 6HG) there is a flood compensation scheme which is a very valuable asset for attracting birds (waders) on migration. Its surrounds need protection so that birds continue to stop off there. Photo below shows lapwing chicks bred on site.
LPR-B-734	Save Gavray Meadows	LPR-A-071	This is still part of the LWS 52W01. It has a major footpath to Launton going through it, which is used regularly by locals. It is the wildlife corridor for Gavray Meadows out into the CTA. This land must allow free passage of wildlife.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 4	Combination of options.

LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Policy suggestions- Making parking cheaper and easier. It should not be about big retail parks outside of the town centres. Make them more assessable and attractive to visit.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Making parking cheaper and easier. It should not be about big retail parks outside of the town centres. Make them more accessible and attractive to visit.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Supporting our Town	Parking, more general use, keeping the soul in the local town centre, not just about big retail parks
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Housing Policies	Allow a border range of new house types. Planning is very restrictive. The Bicester development of new self builds was so enlightening and shows what could be done in key areas. New homes are important but please make them interesting to look at and live in
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Allow listed planning process to be more flexible. Yes keep the character in mind but not allowing old windows to be replaced etc with new better type windows in an old style is madness. Sometimes the listed building application process is so difficult it stops people thinking about what makes us more sustainable rather than changing how we do things.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Green Belt	Building of new estates in small villages on agricultural land is madness. We need agricultural land to enable us be more sustainable. It is not sustainable.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. Continue to support AONB.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Allow interesting design for new builds.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods work in larger towns and even smaller towns. They might be a challenge for small villages but can certainly be of benefit and should be explored.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Work out a way to make it more attractive and easier for people in rural areas to not use their car. Public transport is terrible in our rural village which means people drive when they may not want to. Better bus routes and times would encourage less driving
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure Delivery- Look at areas by catchment and how accessible t
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.

LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 31	Combination of options.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy and Regular Bus services. Give more weight to settlement accessibility.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Question - Settlement	Take into account conservation boundaries.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Please take into account the smaller villages and what they can support. Our village is tiny, already 25 new house are being built, another 300+ have been suggested as part of land that has been submitted. This just cannot be supported by infrastructure, sustainability on any level.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Parish Profile	Give greater weight to the parishes feedback. They represent the community and their specific needs.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	LPR-A-139	Object. Totally disproportionate in relation to the size of the village of Sibford Ferris. Should be designated as green space.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	LPR-A-045	Object. Please do not allow any further expansion of this site. The development of 25 properties should be maximum for this site to be built.
LPR-B-735	Oonagh O'Neil Graham	Option 32	Please look again at the categorisation of villages. We live in a Cat A village but that is only due to the fact that incorrectly our next door village was amalgamated with us during the last review process. We have a local shop only in our village with a reduce bus service , no street lighting, no pavements in parts of the village, yet we have 25 new houses being built. This does not make sense.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Question - Supporting	Employment opportunities should receive high priority in planning decisions but mitigation measures may be needed to deal with additional traffic including public transport and environmentally friendly transport.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Question - Supporting our Town	Easy access to a full range of facilities using public transport and environmentally friendly means.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Renewable energy generating capacity should receive priority in planning decisions and be less prone to NIMBY obstruction.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district. Rewilding option should be considered and where possible pursued.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach. Wider coverage by public transport. Within Banbury some areas have very good bus services but others either never had them or have had them removed. Sinclair Avenue and the "cars" estate is one the latter. Villages on main bus routes do well but others have no buses or token once a week options. To get people out of their cars requires frequent bus services.

LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery should look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 18	Consider further urban extensions.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 19	Combination of options.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Question - Important Views of Banbury	St Mary's is an important local landmark and it should not be over shadowed by development. I suggest the town hall be added for protection.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Improve public transport. Availability, affordability and weatherproofing (bus shelters) are important. There is a cost to these measures but not doing them has both financial and environmental issues.
LPR-B-736	Brian Sargent	Option 15	I haven't seen anything about access to health facilities. I have an issue with availability of swimming pool access. Being retired I'd quite like to exercise with a gentle swim during the day but this option is excluded because schools take over. I can see this is to do with finance but there are cost implications in not having a healthy population as it ages.
LPR-B-737	Kevin Bezant	Option 30	During the consultation for "Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Housing Need" you received 1,000+ representations from members of the public, and not one single point made was taken account of. It seems pointless to respond to further consultations. You claim to have considered nine "Areas of Search" but chose 2 areas that happened to be closest to Oxford City. The cost to the residents of south Cherwell is the loss of 250 hectares of Green Belt land, including the 113-year-old North Oxford Golf Club where you will be destroying 3,000 mature trees - and yet have declared a climate emergency. And why did you choose the 2 areas closest to Oxford City? Because Oxford City told you to... Cllr Alex Hollingsworth - "But more [land] is needed. We're out of room. We can't tackle Oxford's housing crisis on our own. This is why we're working with our neighbouring councils to build more than 14,000 new homes on sites as close to Oxford as possible." Now Kidlington, Yarnton, Bebroke, Gosford, and Water Eaton are about to become part of Oxford's sprawl- all historic villages to lose individual identities. You will be able to walk from the northern tip of Woodstock to the city centre without seeing any green spaces. You claim the countryside will be replaced with a better countryside- "net biodiversity gains". The new Local Plan will carry on developing the same areas in south Cherwell, removing more Green Belt, creating more congestion, more pollution, more strain on the infrastructure, and local schools and services. And I be all of the land you select is owned by Oxford colleges, just like you did in the Partial Review.
LPR-B-738	Julie Campbell	LPR-A-034	Object. What a relief it used to be, to turn off the M40 at this junction, leaving the conurbation of Banbury behind, and drive along a small rural road that is the A361 into the countryside. Then the building of the warehouse began (eyesore). The threat of many more threatens to completely overshadow and blight the small historic villages that nestle either side of the A361: Chacombe, Wardington, Williamscot and Cropredy. Development seems unnecessary and inappropriate. The countryside and character of existing villages must be preserved
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 1	Reviewing your vision, in particularly in regard to rural locations. From table (page 18), over the last 10 years (2011-2021) the development within the rural villages has reached 87% of the 2031 target, yet a further call for development land in rural settings has been requested from landowners. Bicester, Banbury & Upper Hayford have only achieved 28%, 50% and 28% of their respective targets. The local bus services in Cropredy have dwindled to almost nothing. The planning Authority are encouraging a move of the wealthy out of towns to village locations where developers can make the most money. This is killing villages with a lack of youth to take over the clubs and societies that the elderly population are now retiring from. It is voluntary clubs and society's that make the villages vibrant and attractive to live in, but without affordable housing in village settings, the young are forced out. There is a lack of investment in businesses in the villages to encourage the employment of the young starting out on their employment journey. If there is no affordable housing, no useful public transport and no jobs in the villages they just become commuter towns which will kill the shop, café, pubs, halls and everything villages offer. Regarding 4.7, Page 23/24, land offered up for development at Cropredy is the same land that has been worked on for the past 2 years to create a wildflower meadow. The argument to create biodiversity falls at the first hurdle when money is involved unless CDC shows some commitment to this principal and reins in the size of any projected development from 50100 homes (unnecessary) to a smaller number – preferably affordable homes thereby keeping the majority of the meadow intact and helping the local community. Regarding small businesses, with very little connectivity I fail to see how CDC is helping the rural business economy as point 14 champions. Those working from home have nowhere to go but the big towns if they want to expand due to business/office space being limited and no youthful employees available, (assuming the power or water is not cut off due to old infrastructure giving way under pressure). Take a close look at the infrastructure in place (water, electric, telecom, transport). CDC takes for granted what the developer writes on the submission form and allows master planning to proceed before infrastructure, by which time the application is in an advanced phase. Not a week goes by in Cropredy without the road being dug up to repair another infrastructure issue. Fix the infrastructure issues first.



LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 2	KO 1: important but don't over allocate for the sake of developers profits creating 'Estates' where they are not required. KO 2: Please ensure the Local means 'local to the town or village where development takes place' rather than 'local to the whole of a district'. i.e. siting housing in the small villages but only investing in the economy of the big towns.' KO 3: Agree but keep it very local. KO 4: Agree but remember the small towns and villages are part of the district, not just the big towns. KO 5: Agree. KO 6: Agree. KO 7: Agree. KO 8: Strongly agree and would go further in suggesting that nothing is done until you can establish what services and infrastructure you already have and what will be needed. KO 9: Agree. KO 10: Agree, and this objective is more achievable through affordable housing than elite housing so moving the ratio in favour of affordable housing should be seen as a priority. KO 11: Agree. KO 12: Agree. Adding soakaway's, Ponds and other SuDS to all developments and a water storage provision (underground maybe) to supply grey water for irrigation of non-agricultural land. KO 13: Agree, make targeted decisions on what type and range of biodiversity we want. Plant insect food crops as hedges rather than blackthorn/hawthorn which Cherwell has in abundance. Adding new and diverse (Native) hedging and woodland plants (including trees) will ensure that we protect those species that are failing and encourage back existing species. Create micro woodlands, heaths, meadows an integral part of any development above 10 houses - planting the odd tree here and there alongside the roads is a tick box exercise. KO 14: Agree. KO 15: Agree, we do need to increase the number and size of these 'carbon sumps'. By changing the way we think about development we could create Woodlands with some houses in them, grasslands with some houses in them, meadows with some houses in them, rather than housing estates with some grass verges and a tree in them. Most residents of villages have no problem with additional housing, but they don't want to see homogenous estates. Careful planting and reduced housing density would put most of the planning issues to bed. This may mean both the land owner and developer making less profit, but is the right thing to do and a grant or fund could compensate them for some of their loss. KO 16: Agree, needs backing up with funding. You can make the best public transport system between the big towns but if the final 5 miles has no reliable and consistent public transport then the car is king once again as it is the villages poorly serviced by the busses. KO 17: Agree. KO 18: Agree. Some of the historic architecture is appalling, There is no point saving ugly, tumbledown hovels from 200 years ago if it gets in the way of sympathetically built new housing, sometimes buildings fall into disrepair because there not very good. KO 19: Agree. KO 20: Agree but focus needs to be placed upon the aging population in general rather than self interest groups. After all there are many more older people with pressing housing needs than there are travellers. Help traveller communities and all communities seen as different from the norm, be inclusive and offer all of the people all the services. But please don't lump self interest groups in with the elderly. KO 21: Agree. KO 22: Agree. KO 23: Agree, towns and villages also need affordable housing so don't confine it to the big towns only. KO 24: Agree. KO 25: Agree. KO 26: Agree. KO 27: Agree, there is no point creating enclaves adjacent to existing communities, or the existing communities will fade away. KO 28: Agree. KO 29: Agree. KO 30: Agree. KO 31: Agree.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 3	Combination of options. Business start-up's usually begin "In the home", moving swiftly (if profitable) to an office, shed, small unit in the town where the business owner lives. This results in employment of locals working alongside the owner. A couple of years growing a small business employs more people who will generally walk to work. I think villages and small towns need investment in start-up sized premises (or grants to convert premises) to give them the opportunity to get off the ground and consolidate. Sometimes this is as big as these companies get (employ locals). It is only when growing rapidly that they would need to move into the large towns. Large conglomerates need premises (normally purpose built) for their needs which can only be provided by large towns with a large workforce.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 4	Combination of options. Large industrial estates or distribution hubs are desolate places. A healthy mix of businesses complement each other. Cafés and shops benefit the workers isolated on these estates and provide somewhere to go "off site" during breaktimes. In the evenings these estates are largely vacant of people and a waste of land use.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Supporting Employment	Industrial or warehousing premises should be forced to include Sufficient Solar panel coverage in the building plan to be able to support a high % of the energy use of the company itself. Landscaping should complement those already in place at other sites on the estate. Above a certain size, companies should be encouraged to provide open spaces for employee decompression.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. I think it would be useful to turn some of the vacant stores into spaces that community needs. Advice centres, minor injury clinics, community nurses for both physical and mental health, translation services, education centres. If these spaces are empty noone benefits. A change of use from retail to something else should be an easy process.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	Business rates for small independent shops should be done away with entirely, a local capital gains tax for non-rate payers could then be levied so that a good year provides a good return for the council, and a bad year does not see the immediate demise or near bankruptcy of the retailer. This would keep the high street vibrant and occupied.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Supporting our Town	Parking & access.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes. Housing can be designed very easily to have wider hall/doorways, greater floor space and accessibility hand rails, less steep stair cases, lifts etc. This would give a variety of options for various levels of disability. The only sacrifice is a small % uplift in the initial footprint of the house (and garden) and a lowering of density. Solution is dependant entirely upon developer profit margin verses planning intent and enforcement. I would increase the footprint to make all new homes accessible in this way.

LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Housing Policies	Each development should be judged on its own merit. Part of the planning process is to decide the aesthetic and constructional requirements that best fit with the surrounding environment. I place my faith in the planning authority who usually get it right
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Separation Distances	One of the biggest problems people face is with neighbour disagreements. I believe some of the friction is due to people living on top of each other, so an increase in dwelling separation would be advantageous. Having 'Common land' separating properties seems to almost eliminate these issues and provides a light and airy environment whilst helping wildlife to cut through an estate.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Travelling Communities	Traveller communities tend to self-isolate as a way of life which is a shame. I think areas which can be put aside and have the utilities easily connected should be identified and offered to the traveller community for their discussion and agreement. Building traveller sites which are unusable to the traveller community are a waste of resource.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Going above and beyond the minimum standard required today will ensure not having to do it all again in the future. It is more expensive initially but this cost is borne by the developer and can be mitigated by other means
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Stone built historic buildings are warm in the winter and cool in the summer. Heat loss is generally through the windows or the roof (insulation can be fitted.) Don't seal the buildings they still need to breathe and don't render the walls – they need to breathe. Old Victorian/Georgian brick-built houses (having no cavity) are the biggest problem. Fitting double/triple glazing and insulating the loft solves most heating issues. The largest issue with housing stock is an unwillingness to do the simple things that make a huge difference to the heating of the buildings.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 11	If all the buildings in industrial zones could rent the roof space for installation of solar panels, and if the daily oversupply could be stored for nighttime use the majority of the domestic energy need for the UK could be catered for by solar. As an approximation UK daily sun-fall is 500-4000 kwh/m2/day (winter-summer). A 10% efficiency for solar panel conversion gives 50-400 kwh/m2/day. Allowing for transmission losses, conversion losses and storage losses of say 50%, you still get 25-200 kwh/m2/day. The building code would need changing to force all constructional plans of new industrial and warehouse buildings to have roofs strong enough to take a full complement of solar panels and a 'roof rental scheme' controlled by the local council to distribute permits etc.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Enable more working from home initiatives and create a town/village growth fund for small to medium hamlets supporting employment in the town where you live. Reducing the commute to work will drastically reduce the carbon footprint of a town or village.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Green Belt	Protect the Green Belt.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 12	If a development cannot secure the lowest natural capital target, it's probably too big or too densely populated. Where green belt land is developed this becomes an issue. Have the council thought about making the developments porous to nature, i.e. spread the housing units out and connect them up with common land (not manicured lawns). This will take more space which may be acceptable if a new estate is so porous that it makes little impact on biodiversity. When biodiversity is lost in a densely packed housing estate there is nothing that can be done. Developers tend to pick shrubs from a very small list. Low growing, compact, colourful shrubs seem to be chosen to make the plans look attractive. This provides no help to nature and kills off any hope of biodiversity. Part of any plan should be to research the insects and animals that were local to the area and select the food crops these creatures fed upon. They may not be tidy or pretty plants, but they are necessary if you are serious about biodiversity gain and the return/growth of endangered species.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals. Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Set a lower limit for natural capital, below which a development cannot proceed.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Where rainwater runoff from the development would enter the water course, investigation of the downstream ecology should be assessed. If the development could cause a detrimental impact then it should be mitigated on site with a SuDS
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 15	Continue with current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Never let a developer 'buy their way out of a provision'. This creates barren housing developments where children and young adults have nothing to do and nowhere to go. If the provision cannot be included in the plan, then the plan is wrong.

LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Non-productive land could be set aside and be replanted to rebuild the natural diversity that existed then.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Greening future developments with open and scrub green spaces ensuring real wildlife corridors that allow wildlife to hide or set up home.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	10 minute neighbourhoods. Agrees with the Transport connectivity approach. Living in a village does necessitate owning a car. The bus services have been cut back as non-profitable. More council funding of these minor services (to run a regular transport service to the large towns and local villages) would allow village living without a car. Reducing the carbon footprint of villages should be on the priority list if net zero is to be achieved. Ensure a decent bus service running to reduce car dependency.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agrees with the Transport connectivity approach. Living in a village does necessitate owning a car. The bus services have been cut back as non-profitable. More council funding of these minor services (to run a regular transport service to the large towns and local villages) would allow village living without a car. Reducing the carbon footprint of villages should be on the priority list if net zero is to be achieved. Ensure a decent bus service running to reduce car dependency.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Transport Policies	You could support the taxi companies to run subsidised services throughout the villages to infill where the buses are not servicing.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are. Survey the existing infrastructure within the smaller towns and villages to establish if it can cope with further developments and upgrade the infrastructure where required.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Ensure a solid underground electricity system is a prerequisite for future housing developments, the current over ground system is not reliable enough.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 19	Further expansion outwards from Banbury is inevitable. However, the distance between J11 & J10 on the M40 south of Banbury is vast (10 miles or so) and could do with a new junction somewhere in between. This could be a site for a new-town, alleviating excessive development from all of the urban centres. It may relieve some of the pressure on both J11 and J10 which are struggling under current traffic demand. I don't think views of churches should be any more important than any other planning consideration.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Important Views of Banbury	No. I don't think views of churches should be any more important than any other planning consideration.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Make it easier (cheaper) for small niche stores to operate in the high street. Artisan stores would bring in visitors and tourists if the rent and rates were more accommodating, free parking would be advantageous in the town centre
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. Stop Banbury canal-side flooding the Mill arts centre. Protect Banburys open spaces from development. I don't think planning policy has as much of an impact as a good social care policy. Reducing car dependency would require encouragement not prohibition. It is the creation of large retail parks that has created the dependence on car transport. This is a creation of past planning policy.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Protect Banburys open spaces from development.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Addressing Inequality in	I don't think planning policy has as much of an impact as a good social care policy.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Reducing car dependency would require encouragement not prohibition. It is the creation of large retail parks that has created the dependence on car transport. This is a creation of past planning policy.

LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 30	It should be a balance of both, remembering that affordable housing is more important in village settings rather than larger houses. Large housing estates of 'town houses' like the current developments around Banbury would kill any community if bolted onto a small village. Any development should be sensitive to the community and limited in number. An allowance of say 1% of the existing housing stock could be absorbed into a small village yearly without corrupting village life but would need to be dripfed into the village
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 31	Combination of options.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 32	Support a rural settlement hierarchy. More weight to public transport. Some very small villages have many services due to historical growth, funding, generosity of patrons etc. Other large towns may have little or no services. Current village housing density should be the overriding factor limiting expansion to preserve the village, this needs to be included in any Hierarchy plan.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Settlement	Don't limit the growth of a village by a defined boundry, but a notional boundry (set by the town/parish council) including land or packets of land for future development would prevent uncontrolled expansion.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals. Each development site needs to be assessed on its own merits and the value (or detriment) effect on the village where it is located. Societal, environmental and aesthetic impacts need to be considered as important as services and access. Biodiversity impact that should be mitigated for locally.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Option 34	Local plans for all village communities should be drawn up by the parish/town/village council as they have intimate knowledge of the local historic and natural area. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance. Neighbourhood planning- Give the views in any local parish plan more weight. Development Management Policy - Preservation of seasonal (transient) landscape features not visible all year round. e.g. unique woodland colouration in spring & Autumn, winter spring outflows, Summer and migratory bird roosts, lowland winter marshes, etc. All are unique in areas of otherwise unremarkable farmland, but have their own transient eco systems which insects, birds and other wildlife rely upon.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Give the views in any local parish plan more weight.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Question - Development Management Policies	Preservation of seasonal (transient) landscape features not visible all year round. e.g. unique woodland colouration in spring & Autumn, winter spring outflows, Summer and migratory bird roosts, lowland winter marshes, etc. All are unique in areas of otherwise unremarkable farmland, but have their own transient eco systems which insects, birds and other wildlife rely upon.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	LPR-A-155	This land has been prepared as a wildflower meadow. This will become a unique feature in a sea of arable fields and animal pastures. There is a winter spring to the southern boundary which flows at a sizable volume and causes some local flooding which would need a sizable pond to act as a SuDS to prevent it flowing directly into the canal/river Cherwell. There is no route to the village centre (the tow path being on the opposite side of the canal boundary) forcing future residents out onto the Claydon roadway (no path) which is a fast rat run to avoid J11 of the M40. Any resident living here would be compelled to own a car. This site has had 3 planning applications rejected already
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	LPR-A-202	School lane is not a 'made up' road and is unsuitable for high traffic volumes. The school gate opens out directly onto the road placing cars and children onto the same traffic way.
LPR-B-739	Gareth Denton	Cropredy	All the land offered for development in Cropredy has suggested development densities far above required. Any developer wishing to build on these sites needs to reduce the density to no more than needed and include large area's of greenspaces to allow the wildlife to thrive. This would allay fears which the local residents have and could smooth the planning process.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 1	With the planned increase of houses to the area, how exactly will current infrastructure cope. Oxford Road through Banbury cannot cope with the increase housing which brings 1000s cars to the area. The roads through the current housing estates to reach these new ones will also not be able to cope. And will bring a lot more noise and co2 pollution to the quiet areas.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 2	Introducing further housing estates will not meet climate change as you're introducing 10,000s of new cars to the area. Further adding to the already heavy congested roads that cannot cope with the current traffic levels
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 6	Reduce the % at banbury.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes. Stop utilising the quiet sections of current estates to build new ones thus devaluing the current houses and making the area noisier, more pollutant and upsetting and not what the home owners chose to live there in the first place. Im sure you wouldnt want this to happen to you.

LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. All new houses should come with solar panels and car chargers as standard to aid supplying energy to grid and promoting people to switch to electric vehicles.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Add solar panels at a minimum. Prodrive solar roof demonstrates the solar panel roof works.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Question - Green Belt	Stop converting the greenbelt on edges estates to create new estates. This devalues the current houses and upsets a lot of people as they chose "country" lifestyle which you take away from them.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Do not agree with the proposed approach. Main oxford road cannot cope with current traffic levels yet council are happy to have over 6000 homes built just off it
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery - look at areas by catchment and accessibility.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 19	To the north of the town and to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11). Avoid South of banbury development as this already has massive developments scheduled which are beginning to ruin the green belt and countryside. Plus new home owners on the edge of these estates will be mis-sold the green views and quiet lifestyle.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Need to protect the south of banbury green spaces
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy.
LPR-B-740	Andrew Down	LPR-A-091	Please avoid developing here due green belt and increasing the amount of vehicles to these quiet small estates.
LPR-B-741	Brian Carlick	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Yes
LPR-B-741	Brian Carlick	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-741	Brian Carlick	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-741	Brian Carlick	Option 32	Yes - Local shop, regular bus service.
LPR-B-741	Brian Carlick	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.

LPR-B-741	Brian Carlick	Charlton on Otmoor	The Baptist Church (listed as second place of worship) closed a few years ago and has been converted to housing. I would think a modest expansion of housing in the area marked pink on the map would be an asset to the village but drainage might be a challenge on the piece of ground mentioned. It is adjacent to the new parish cemetery which has drainage problems. Local pumped sewerage system to the Sewage Works is reported by locals at the ends of the systems to be not coping very well and any new housing would bring more burden to it. The profile does not mention the H5 Stagecoach bus service (Hourly on weekdays between Bicester and the JR Hospital) which runs along the "main" road 7 minutes walk from the village but does not stop. I understand this matter is to be brought up at an imminent Parish Council Meeting. It would make sense to have at least a request bus stop near to the village as it would at least save a few car journeys. The Charlton Services 94 bus runs an incredibly limited service and is no use to people wanting to travel in the middle of the day.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 1	Cherwell has already taken more than the average national quota for housing development. If development is still required, I feel vacant brownfield sites and buildings should be utilised to meet any additional housing development requirements; this could be the answer for a sustainable future in terms of housing and the environment. Our countryside is under significant threat. We need our countryside, for our health and wellbeing, for food and our animals, to maintain housing values in the villages and maintain their individual identities, as they are at risk of being swallowed up by overdevelopment.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Supporting	There are many vacant shops and larger stores in Banbury town centre. Could these not be repurposed for social enterprises, housing and leisure facilities, to breathe new life into the town centre and bring employment to the area?
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. We need to be flexible in utilising vacant spaces and buildings within the town centre, to attract more people and make it a more vibrant, thus helping the local economy. These spaces could be used to meet housing quotas, leisure and retail. Banbury is a beautiful town, steeped in history and it's sad to see so many vacant buildings and spaces. There are plenty of cafes and places to eat, but to allow housing and leisure facilities to be developed, would be beneficial. Encourage independent and smaller retailers to invest in the area is important to maintaining Banbury's charm and uniqueness. Banbury has just had a large retirement housing development built in the town centre, which is great for older people who need access to local amenities and transport links. Vacant retail outlets and historical buildings could be repurposed for older people, providing it is sympathetically done and meets their health and well-being needs.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Ensuring change of use from commercial to residential status when planning applications are made are easy to facilitate.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Supporting our Town centres	Local town centre and retail related policies should be sympathetic to it's communities needs and wishes, ensuring they are spaces people want to come to, enjoy and spend time in. Renovation of historical buildings, repurposed for residential, retail use and social enterprise should be considered and encouraged.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 6	We do not need any more development in the Cherwell. Our villages are at risk of becoming swallowed up by surrounding towns and we will lose our individual identities, which attract tourism to the area and maintain property values. We need to keep our countryside and green areas for our health and wellbeing. If any more development is needed, it should be built upon existing brown sites or upon vacant land or where vacant buildings exist. It may be more expensive, but what is the point of leaving land and buildings empty which could be built redeveloped? The infrastructure has not been in place to serve our communities for some time and there would be increased pressure placed upon already overwhelmed services and facilities, with an increase in traffic congestion, which is not good for anyone's health and well-being. Following the covid pandemic, many large stores in town centres have shut down and left vacant, why could these not be given change of use from commercial to residential and developed into homes, where shops, restaurants, transport links and other important local amenities are within walking distance. If there is such a demand for housing, could this not be a consideration as part of regenerating our dwindling and damaged town centres.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Separation Distances	Yes
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Housing Policies	Modular homes could help to fulfil the housing need, especially if using vacant stores in town centres, aimed at professionals and also a proportion of social housing. I do not know much about modular housing, however, in times of a pandemic, need to consider the distance between homes
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Travelling Communities	Provide dedicated vacant brown sites for Travelling Communities but kept to a minimum. There is significant stigma towards this minority group, and they are often misunderstood and rejected by society. I think there needs to be more cohesive and collaborative relationship building with Travelling Communities, however, the mainstream community needs to be safe, clean and respected by everyone, including those from Travelling Communities.

LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	It's important to preserve historic buildings, and it is possible sympathetically restore them and repurpose them, as this has been done in the past. They could be developed into beautiful homes, offices or used for social enterprises.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	There needs to be a clear policy on local waste management and there should be research and development sites for renewable energy, trying to keep it a more local responsibility. Policy should include providing more education on how we can locally do things to tackle climate change.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Green Belt	No further housing on green belt.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Restore old buildings sympathetically, grow more trees and plants, create more open spaces and gardens, leaving what's left of our beautiful countryside alone and not developing housing on it. Also, I think more community gardens, where residents take pride in cultivating the land, growing fruit and vegetables which can be given to families in need.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agrees with transport and connectivity approach. The approach should be different for rural areas. We need to reduce the speed limits for rural villages and suburban areas to 20 miles per hour, which will reduce carbon emissions. Additional buses using lower emissions, possibly a tram system. Increased cycle lanes between rural sites and towns.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 19	To the north of the town and to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11). Develop on existing brownfield sites, commercial areas and empty department stores.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes. All historical buildings should be protected. They are pieces of architecture which make Banbury what it is. They should be protected. The craftsmanship and work that has gone into these building cannot be replicated without great cost and time
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Banbury is a lovely town, full of history, however, it needs to promote more independent retailers to add to its charm and uniqueness. There are many empty spaces and shops, which have fallen victim to inflation and the pandemic, these spaces could be developed sympathetically into new residential dwellings and enable social enterprises to use these spaces. Not everyone wants sparkly brand new, box like structures and bulk standard high street stores. Some people like smaller, more independent retail stores and places to eat and drink, rather than the major chains.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 21	Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	They need to be kept cleaner and have community gardens, where the community can take some ownership of what goes into them. People's Park is a beautiful space and Spiceball Park is also a great place to walk and socialise, but there simply aren't enough green spaces in Banbury for everyone to enjoy.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Reducing Car dependency in Banbury	Better cycle lanes, reduced speed limit between immediate surrounding villages of Banbury. Between Adderbury (Twyford) and Bodicote there is a small straight run at national speed limit. People drive at the speed limit which puts cyclists off and the pavements are too narrow to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. There is so much traffic on the road and the Oxford/Banbury Road is so busy and fast. Whilst the speed limit is 30 in Adderbury, on the main road, no one hardly adheres to this. I feel a 20 mile per hour speed limit should be enforced in villages, and a camera operating system be in place, whereby a driver's registration plate is recognised upon entering the village as well as their speed and then upon leaving the village. There needs to be better traffic calming measures in place in villages and greater availability of cycle lanes which are safe to use. I think a cheap and accessible tram system is the way forward for the future.

LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 30	There does not need to be any more development in rural areas. My understanding is, Adderbury and Bloxham have had more than their fair share of development.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School ,Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy, Regular Bus services, Green spaces and parks and traffic calming measures. Should give more weight to accessibility of the settlement.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Settlement	There does not need to be any further development around Adderbury, there has been enough. We are in danger of becoming part of Bodicote and Banbury and of losing our identity.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-742	Nicola Sage	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Listen to the views and ideas of the communities and take them seriously. Give the Parish Council more power to make important decisions about its community.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 1	Adderbury is a small village that already has enough new builds. There isn't enough for more families, traffic etc. 1 small shop, 1 schools, churches and pubs. The traffic through the village is already dreadful at peak times and school run times, more homes will cause more traffic. There's plenty of land nearer Aynho, Deddington, Kings Sutton, Charlton, Croughton etc. Some of these villages having more to offer families. Please don't spoil the beautiful village of Adderbury by swamping it in traffic and people.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 2	Far to many houses for such a small village
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 3	At main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington; significant transport interchanges; and, larger villages.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 4	Combination of options.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	We need to ensure that adderbury is not swallowed up with housing, keep grasslands and livestock part of its natural beauty.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	All new builds should be in iron stone in keeping with the beauty of Adderbury village. No modern looking properties which are an eye sore.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery - Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 19	North of the town.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Rural areas will no longer be rural if we keep building on them.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-743	Karen Turner	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 3	Combination of options.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 4	Combination of options.

EPR 1973



LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Make parking in the towns free or at least capped at say £1. Expensive parking just pushes people online.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	Build a large carpark outside the town centres on a brownfield site and run a little railway or high level pods on a wire as in London back and forth all day. Will keep traffic away and encourage people to visit the centres. Safer town centres. Attract people to Banbury etc from outside area, more money coming in.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Housing Policies	Look at how houses are built in colder countries. Insulation standards etc. We need to get away from bricks and mortar, too slow and expensive. More houses should be modular, built in factories and assembled on site, using recycled materials such as old car tyres etc
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Separation Distances	SHould be a minimum gap between houses
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Travelling Communities	Travelling communities make a mess and nuisance wherever they are so understandable nobody wants them. The whole subject needs to be boiled down and start over. They need to change their attitudes and behaviour. Problematic issue, can't solve here
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Green Belt	Elan Housing want to build 60 houses in Shenington. Too many houses are already being built in the Banbury area, in fact Banbury is currently surrounded by an enourmous ring of housing construction. None of the roads are being upgraded nor extra facilities like schools and surgeries being added. Can't just dump houses wherever. Banbury is a traffic jam. Shenington is a Category C village. Infill only. 60 extra houses means 120 more cars, overloaded and Victorian sewage system, problematic access both ends of the village as it stands- narrow lanes - no pavements, primary school already to the limit mostly from other areas, surgery getting more busy anyway, ecological and environmental issues to consider also, noise and dust, air quality etc etc. Nobody in the village wants this to go ahead. We have formed an action group to vehemently oppose.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Disagree with approach and should be different for rural areas. Smaller and more frequent buses are used between the villages. The larger buses are dangerous and not used. They are often wider than the roads. Why not use shuttle style buses that are narrower, safer and run them every hour. They could be electric.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Transport Policies	Change some of the crazy junctions in Banbury, particularly near the railway station, the big crossroads. Why not move the railway station slightly further north or south, get it out of that bottleneck place on the bridge. Constant log jam there. Going to get worse as the rate of housebuilding here rises causing two more cars per house to park there and commute for instance.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Railway station area. Better bus system would reduce car dependency.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 31	Combination of options.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Village Hall, GP Surgery and Regular Bus services. More weight should be given to public transport accessibility.
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	General	
LPR-B-744	Steve Truner	Shenington	Object to development.

LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	Option 1	I acknowledge the requirements for more local affordable housing. The number of new house planning applications for Adderbury will not attract first time buyers. The new property "Help to Buy" scheme is being abused by major builders. The scheme should be renamed "Help to Bonus Scheme". The infrastructure around Adderbury cannot cope with the planned new builds. Cherwell Council must incentivise "Brown Site" Housing development. Banbury Town centre fits the category perfectly. The building of linear housing developments around Adderbury will destroy the historic rural atmosphere of Adderbury. A local example of this is Kidlington Oxfordshire.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	Question - Supporting	Policy - A Cherwell Council sponsored apprenticeship programme.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Encourage small businesses.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	Question - Green Belt	The Green Belt has proved its valuable worth during lockdown. Personal well-being is help by countryside walking.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	LPR-A-178	Object. Will destroy the rural feel of Adderbury.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	LPR-A-081	Object. Will destroy the rural feel of Adderbury.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	LPR-A-002	Object. Will destroy the rural feel of Adderbury.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	LPR-A-156	Object. Will destroy the rural feel of Adderbury.
LPR-B-745	Paul Bonne	LPR-A-077	Object. Will destroy the rural feel of Adderbury.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 2	Meeting the challenge of climate change needs to be the priority objective as without succeeding in this area the other two objectives will fail.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges. notice that in the consultation document it gives the option-'mostly on previously developed land, including in less sustainable locations' but on the options for responding to the consultation it just says 'mostly on previously developed land'. There is a big difference between those two statements
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Supporting	Need to include policies around increasing and maintaining biodiversity on employment land and other policies that help ensure new or expanding employment land can help towards climate goals.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Policies that promote environmentally positive changes such as clean air, biodiversity and reduced waste to ensure that our town centres are a positive part of reducing climate change.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes. Most housing does not meet accessibility needs yet more and more people need this.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Housing Policies	Policies that ensure that environmentally benefits, biodiversity and sustainability are at the forefront of development and construction. Appropriate separation is required to ensure that greenery and therefore biodiversity can be integrated. Otherwise people concrete over the gaps between properties and there can be no biodiversity.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Separation Distances	Appropriate separation is required to ensure that greenery and therefore biodiversity can be integrated. Otherwise people concrete over the gaps between properties and there can be no biodiversity
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Every new property that goes up without the maximum sustainability in place will cost more money in the long run to retro fit and will contribute significantly to delaying and prevent climate goals being achieved.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 11	These seem like an odd choice or either or. Surely both are needed.

LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Stricter policies and penalties for when construction companies do not meet the requirements or fail to provide the climate change benefits promised.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Green Belt	Brownfield sites should be used up before Green Belt. We cannot keep chipping away at the green belt to build on it especially at a time when we are more than aware of the importance of nature and biodiversity. At a time when there is a climate crisis I find it hard to believe there can be a justifiable exceptional circumstance to remove green belt.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Policies should be ambitious and aim to make Cherwell a leader in biodiversity and natural environment so that nature and the people of Cherwell can thrive.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Approach should be different for rural areas. Rural areas do not have the option to reduce car travel so other technology is required. Better provision for people with additional mobility needs. For example seating at all bus stops. Cheaper bus service and/or cheaper parking at park and rides. More reliable public transport
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Transport Policies	Air travel is very much not a positive environmental form of transport so London Oxford Airport should not be supported to increase air travel until such time as planes are more environmentally friendly.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Policy on Infill housing. Environmental benefits and biodiversity on and near the site. Parking issues.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-746	Rhiannon Davies	Question - Settlement	Settlement boundaries ensure villages don't merge into each other and can maintain their identities as well as protecting the surrounding green spaces.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 1	The vision include the protection of the rural nature of the area outside the main towns. Better use of land within the boundaries of the main towns must be maintained.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 2	Affordable homes for our young people is not happening at the moment. A major objective should be to provide more social housing and more affordable housing not via shared ownership.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Free parking, good public transport links and low business rates to encourage independent retailers.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Question - Housing Policies	Alternative more sustainable methods of construction should be encouraged.

LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Stop allowing developers to build new houses that need retrofitting immediately.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Question - Green Belt	The larger villages like Adderbury, Deddington, Hook Norton and Bloxham should have a green belt to stop the insidious spread of development that is currently taking place.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 12	Refuse permission to develop
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Trees and hedges should not be felled and then say more have been planted. Existing mature trees and hedges should be retained and built around. We might then see some thought going into the planning of developments instead of the same format being regurgitated.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree with approach and should be different in rural areas. Can't drive any less. At our main settlements. Too much traffic indicates that people are travelling to get to work. Large housing developments in the villages mean people get in their cars to go to work. Traffic has increased significantly through Adderbury and Deddington this is not sustainable
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery - Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 29	Limit further development beyond that already planned for.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 31	Combination of above.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 33	Combination of above.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	Parish Profile	Important to protect our parishes. Quality of life is important to the whole district and i do not know any person who is happy with the way our parishes are being over burdened with developments that locals cannot afford. Stop loading on to the larger settlements some of the smaller parishes have become havens for second home ownership as they have been protected from development thus pricing the properties out of reach of locals who want to work in the area.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	LPR-A-009	Object. This site is on a dangerous stretch of road and creates a precedent to more boundary 'leakage'. A greenfield site that should be maintained as such.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	LPR-A-056	Object. A greenfield site. Beyond the parish boundary. Too far away from centre of village and separated from main amenities by a main A road.
LPR-B-747	Janet Macey	LPR-A-054	Object. More crossing points would cause even more build up of standing traffic. Extending the boundary of the village and greenfield sites
LPR-B-748	John Bailey	LPR-A-004	Object. Lack of facilities in the village: there is no school, doctor's surgery nor shop. Roads in the village are mainly single track; even the main road (High Street) is narrow and cannot support heavy traffic. Parking is a problem throughout the village. There are problems with drainage due to the underlying rock; even the local sewerage plant is struggling to cope with existing capacity and there have been reports of raw sewerage being discharged into a local brook. Planning applications for both sites have previously been refused by CDC
LPR-B-748	John Bailey	LPR-A-171	Object. Lack of facilities in the village: there is no school, doctor's surgery nor shop. Roads in the village are mainly single track; even the main road (High Street) is narrow and cannot support heavy traffic. Parking is a problem throughout the village. There are problems with drainage due to the underlying rock; even the local sewerage plant is struggling to cope with existing capacity and there have been reports of raw sewerage being discharged into a local brook. Planning applications for both sites have previously been refused by CDC
LPR-B-749	Simon Baylis	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-749	Simon Baylis	Option 19	To the north, south and west of the town.
LPR-B-749	Simon Baylis	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-749	Simon Baylis	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance.

LPR-B-749	Simon Baylis	LPR-A-185	Object. Lack of access (inbound would only be accessible via Overthorpe Road). The slip road from A422 is in West Northants and subject to No Entry westbound. If developed, would reduce local gap and increase traffic on minor roads through Chacombe and Warkworth as drivers seek to avoid congestion at J11 roundabout. Noise and light pollution would impact Nethercote, Overthorpe and Carrdus School
LPR-B-749	Simon Baylis	LPR-A-034	Object. Would require access from A361 and increase traffic volumes on J11 roundabout, which already fails to cope with peak volumes (despite recent signal upgrade). If developed, would reduce local gap, and increase traffic on minor roads through Chacombe and Warkworth as drivers seek to avoid congestion at J11 roundabout. Noise and light pollution would impact Nethercote, Overthorpe and Carrdus School.
LPR-B-749	Simon Baylis	LPR-A-168	Object. Would require access from A361 and increase traffic volumes on J11 roundabout, which already fails to cope with peak volumes (despite recent signal upgrade). If developed, would reduce local gap, and increase traffic on minor roads through Chacombe and Warkworth as drivers seek to avoid congestion at J11 roundabout. Noise and light pollution would impact Nethercote, Overthorpe and Carrdus School.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 1	Number 2 of the vision should have mandatory inclusion of renewables such as use of brown water for toilets, solar and air source heat pumps. This is vital in light of the Governments ambition to phase out gas boilers. It would help reduce the prices of the technology so enable more affordable retro fitting and also help to grow local green businesses. This should be reflected in numbers 4 and 7. Number 6 should not concentrate on Banbury , Bicester and Kidlington. It must focus on better bus services to and from the surrounding villages, especially at commuter travel times otherwise we have no option but to use our cars e.g. in the morning there is a fast bus between Banbury and Oxford but it only stops in Deddington, whereas if it accessed the larger villages on its route others of us may be able to use it. The trains finish too early in the evening making it impossible to use the bus. The bus and train services should be more integrated so people can use a bus to get to a rail station to continue their journey by train e.g. the bus through Steeple Aston leaves too late for someone to get off at Heyford Bridge and go and get the train into Oxford quickly. The return journeys need to be linked. The train services are not frequent enough- they should stop hourly at village locations between noon and 2pm. There should be a park and ride built behind Kidlington airport, accessible from both the A40 and A4260 that would be used by the 500 bus. There are more houses being built at Begbroke and additional park & ride facility in the vicinity would stop this traffic all having to reach the existing ones at Pear Tree and Oxford Parkway thereby relieving congestion and pollution. It would reduce the length of journeys. Do not install a bus gate at Middleton Stoney. This would adversely affect road users. It would push all of this traffic through Heyford Park or more probably, and more detrimentally, through Kirtlington/Chesterton. Chesterton has now been landed with the Wolf development and so this bus gate would be a disaster as the B430 road is frequently congested. Number 12 of the vision does not take into account the death of the High Streets/Town Centre in Bicester and Banbury. Number 13 is incorrect. Heyford Park desperately needs a community cemetery. The play areas in Heyford Park are privately managed and have been closed all summer.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 2	KO. 1 needs reference to 'brown sites' inserting as re-using this should be the priority for any future development. KO 4 - the mobile networks servicing villages must urgently be improved. KO6 - clear up the town centres and make them attractive because visitors will not want to visit tatty, dirty areas where they feel unsafe. KO8- improve local infrastructure. Do not support national projects such as the Oxford Cambridge Arc, the rail freight depot proposed for Ardley etc. that would result in increased pressure on our local roads such as the A34 which is already a nightmare and struggling with traffic flows. Reopen up the old branch railway lines for passenger services where demand can be proved. KO9- protect the Green Belt and Sites of Special Environmental Interest. KO 10, 11, 12 and 13 should specifically include maximising the use of renewable energy. KO15- do more to protect the wildlife that has no option but to cross busy roads e.g. badger tunnels and gaps in fencing along the roads to allow deer and other animals to pass. The speed limit should be reduced along Sturdy's Castle and Hopcroft Holt. KO16- please refer to my comments in Option 1. KO17 - make all new developments utilise brown water and water collection systems. KO21- make some of the most basic disability access requirements e.g. larger doorways a standard requirement for all new builds. KO22 Do not let management companies control all aspects of life for communities. These should be community managed and led e.g. through parish and town councils. They may choose to engage a management option but this should only be an option and not something that is forced. KO23- re-use all of the brown field sites before allowing any buildings to be put on new sites. KO24 makes no reference to villages - only focused on town and villages have been forgotten. KO27 Do not expand the rural villages unless and until the supporting infrastructures are in place e.g. a good, frequent rural bus service that is guaranteed for the future. KO29 this is inherent in most of the other objectives so needs high priority when considering smaller villages or rural communities, but seems to be overlooked. KO31 if developers commit to a number of sustainable houses on a development and then try to wriggle out of providing it, the planning permission should automatically be withdrawn/revoked. Too many are trying to avoid delivering affordable housing.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land. Focus on sites previously used and where there should already be adequate transport existing infrastructures or where it should be most cost effective to develop further if required
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). CDC should avoid creating areas that become large industrial sites that offer no benefits and may in fact be detrimental to local residents unless they are on the edges of towns e.g. because of pollution, traffic volumes large expanses of industrial units that are unoccupied at night resulting in possible safety concerns, detrimental affect on the value of existing houses in the area etc.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Supporting	Actively support the growth of green industries. These are often SME's with limited cash flows.

LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. Integrated areas appear to work better e.g. in Henley where the shops and cafes are situated amongst the houses, thereby creating community areas. Promote individual small local shops rather than those that can be found on any high street to make these towns a destination. Limit the growth of places such as Bicester Village that offers shopping options for few local people. The nature of Bicester Village does nothing to encourage users into Bicester centre and if it did they could not park anyway. Although there are low paid retail jobs at Bicester Village available for the local community there is also a lot of unwanted traffic congestion, pollution etc.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Support local SME's that produce and sell locally as they have a lower carbon footprint.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	Limit the number of retail distribution centres on the edges of towns as these put pressure on local road networks i.e. lorries. The proposed rail freight interchange at Ardley should be rejected as it would offer few, if any benefits, and would massively increase freight traffic on local roads and through local villages, especially when there are problems on the M40 or A34.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 6	Keep the current limits but enforce it much more strictly so developers can't change reduce the number/change the type of provision after planning applications have been approved.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Housing Policies	Make homes them A rated energy efficient and utilise a percentage of renewable energy features. If air heat pumps are to be made mandatory in the future, this should be a mandatory requirement on all new builds from now on too prepare for this
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Separation Distances	Houses must not be so close together as to make overlooking a problem for neighbours. Back gardens should be accessible from the side of the house so the numerous bins can be wheeled between the houses and stored behind each house even if it is just down a shared passageway.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. We have a duty to maximise the use of energy efficient products and renewable technologies to help protect the environment and reduce our impact upon it.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Maintain the facades and any particular things that are historically important whilst allowing the use of replicas made from recycled materials or by installing things that upgrade the structures e.g. hand crafted double glazed units, replacement beams etc made from recycled plastic etc. This is a developing market, would save natural resources and help resolve some of the problems of disposing of plastic waste.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 11	CDC should make it a fundamental requirement for all new builds of whatever type. It can start of as a fairly low percentage but should increase over time. It would help protect the environment and reuse our natural resources. It is desired by many people. It would help develop the renewables market and thereby reduce future production costs. It should lead to further innovations.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Ensure that these assessments are produced by independent and qualified professions. They should only be commissioned directly by the developers they use a company who is on the CDC agreed list of assessors which is reviewed and updated regularly. These should be publicly available documents.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Do more to protect wildlife. Animal tunnels, and reduced reduced limits enforced by cameras should be installed on roads where this is a particular problem.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach. Put all play facilities under public control.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Outdoor sports provision must be sited close to the new developments so they service these communities, otherwise people will have to use cars etc to travel to them which defeats the aim of reducing travel.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	There should be a duty on owners to protect historic environment.

LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree with approach which should be different for rural areas. Make sure that any plans are fit for purpose and consult with local people beforehand. Officers appear to make assumptions about what rural communities need rather than asking e.g. the proposed bus gate at Middleton Stoney which nobody who lives locally wants. It is very difficult for our voices to be heard when things are already being developed and it is a waste of public money when local communities are eventually consulted and such plans subsequently (hopefully) get rejected. Better bus service, park and ride facility north of Kidlington airport, cheaper leasing of electric cars, sufficient charge points, cost effective installation of home recharge points and consideration given to people with no or difficult to access garages when installing these. Electric cars are beyond the pocket of many people to buy and the technology is still developing so it would be great if we could lease them cost effectively. For this to work it would have to be properly controlled and regulated. Do not phase out hybrid cars until the electric market has developed properly and reached a stage where the electric vehicles are price comparable to current used vehicles of a certain age.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery - Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 29	Limit further development beyond that already planned for. Heyford Park urgently requires a cemetery to cater for the end of life needs of this growing community. The burial facilities in local churchyards are filling up, and not everyone wishes to be cremated, but there is no current provision for the burials. No additional development should be permitted until this missing community facility is provided
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery ,Regular Bus services and Village pub/eatery. More weight should be given to the accessibility of a settlement.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Settlement	Support settlement boundaries.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy. Respect any approved Neighbourhood Plans that are in place.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Help local communities develop a neighbourhood plan, respect any plans that are approved and help the communities when updates are required.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Question - Development Management Policies	Maximise the importance of environmental considerations.
LPR-B-750	Lorraine Watling	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-751	Simon Clifford	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-751	Simon Clifford	Option 31	Combination of options.
LPR-B-751	Simon Clifford	Option 32	Yes - Local Shop and Regular Bus services. Accessibility - Yes- walking/ Cycling.
LPR-B-751	Simon Clifford	Question - Settlement	No. The spread of boundaries must be restricted, so that the countryside is kept as large and open and accessible as possible. The "filling in" policy previously adopted, offers little amenity to the new build owners and degrades the amenity of villagers
LPR-B-751	Simon Clifford	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals.
LPR-B-751	Simon Clifford	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance.
LPR-B-751	Simon Clifford	LPR-A-091	Object. They are separated by a single track no though private lane which is a public bridleway. Another single track lane borders one side of the proposed development which is used extensively for cyclists, runners, walkers and horse riders. These fields and their public rights-of-way access represent the start of the countryside amenity around Bodicote for which popular for recreation. It is unique around this area to have the facility of so many footpaths linking the villages of Adderbury, Bodicote and Bloxham. Encroaching on this leisure/grazing land facility will act as a precedence for further expansion into the open land, narrowing the boundary between villages and therefore curtailing the current health value and amenity value to both local residents and many Banbury resident who use Bodicote as the starting point for their walk. Bodicote has really taken the full brunt of recent housing development. It cannot and should not be expected to entertain more houses on its borders, with additional car traffic, noise, light pollution, impact on nature, not to mention the additional strain to local services. The inclusion of these fields, represent all that is wrong with local planning, "adding a bit more on" to the Bodicote boundary is not a strategy, it's a dereliction of the council's duty to ensure that the amenity value of villages is preserved, for the benefit of both town and country.

LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 1	To meet climate action targets, reduction in the need for transport is critical. I'd like to see Cherwell taking the lead on developing better rural mixed use areas. Allowing light industry and business in existing villages as well as new developments. will allow Cherwells rural communities to work closer to home, reducing the environmental impact whilst attracting high technology business through the Arc. This should be a specific statement rather than point 14.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 2	The objectives are not bold enough, or sufficiently well-defined - many could be met without any specific action taken. Particularly against "meeting the Challenge of climate change". KO14 has a typo in the first word.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 3	Combination of options. Employment land must be distributed throughout Cherwell and the Knowledge Spine. It is not acceptable to be proposing continuing developing major sites where a large number of people must travel in to from all over the region. Cherwell could look toward the German model of local industry sites and move away from the major sites that will surely be outmoded in the future due to the lack of access.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). In the longer term, distribution is likely to be reducing as the effects of consumerism, supply chain overconfidence and materialism in society are reduced. Cherwell has an opportunity to consider how to relocate employment in this plan that is not yet sufficiently granular.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Supporting	Minimise the scale of employment sites, increase the distribution.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Consider how to manage rents to ensure shops are filled.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Supporting our Town	Prevent development of inaccessible out-of-town retail centres, to promote activity in the population and reduce congestion.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Housing Policies	Home building must include a greater assessment of the character of developments- how they fit in to the landscape, how they interact with the existing housing stock, and how they interact with one another. Identi-kit housing estates on complicated cul-de-sac systems are uninspiring and difficult to love. Design should showcase the best of new methods, materials, and planning and developers must be beholden to deliver spaces that future generations will actively desire.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Priority should be for sites with minimal environmental affects- protecting and enhancing the environment should not be secondary to meeting energy needs for the region. Reducing energy consumption would be a better alternative.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Support nuclear fusion development in Oxfordshire by providing appropriate sites and support for companies directly and in the supply chain. There are four nuclear fusion companies in Oxfordshire the highest concentration in the world.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Green Belt	The green belt must be maintained to prevent and limit urban sprawl in an increasingly overused region of the countryside. Better provision in the greenbelt for unused land should be considered.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. Cherwell should be focusing it's efforts on expanding the sites that already exist e.g. Otmoor, the Cherwell valley. Reducing intensity of arable farming and restoring hedgerows, floodplains, bog areas should be achieved.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Major development proposals should be offset by enhancing the natural environment around them, and by increasing the network of wildlife corridors in their vicinity. Ponds, rivers, ditches, and hedgerows must be included as part of any new major development.



LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Consideration of light pollution from sites should be much more carefully considered than has been to date. Specific requirements for surrounding new developments, or increases in light levels should be met with natural shading from trees- allowed to grow to an appropriate height before the light is introduced.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Consideration of light pollution from outdoor sports pitches must be considered for their locations. Better provision of sports facilities to more than multi-use pitches should be considered - e.g. cycle racing facilities.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Local materials should be prioritised, but not at the expense of developing good design, or using new techniques. Change is not always bad and local planning policy should recognise this. Developments should be required to have an assessment of design and to prevent the use of plans used in multiple sites around the country.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Disagree with the approach. Cherwell should incorporate a local light rail system to build the Oxfordshire Knowledge spine- regular and reliable service between Bicester-Kidlington-Oxford-Harwell with appropriate commuter spots will move significant traffic off the A34 corridor. Provision of local active transport solutions at rural stations to connect to the local businesses. The primary reason that it is not possible to use active travel in rural areas is due to the prevalence of the private car and the danger they represent. Journeys of 5 miles and under should be active travel predominantly, but can not currently be undertaken safely- consideration of how to reduce through traffic on non-main roads should be prioritised, as well as provision of better safety measures for the use of bikes. Reduce speed limits on rural roads, provide financial support for e-bikes in rural areas to allow journeys to be more easily undertaken.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery - look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Stronger policy for managing water and waste infrastructure to ensure the health of our environment (by not removing too much water or discharging untreated waste).
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Consideration of maintenance of green space within Kidlington. Major assessment of design of space for residents and externally.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. Provide a direct transport link to any outside of greenbelt development sites. Enhance the green belt to increase it's value to residents, the environment (e.g. by stipulating maximum field sizes, minimum space between fields for hedgerows, ditches, trees, paths).
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential. Kidlington Centre should be made affordable to ensure provision of all needs of local residents to prioritise the provision of services in a central area
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Kidlington-Oxford commute - build a railway station.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. Expand the remit to promote accessible paths from kidlington to all local villages and areas of interest esp. for off-road bike access.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Overdeveloping rural areas will result in them becoming sub-urban areas with poorer access and increasing the rate of private transport use. Keep the regions villages as villages
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans. Priority should be for avoiding developments - focus on expanding by individually designed houses as opposed to development of groups of houses or using opportunities to replace poor quality post-war housing stock. Ensure development includes employment.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 32	Disagree. Additionally, no more weight due to accessibility of urban centres.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Settlement	Agree to settlement boundaries.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.

LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Neighbourhood plans should allow a greater provision of local say on developers proposals particularly around the design, integration, consideration of services and impact. Addressing the neighbourhood plans should be a necessary component of any development.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Question - Development Management Policies	Development management policy areas are a good start, Cherwell should be considering becoming a lead on sustainable development given the local limitations (lots of potential land, but limited water and brownfield remaining).
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	LPR-A-223	The Church Commissioners proposal to develop 554.6 hectares of green belt is grossly disproportionate to the need and local environment. The church commissioners should instead be limited to a settlement boundary to limit the environmental de-valuation of the existing village. Consideration for settlement boundaries should include a specific consideration of the environment - for example, Islip, Oddington, Chalrtonon- Otmoor Noke should be limited by their locality to Otmoor and the consideration of expansion of Cherwell's only significant wildlife-focused environment which is critical to the region. The site covers primarily arable land, which has been driven to poor ecological value by mismanagement and aggressive farming techniques. The specific location of Islip at the confluence of the Ray and Cherwell rivers, and within easy access of Oxford, Kidlington and Bicester, should be cause for ensuring local green space. The Bioabundance report "New Regional Nature Park for Oxfordshire Plan 2050" provides good debate on how this area should be developed as a nature park and wildlife corridor. Islip could become the lowcarbon access point to this environment through the existing transport links to all three of the major local towns and provide significant wellbeing for the urban population. Better provision of access and re building of wetland and woodland landscapes on Church Commissioner land would enable this. As opposed to an extension of Kidlington in all but direct access. Specific consideration of the proposal site should be very carefully considered by the limits of the locality to Otmoor and the consideration of expansion of Cherwell's only significant wildlife focused environment which is critical to the region. The proposal would isolate the Ray catchment from the Cherwell for wildlife, further de-valuing Cherwell's Rural environment. A vision statement accompanies the response.
LPR-B-752	Dr Alasdair Morrison	Option 1	The plan on the whole is reasonable for maintaining the status-quo. However, it lacks ambition and foresight. Reviewing this plan in 20 years will likely see large swathes of the plan eliminated by technological developments and shifts in industry requirements and the climate crisis. The authors should work to provide a stronger and more accountable plan that meets the needs of future generations with better consideration to leaving the environment in a better state than it currently is. The plan needs to think much bigger and promote a seismic shift in how we live to meet the climate crisis.
LPR-B-753	Philippa Jeffrey	LPR-A-185	Strongly object. To think of those fields being developed for commercial use makes me so sad/angry/shocked. It would have a hugely negative impact on the countryside and the environment. Increased traffic, noise, destruction of natural habitation, increased flooding risks.
LPR-B-753	Philippa Jeffrey	LPR-A-034	Strongly object. To think of those fields being developed for commercial use makes me so sad/angry/shocked. It would have a hugely negative impact on the countryside and the environment. Increased traffic, noise, destruction of natural habitation, increased flooding risks.
LPR-B-753	Philippa Jeffrey	LPR-A-168	Strongly object. To think of those fields being developed for commercial use makes me so sad/angry/shocked. It would have a hugely negative impact on the countryside and the environment. Increased traffic, noise, destruction of natural habitation, increased flooding risks.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 1	Vision statement 1 should give at least equal significance to adaption to climate change as to sustainable energy production.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 2	KO 7 should include the diversification of high streets so they compliment out-of-town and online shopping rather than trying to compete. KO 12 should include an objective covering measures to help the adaption of existing housing and infrastructure to maximize resilience to the effects of climate change.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 3	Combination of options.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Retrofitting is very important but do not know the answer to the question in terms of 'hard' actions. At the very least, there are 'soft' actions. Cherwell should gather relevant information, evaluate it and make sure it gets to property owners with appropriate recommendations. This should be an ongoing process so the advice can be modified as new options become available.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Question - Green Belt	Banbury is expanding considerably. However, rather than advocating a green belt, radial protected areas should be designated so wildlife can access near to the core without being isolated from the outside countryside. Spiceball and the river/canal provide routes. What about east and west?
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas

LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods sound like a good idea. Rural areas might lack the routes to reach local facilities. For example, narrow, winding, poorly lit roads without footways. Or few footpaths and bridleways for exercise on foot, bicycle or horse. I think these are OCC responsibilities but perhaps CDC can be a facilitator.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Question - Transport & Connectivity	I cannot see viable options that would enable me to drive less. But I will be looking for charging points when I get an electric car.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery - look at areas by catchment and accessibility.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Radial green spaces as answered under "green belt".
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans. Neighbourhood plans are too expensive for small parishes to produce. And there might not be people available to undertake the work involved. A less onerous, more informal option for community led plans should be recognized.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. Bus services might need subsidies. These should come from within the county rather than from an adjacent county. Safety of road network through the settlement. Broadband and mobile phone network provision. Electric power supply capacity (for recharging cars, heating etc). Water supply capacity (Thames Water might become even more stressed). Parishes are supposed to have emergency plans of what they would do if required to be selfsufficient, eg cut off by excess snow and no power. The effectiveness possible given local conditions should be considered in some way when developing a hierarchy. Rural settlement hierarchy should give more weight to accessibility.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Question - Settlement	Settlement boundaries would save time and money in resolving disputes over planning applications. But perhaps individual settlements should be asked whether they want such definition. That would enable local considerations to be taken into account
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 33	Combination of options.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Parish Profile	Have the proposed sites been agreed with the local communities? Surely, that should have been a first priority before publication.
LPR-B-754	Dr Robin Furneau	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Neighbourhood plans are expensive to produce for small parishes. That is immediately evident from perusal of the map showing where plans exist. And there might be difficulty finding people willing and able to undertake the task. There must be an alternative. A less onerous, simpler method for a community to express its opinion should be recognized.
LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement. The room dimensions should be standard sizes acceptable to call it a "room".
LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. The proposed site on the edge of Bodicote would destroy the natural beauty and habitat of the surrounding and conservation area around it. It would cause already traffic congestion in Church Street to a unsafe and quite frankly an impending sense of intrusion to a small and quiet village. The noise level and road access and the pollution smells would cause increased health hazards to the population already residing in this area. The increased traffic volume would not be conducive to such a small village and narrow roads. The loss of amenity and unsafe traffic generation would destroy this village.
LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Traffic generation Highway safety/ adequacy of parking Loss of trees Design appearance and materials Nature conservation. Noise and disturbance resulting from use Conservation area Road access.
LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	Question - Important Views of Banbury	St Marys Church is an important part of the form and image of Banbury and important to protect these silhouette views of significant architectural cultural buildings. It is important to protect this local character.
LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	Option 19	To the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11).
LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.

LPR-B-755	Gill Davies	LPR-A-091	Object. The proposed site on the edge of Bodicote would destroy the natural beauty and habitat of the surrounding and conservation area around it. It would cause already traffic congestion in church street to an unsafe and quite frankly an impeding sense of intrusion to a small and quiet village. The noise level, road access and pollution smells would cause increased health hazards to the population already residing in this area. The increased traffic volume would not be conducive to such a small village and narrow roads. The loss of amenity and unsafe traffic would destroy this village.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 1	The basic premise of the numbers of houses required is incorrect. ONS have stated the expected population growth, which this vision suggests, is substantially more. The local plans have not been taken into consideration and the local views of the residents of small villages. We are seeing villages swallowed up into ribbon development. This policy only provides the developers with a free for all in making profit and not building on brownfield sites the affordable homes we need. The government announced it would "not build on greenfield sites" and "would invest in building on brownfield sites" so lets see that happen!. How can building in villages, without proper transport infrastructure and workplaces can help the environment. Building in villages will mean more cars on the roads, more pollution. Villages character have been lost. Affordable homes for those who need them in places where they are close to places of work and facilities in brownfield sites.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes).
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Question - Green Belt	The basic premise of the numbers of houses required is incorrect. ONS have stated the expected population growth, which this vision suggests, is substantially more. The local plans have not been taken into consideration and the local views of the residents of small villages. We are seeing villages swallowed up into ribbon development. This policy only provides the developers with a free for all in making profit and not building on brownfield sites the affordable homes we need. The government announced it would "not build on greenfield sites" and "would invest in building on brownfield sites" so lets see that happen!. How can building in villages, without proper transport infrastructure and workplaces can help the environment. Building in villages will mean more cars on the roads, more pollution. Villages character have been lost. Affordable homes for those who need them in places where they are close to places of work and facilities in brownfield sites.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	ALL historic sites should be maintained and not built on or close to.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree with the approach. Approach should be different for rural areas. Build houses on brown field sites , near toms and cities. Not on green field sites or in remote villages
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Local villages should not take the burden.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. The basic premise of the numbers of houses required is incorrect. ONS have stated the expected population growth, which this vision suggests, is substantially more. The local plans have not been taken into consideration and the local views of the residents of small villages. We are seeing villages swallowed up into ribbon development. This policy only provides the developers with a free for all in making profit and not building on brownfield sites the affordable homes we need. The government announced it would "not build on greenfield sites" and "would invest in building on brownfield sites" so lets see that happen!. How can building in villages, without proper transport infrastructure and workplaces can help the environment. Building in villages will mean more cars on the roads, more pollution. Villages character have been lost. Affordable homes for those who need them in places where they are close to places of work and facilities in brownfield sites.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 31	The options are restricted to three, why not re-think the whole, listening to the those n the villages.

LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Question - Settlement Boundaries	The basic premise of the numbers of houses required is incorrect. ONS have stated the expected population growth, which this vision suggests, is substantially more. The local plans have not been taken into consideration and the local views of the residents of small villages. We are seeing villages swallowed up into ribbon development. This policy only provides the developers with a free for all in making profit and not building on brownfield sites the affordable homes we need. The government announced it would "not build on greenfield sites" and "would invest in building on brownfield sites" so lets see that happen!. How can building in villages, without proper transport infrastructure and workplaces can help the environment. Building in villages will mean more cars on the roads, more pollution. Villages character have been lost. Affordable homes for those who need them in places where they are close to places of work and facilities in brownfield sites.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. These housing sites again favour developers and not the individuals who wish to buy or rent houses. The numbers of houses needs to reviewed in line with official statistics , currently your vision is for far greater numbers. The houses needs to prioritised on brown field sites and near workplaces, with good transport infrastructure not in villages.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	The neighbourhood plan needs to be driven by those locally. however this Plan for "localism" has been hijacked, to answer the needs of the developers.
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	LPR-A-001	Object. Deddington. Has seen over the last ten years growth in housing more than it has for the previous 60 years. The villagers in the Local plan voted to limit Housing to small sites , despite that 85 houses were built , under considerable protest
LPR-B-756	Ronald Turner	LPR-A-150	Object. Deddington. Has seen over the last ten years growth in housing more than it has for the previous 60 years. The villagers in the Local plan voted to limit Housing to small sites , despite that 85 houses were built , under considerable protest
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 1	The vision is great but CDC will need the support of outside partners to deliver it. This includes central government, other LAs, Statutory consultees/undertakers and commercial companies and house builders. Don't forget the move towards homeworking by multiple companies, which may need larger homes and local hubs.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 2	There should be support for sport and arts which support local economies by creating jobs and training as well as other nontraditional employment areas. I draw your attention to Sport England's economic tool.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 3	Combination of all.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 4	Combination of all.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Supporting Employment	Sport England support the consideration of E use classes in employment land. Sport is only recently been seen as an economic generator. I refer you to our insight on sport and the economy. It is estimated that there are 1,577 jobs with a value of £53.1m as a result of sport in Cherwell. and there is wider spending of £54.6m on health and £29m on volunteering
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan. Sport England is doing research into better performing buildings related to sport. As and when this information is available we will share it. BREAM is on direction but Passive design also has an important role to play, so please do not focus only on BREAM.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Sport needs the natural environment and with good robust management plans they can both be safeguarded.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. As and when the new playing pitch strategy and built facilities strategies are completed and adopted, these shoul db e the drivers for new and enhanced indoor and outdoor sports facilities. BUT they need to be kept up to date through regular Stage E meetings with the relevant steering groups.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	By setting them out clearly by qualified professionals
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods - Yes up to a point, but you can't have say a Doctors surgery or a swimming pool every 20 minutes - a reality check is needed.

LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 18	Consider further urban extensions. Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 19	Combination of all. Banbury 1 - the need for the relocation of Banbury United club at the developer's expense to be in line with the previous LDP, the adopted Playing Pitch Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 99.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Important Views of Banbury	No
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	By robust strategies and making sure that any loss is mitigated properly.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Blanket ban on cars in the centre and better public transport/walking and cycling schemes including suitable bikes/cycling scheme for the disabled and low socio-economic groups.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 22	Consider further urban extensions, limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 25	Facilitate such developments through a criteria based policy.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Sport is protcted under the NPPF. However do need to expand the sporting offer.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	We need the nationally signnifanct site for gliding.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential. Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	I would refer you to the playing pitch strategy Steering group meetings in recent months about improving stratfield Brake sports ground. The creation of a football hub opposite.
LPR-B-757	Sport England	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for). There are opportunities for creating regional and national sports venues which should be explored. Recently Box Lacrosse approach the land owners and were told currently it was not possible to create a venue and it may be in the future. It may be possible to create one of Sport England's Local Leisure offer on the site or within one of the hangers.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 1	"Developing our Options" reads like an urban planning document which is surprising as Cherwell is predominately a rural environment. Long term planning in the light of Brexit and COVID is problematic until we have a clearer picture of social, economic and demographic trends. COVID has only accelerated this trend and it is no longer necessary to be physically located near to colleagues. I expect this is happening in other industries as well. So I would question the long term need for better transport and economic centres
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 2	Reads as a set of urban planning objectives, with little about protecting and enhancing the existing environment. I would like to see better protection and enhancement for habitats, waterways, air quality, biodiversity. I see little concerning objectives for agriculture, a strategy for food production, or support for farmers. In a post Brexit environment domestic food production may increase in importance - building new houses is carbon intensive, and damaging to the environment. Surely the focus should be on improving energy efficiency of existing ones
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8).

LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Small businesses in town centers often begin as transient "pop up" businesses which require small spaces on a temporary basis. Best to provide indoor and outdoor modular spaces that can be adapted to different business needs.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Provide open spaces and enhance the local character of Cherwell towns to make them places want to be and spend time in.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 12	Consider carefully the need for the site at all.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Approach shouldn't be different for rural areas. Improved local grocery stores
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 32	No more weight due to accessibility to urban centres.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Question - Settlement	Yes to settlement boundaries so that the defined limits and nature of the towns and villages are maintained in the long term.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-758	Graham Finch	LPR-A-056	Extensive views to the north of Deddington over farmland and woodland, and the Deddington circular walk runs along its western boundary at Cosy Lane.
LPR-B-759	Prof Patrick Michael O'Brien	LPR-A-229	Strongly object. The proposed development would be half the size of what already exists in Shenington and that alone would be sufficient for the application to be turned down. The proposed buildings are totally out of character with the existing homes and buildings in the area. The infrastructure in terms of water, drainage (particularly), schooling, sewerage, internet facilities are already extremely stretched and the new development cannot be adequately accommodated. Traffic in this road is already somewhat excessive- the arrival of new commuters, school runs and online deliveries (there are no shops for 2.5 miles) would be tremendously disruptive in such a village. Reducing the total number of properties would simply be the thin end of the wedge. Looking at the company's previous developments it seems unlikely that it will be sensitive to local architectural Shenington is an outstanding historical village and what is proposed would be an aesthetic disaster and totally out of character for this edge of the Cotswolds environment.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 1	Vision should include: Recognition of the tools needed to achieve the goals of economic growth that are compatible with climate change, health and well being goals, specifically the provision of high quality active travel provision as priority over car dependent decisions. Neighbourhoods are primarily connected to each other and to facilities by direct and safe walking and cycling paths rather than being dependent on motor vehicle carriageways. Priority is given to ensuring that walkers and cyclists are able to reach their destinations safely and conveniently and motor vehicle routes are then designed around this, rather than viceversa. People are able to maintain their health and fitness effortlessly by using safe and convenient walking and cycling routes. Dominance, noise, pollution, danger, and inefficient use of space by motor vehicles in urban centres is minimised by pedestrianising town centres, rerouting motor vehicles around key urban centres rather than directly through town centres, and better allocating roads and car parking to more efficient use of space such as public space for parks, gardens, cafes and restaurants, and bike and electric bike parking. Rural communities are connected to urban centres with safe and direct walking and cycling routes.

LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 2	KO1: It is important to consider the link between required area for housing and the current policies around car dependency. The space requirement can be greatly reduced by addressing the space hungry needs of parking and roads. Urban sprawl will be in direct contradiction to the stated climate mitigation objectives of the council. KO10: The transport emissions of housing developments must be included in the definition of net zero, this will necessitate prioritising active travel provision. KO11: This is not ambitious enough, given the timeframe of the local plan, the ending of reliance on fossil fuels should be the aim rather than a reduction of reliance. KO16: the role of active travel is highly supported, but the integration into developments and transport planning is not visible from the objectives, it is not a separate issue. KO28: the concept of the 15minute neighbourhood should be considered as the definition with which to make this objective a reality. The sustainable accessibility of amenities and facilities should be <u>within a 15 active travel or public transport journey.</u>
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 3	Employment land should be situated in locations that are readily walkable and cyclable from urban centres along safe and segregated paths, or located <u>at sustainable transport interchanges such as railway stations that can be reached on foot or by bike.</u>
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 5	Town centre development should be focussed on ensuring that there is a sufficiently large concentration of development in a single place that a person can meet many or all of their needs conveniently on foot or bike without being forced to travel out-of-town or to areas that are only accessible by <u>motor vehicle.</u>
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	Out-of-town drive and park only development should generally be restricted. All town centres should be readily accessible by safe, direct, and attractive footpaths and cycle paths. Motor vehicles should be prevented from driving directly through the middle of town centres so as to avoid wasting space and creating danger, pollution, and noise. This is stifling economic growth and an increase of tourism. Rather, motor vehicles should be encouraged to take indirect routes around town centres so as to discourage unnecessary motor vehicle use and to support and encourage walking and cycling. "No cycling" areas should be removed. Sufficient secure and convenient parking for bikes and electric bikes should be provided. Retailers should be able to easily apply for bike parking to be installed at their location if requested.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Supporting our Town Centres	Out-of-town drive and park only development should generally be restricted. All town centres should be readily accessible by safe, direct, and attractive footpaths and cycle paths. Motor vehicles should be prevented from driving directly through the middle of town centres so as to avoid wasting space and creating danger, pollution, and noise. This is stifling economic growth and an increase of tourism. Rather, motor vehicles should be encouraged to take indirect routes around town centres so as to discourage unnecessary motor vehicle use and to support and encourage walking and cycling. "No cycling" areas should be removed. Sufficient secure and convenient parking for bikes and electric bikes should be provided. Retailers should be able to easily apply for bike parking to be installed at their location if requested.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 8	Cherwell should not introduce a policy requiring minimum separation distances between residential properties. High density supports walkable and cyclable towns where residents can fulfil the majority of their needs on foot or by bike. Larger separation distances makes it more difficult to provide facilities due to insufficient density, forcing facilities to be located only where they can be accessed by motor vehicle. Detached housing is also less energy efficiency than terraced and adjoining properties.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Separation Distances	No
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 9	New homes should have sufficient safe and convenient bike parking spaces as well as communal bike parking for visitors.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Given the vast proportion of emissions in Cherwell are for transport, yet most local journeys distances that are walkable or cyclable are currently made by motor vehicle, serious emphasis should be placed on ensuring that all construction enables residents, workers, and visitors to reach it safely, directly, and conveniently on foot or by bike. Less reliance should be placed on electric vehicles given that electric vehicles do not address the negative consequences of manufacture, traffic congestion, traffic accidents, parking space requirements, waste of road space, danger, and undermining of public health.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 14	Many areas where children would historically have played on the streets have been rendered too dangerous due to the quantity, speed, and size of motor vehicles. Streets should be designed so that it is safe for children to play in the street, or ride their bikes safely without supervision. Low traffic neighbourhoods would contribute to this coupled with the concepts from the Netherlands and Germany of 'Residential areas' and 'Cycle Streets' <u>where walking, playing and cycling are prioritised and cars are 'guests'</u>
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 15	Sports facilities should be within cycling distance of most users. However the planned relocation of sports facilities from Bicester to Chesterton indicates that insufficient land has been earmarked near to housing and that they are increasingly built in locations that makes their access car <u>dependent.</u>
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	One aspect of good design and beauty is to avoid areas that are dominated by cars, car-parking, and roads. While the car has its place, good design can ensure that other factors such as public spaces, greenery, footpaths and cycle paths through green areas are highlighted.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20-minute neighbourhoods are a helpful set of principles for ensuring that places are well-designed and sustainable. The 20 minutes should be measured by walking and cycling distances.



LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The transport hierarchy has never really been implemented properly, despite previous documents referring to it. Development is currently focussed on motor vehicle travel and increasing the number of cars on the road. Serious steps need to be taken to ensure that other alternatives are available, and properly funded. The most obvious is to put in place concrete commitments to ensure that transport and connectivity properly applies the transport hierarchy, with reducing the need to travel and enabling active travel as the starting point. Targets and monitoring need to be in place for active travel to enable the level of transparency and modelling capability that is currently reserved for vehicle traffic only. Rural areas are now becoming more feasible to connect with the advent of the electric bike. Measures should be taken to connect outlying villages with local towns in a safe and convenient way. Dedicated, off-carriageway, cycle routes should be implemented, and certain connecting roads should be closed to motor vehicle traffic.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Transport Policies	There needs to be a detailed Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure plan for all key towns and villages that specifies exactly what pedestrian and cycle routes and crossings need to be constructed where. Currently provision is very haphazard and up to the whim of the developer, rather than being a proper, joined-up and cohesive plan that all parties are working towards. The progress in implementing the LCWIP should form a key measurable and public metric on the county's progress to decarbonising transport.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? The approach to infrastructure delivery needs to be revised. Currently, it is very backward looking and locks in previous shortcomings. If there is limited walking and cycling due to limited or no safe or direct supporting infrastructure, this is often taken to be evidence of a lack of demand. Demand should be estimated on the basis that suitable infrastructure was provided and with a view to the levels of active travel demand needed to reduce vehicle congestion and transport emissions. Along key routes, walking and cycling levels should massively increase to be in line with climate and health goals. Grouping infrastructure by how accessible it currently is by walking, cycling, and public transport will tend to lock in these types of shortcomings. Better would be to group infrastructure according to how accessible it would be if walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure was improved.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Given the vast benefits of creating walking and cycling infrastructure over motor vehicle infrastructure, and the current imbalance in the networks, funding should be weighted towards walking and cycling.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 22	Any development in or around Bicester must be well connected by cycling and walking provision, this would favour more central locations, but where expansion takes place the connectivity and extent of land needed can be limited by prioritising active travel provision over space inefficient car centred developments.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Option 24	The main problem for Bicester is that it is dominated by motor vehicles and the public space is wasted. The historic and beautiful market square is a car park and huge traffic gyratory, despite there being ample parking nearby and other routes around the town centre that do not require driving straight through the middle of the most valuable public space. This parking is an inefficient use of space, limiting the number of customers who can access the centre as well as making the place less appealing for customers to visit due to noise, pollution and danger from traffic. It is obvious that the Market Square should be closed to motor vehicles to encourage tourists, visitors, and shoppers back to the centre. Motor vehicles should be routed around the Market Square, not through it. Equally, Church Street and the Causeway are the most beautiful and historical areas, but are ruined by traffic driving straight through. The Causeway should also be closed to motor vehicles.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	These spaces could be protected and enhanced by being connected by safe (away from the road) and direct walking and cycling routes to discourage motor vehicles and encourage visitors.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Bicester would be eminently walkable and cyclable due to its lack of hills and compact layout. Most places in Bicester are no more than 20 minutes from other places. The main obstacle to walking and cycling is a lack of direct and safe walking and cycling routes. Many routes are on busy roads with fast cars, with poor quality paths, barriers, uneven surfaces, and lack of priority. Junctions are dangerous and indirect. To reduce car dependency, steps should be taken to make it more convenient to walk and cycle than to drive. This might involve requiring car drivers to take a slightly more indirect route, but the consequences would be to support walking and cycling and remove cars from the road, making it quicker and more convenient for those who choose to drive. Cycle routes should be made accessible to the disabled and those with less usual bikes this opens the possibility of use by mobility scooters. The London Road level crossing should be closed to motor vehicles, but made accessible to pedestrians, mobility scooter users and cyclists with a safe and convenient underpass.
LPR-B-760	BicesterBUG	Question - Development Management Policies	It would be helpful to have a plan for promoting walking and cycling in towns and villages, and for connecting towns and villages.
LPR-B-761	Andy French	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-761	Andy French	Option 19	To the north of Banbury. There is mention of significant housing being developed in Adderbury. Adderbury does not have the services to support this. It doesn't have a Dr's or dentist, the local ones in Deddington and Bloxham are already at capacity with long waiting lists. Before looking at housing the services need to be improved. Adderbury is a small village that wants to continue to be that, not just an extension to Banbury.
LPR-B-761	Andy French	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes
LPR-B-761	Andy French	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.

LPR-B-761	Andy French	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District).
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Question - Green Belt	No housing should be considered for green belt countryside.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree with approach. Rural locations can not support the massive growth in housing development without major infrastructure changes and these are not environmentally responsible. So no development should take place. Don't build in remote areas
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Infrastructure delivery - look at areas by catchment and accessibility.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Retain views of St Mary's Church.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 21	Allocate the site as a regeneration are to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-763	Mark Symonds	Option 32	Yes (more weight to accessibility) - walking/ Cycling
LPR-B-763	Mark Symonds	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-762	Mark Symonds	Adderbury	Find the proposed building plan disgusting. Green belt land should be used for farming and agriculture which since leaving the EU will be coming important as the UK looks to support it self. This area has seen a massive increase in house building, above the government's guidelines. There all planning should be stopped with immediate effect.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Question - Local Green Spaces	The green space between Banbury and the villages to the south should be protected- specifically between Banbury and Bodicote, all green space around Adderbury should be preserved and not developed. Deddington green space should also be protected. The new houses built specifically around Adderbury haven't even sold from the last developer and remain empty to this day. An utter disgrace and disrespect to local village residents that this was not made more visible and not provided is greater clarity.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes, retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church to protect a historical site.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 21	No development along the canal
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Question - Banbury's open spaces	Regenerate what's there but do not develop green space

LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Better bus service and cheaper parking at the train station
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 30	absolutely no further development of Adderbury. Housing should not be made outside the town centre of Banbury, this will reduce travel to and from the town, reducing pollution and promoting a living vital town centre. Further Developing Adderbury will cause irreversible damage to the local area, putting stress on an already choked road system through the village. Furthermore the historic Adderbury Circular Walk will be no longer the beautiful green space it is as several borders will be compromised which is absolutely unacceptable. All residential housing bordering Croft Farm and that part of the circular walk will be significantly devalued and devastated by Croft farm land development. It is a popular walking field as part of the local parish, it is a destination for walkers from all parts of the county and country and it's loss would take an irreversible negative toll on the villages landscape and environment. As a popular family exercise route and part of a wider green belt, Croft farm should be protected indefinitely. Access would be problematic, a pollutant and a danger to the many local children walking through Croft Lane on the way to school at Christopher Rawlings Primary school.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 31	All local residents should be contacted individually about development around villages. It feels underhanded and corrupt that residents find out by chance. The council is deceptive and backs developers without consideration for impact in local residents
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 32	It should not be allowed to happen. Yes settlement boundaries should be defined so residents know exactly what to expect for the future of their village and can have a voice. Also so their home and investment there-in can be protected from devaluation should development take place
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Option 34	Absolutely zero environment value seems to be placed on the development around villages and more specifically Adderbury. The local ecosystems will be destroyed, the natural environment that people sought in moving to Adderbury will no longer exist and the village will become more polluted due to extra traffic and higher population. The reason family move to villages is to enjoy green spaces and the natural environment - which is irreversibly destroyed by further development. A historic village like Adderbury is unique and should be protected.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Parish Profile	The maps available to the public are illegible. A very clear and well labelled detailed map should be provided to ALL residents rather than the council hoping their poorly produced map will slip under the radar of villagers. It is an absolute disgrace how this is currently handled. It is not transparent nor brought up the attention of those it should. People's lives are being impacted by this and it's just seen as a money making exercise with no consideration to the environment and impact on families lives
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Question - Development Management Policies	protecting villages division from towns, protecting heritage and green open spaces.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	LPR-A-077	Object. This development should absolutely not go ahead as would remove a public access area and forms part of the Adderbury circular walk. It is a popular walking area with historic stiles, unique natural features and routes dating back hundreds of years. Also the land at Croft farm is a popular exercise area for local dog owners and families, all year round. The extra traffic and resultant pollution, local road congestion, and hazard this would represent would change this historic village forever. The village's historic and environmental value should be protected at all cost. Ecosystems will be negatively impacted, drainage and flood areas at the bottom of the hill at Croft farm will be pushed past their tipping point. Flooding is already a massive issue at the bottom of the hill so will be further compounded by development as there will be no natural drainage but the downhill reservoirs. It would be a local environmental catastrophe to develop Croft farm.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	LPR-A-156	Object. Local road / traffic congestion, pollution, ecosystems will be devastated.
LPR-B-763	Beverley Martin	Adderbury	Object - All sites bordering east and west of Adderbury village - Local road / traffic congestion, pollution, ecosystems will be devastated.
LPR-B-764	Louis Pouyanne	Option 1	Please do not further develop Adderbury. The village has grown hugely in recent years and the facilities and roads are not able of coping. The conservation area is subject to heavy traffic and is becoming dangerous
LPR-B-764	Louis Pouyanne	Option 4	Option 3 - Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-764	Louis Pouyanne	Option 6	Option 2 - Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-764	Louis Pouyanne	Option 7	Option 2 - Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-764	Louis Pouyanne	Question - Green Belt	please keep Adderbury distinct and separate from the Banbury sprawl, the village is unique and has 'chocolate box' appeal
LPR-B-764	Louis Pouyanne	Adderbury	Adderbury is a beautiful village which runs the risk of being over developed and subsumed into Banbury. We have experienced much housebuilding in recent years and none of the roads etc. have been improved. The conservation area is over crowded with traffic and is becoming very dangerous for pedestrians
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 1	As a resident of Adderbury I am appalled by the plan for more housing development in the green spaces around the village. The village has had a large amount of development during the past few years and housing is still not sold in these developments. Why would more housing be the answer? Adderbury is a small community which prides itself on the conservation of the beautiful countryside around the village and it would be devastating to lose even more of this.

LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 3	Option 1 - At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 4	Option 3 - Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 6	Option 2 - Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 7	Option 2 - Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 8	Option 1 - Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Question - Separation Distances	Yes
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 9	Option 1 - Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 10	Option 3 - Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 11	Option 2 - Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 12	Option 3 - Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 13	Option 1 - Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 14	Option 3 - Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 15	Option 2- Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Question - Transport & Connectivity	yes, the approach should be different for the rural areas, for example focusing on low carbon technology rather than a reduction in the need to travel
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 16	Option 1 - Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 17	Option 1 - Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy and Option 4 - Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 18	Option 2- limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes, retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 20	Option 2 - allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 30	Option 1- Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 31	Option 3 - Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 32	yes give more weight to availability of certain services and facilities. Most important Primary School, Secondary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, Regular Bus services
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 33	Option 3 - Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-765	Lucy Waters	Option 34	Option 1 - Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 2	KO7 is a key point, Banbury town centre needs support. I appreciate there has been and is investment in certain areas (CQ2, Lock29) which is great, but the remaining CQ1 is becoming empty and the centre of town looks run down. Town centres are fundamentally changing, but they should still remain as hubs for our community and Banbury should move with the changing times by not allowing the lowest common denominator, in the form of more card shops, gambling stores etc.
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. 100% more needs to be done in terms of cycling routes throughout the town. A lot of the paper refers to becoming carbon neutral, and a key element to that must include the provision of well planned cycling infrastructure.
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Question - Separation Distances	yes. Living on Longford Park, its not right to cram as many houses in as possible to maximise profits for already very rich organisations. These are peoples homes, its their lives, its children's childhoods, not numbers on a spreadsheet.

LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Question - Housing Policies	New developments MUST be held accountable for the residents that live there. Living on Longford Park the residents were sold the idea of a community in terms of a doctors, a shop, pub etc. which has not been delivered due to a lack of backbone or authority or creativity or engagement with the council. They simply build more houses, maximise profits and walk away.
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Question - Travelling Communities	Ideally out of town
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 10	All new builds homes should require a certain percentage of solar panel installation, at the cost of the developer.
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	yes
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach to support the Local Plan Review. Yes the approach should be different for the rural areas, for example focusing on low carbon technology rather than a reduction in the need to travel. Better cycling infrastructure and police engagement with the cycling community would help to drive less or use alternative transport modes with lower emissions.
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 18	focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 19	to the north of the town to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11) to the west of the town
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes, retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Cycling infrastructure
LPR-B-766	Ryan Day	LPR-A-007	Object.
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 1	Apparently we are in a climate emergency, so why not take more green fields and tarmac them. We need to use what we have got, consume less, use existing housing more effectively, use brownfield sites and stop eroding the countryside.
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 2	economic growth is incompatible with saving the environment
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. Now is the time to have a total rethink about land usage, space above shops currently unused, empty shops, offices
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. I doubt retail will ever be the same after Covid so some shops will need to be repurposed
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Make parking easier, more independent shops. More variety at the moment it is coffee shops and nail bars. Personally I only go to town if I have to because of parking charges why pay when you can park free on the retail parks. The market is much better now though
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Supporting Our Town	don't overload the town with the same options, such as coffee shops, just to get premises let. Variety is needed
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Separation Distances	Don't know
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes

LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Well it should be a level playing field with new housing on VAT. Historic buildings need protection, although that didn't work with Persimmon homes knocking down an historic building in Banbury
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation. Renewables have a carbon footprint to, such as service roads needing to be built, are the wind turbines imported from abroad, more loss of green field sites. How often does the wind blow, sun shine. Put solar panels on roofs of factories/warehouses, there is enough ugly warehousing going up after all
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Yes stop building on greenfield sites
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Green Belt	Yes, stop absorbing villages into Towns, look at Bodicote, Drayton, Hanwell and what happened to the important gap between Banbury and Middleton Chnoney
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	To be quite honest the new building going on around Banbury I find boring, souless red brick boxes and why anyone would want to live near the motorway is beyond me
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	rural areas are fast disappearing as Banbury spreads its tentacles further
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Transport & Connectivity	No do not agree with the prposed transport and connectivity approach. Public transport is not convenient, I live in a village with no bus service at all. By car you can please yourself, no carrying heavy shopping on a bus, no waiting around in all weathers and no catching covid or anything else from anyone else. Yes the approach should be different for the rural areas, for example focusing on low carbon technology rather than a reduction in the need to travel
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy and Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 19	Other, Green fields should not be used
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes, retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church; We have to have something nice to look at, it is now Shed City coming up the M40
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 32	yes, most important are Primary School Secondary School Local Shop Regular Bus services. Yes. should we give more weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Settlement	Yes to protect the identity of villages
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals. Growing food should be as valuable as development Land
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district

LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Developers seem to have the upper hand, once they have an option on land they will just keep coming back, villages need more protection
LPR-B-767	Sarah Browne	Question - Green Belt	Far too many greenfield sites proposed (submitted sites)
LPR-B-768	David Erskine	Adderbury	no more development, i.e. building of dwellings in Adderbury.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Measures to make town centres thrive: I'd like to see much more imagination in making town centres attractive, e.g creative paving design (Banbury's paving in the marketplace area and Parsons street is abysmal), attractive street 'furniture', benches, more flower tubs and trees where possible, more public spaces within town centres for people to congregate, more live events, create a thriving market(s)- there doesn't seem to be the will on the part of the Banbury Town Council to make it happen - make it a must-visit event for Banbury to bring in visitors. Make it easy for people to come into the town centre which means better bus services, cycle routes and free parking. I am in favour of more residential accommodation in town centres to keep them alive.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Supporting our Town	we need financial incentives to encourage and support traders in to centres
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. I want to see more 'council' housing in whatever form that takes to provide affordable housing for all that is of high quality and well managed and to remove the stigma of social housing that it is only for problem/poor people
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Housing Policies	I'm not sure if this is the right section but shouldn't we be insisting on solar panels and other technology to save energy
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Travelling Communities	I agree with the proposal but can't suggest a location.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Better public transport, cycle lanes, community-generated and utilised energy projects
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Green Belt	Urban sprawl in Banbury
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. For too long new housing and commercial development has been carried out with no reference to this issue- result loss of biodiversity and increase flood risk - i.e. not enough land to soak up rainfall and increased runoff due to too much concrete. Spiceball Park is a good example of what can be achieved if there is a plan and a will- e.g. re-wilding in an area surrounded by major roads and industry.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	No, only that it is a bloody good idea.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 14	Play/recreation provision for young people has been cut drastically. I grew up in London with access to a boy's club- very fond memories. But it needs to be done properly with adequate funding to provide a high-quality experience
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements

LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Preservation and maintenance of public footpaths. After years of neglect and vandalism (inc by LA's) now is the time to preserve and cherish our historic assets and environment
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Consulting local people.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes agreed. Great idea. Good for community cohesion and all the health/enviromental benefits that come with it
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Transport & Connectivity	It's time to rethink transport and connectivity and the plan is attempting to do this. It may take decades to change people's car use but if the infrastructure and connectivity is in place, it could work. Cars dominate and are oppressive to pedestrians, cyclists and people with mobility problems. Cars need to be pushed down the heirarchy. Yes, the approach should be different for the rural areas. Cheap or free frequent, reliable, clean buses/trams. Banbury needs a transport hub to centralise/connect buses, trains and other transport modes. May not be possible?
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Transport Policies	No new road building. Improve existing roads and provide safe cycle lanes. I'd want to restrict new residential/commercial development related to the new east-west corridor from Oxford to Milton Keynes/Cambridge
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 19	a combination of the above
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes, retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church; it is such an important landmark. I live in Easington- People's Park and the housing in Bath Road and surrounding roads should be preserved from unsympathetic development
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Supporting our Town	I think you need a team dedicated to this. Am I right in thinking the majority of CDC councillors live in the villages? We need the views of local people. Banbury Town Centre has so much potential but has been neglected by the incumbent CDC.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Another missed opportunity with Castle Quay 1. I was gobsmacked that there seemed to be little consideration of the canal as a leisure and tourist facility, an example being the veranda at the back of Debenhams being used for wheelie bins and random storage. Castle Quay 2 may change all that but there is a ridiculous design fault at the rear of Lock 29- sitting down for a coffee one's view of the canal is blocked by a wall!! We must retain/develop canalside as a public space. It could be great!
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Banbury's open spaces	Adequate funding, maintenance, and encouragement. I live at the back of Easington Rec which is an example of what can be achieved. New play area for toddlers, tree planting to replace lost horse chestnuts, picnic tables and incredibly well managed football pitches. A few more benches would be welcome and maybe some exercise installations like they have in Spiceball Park. Banbury Town Council are doing a grand job and local residents thankfully thwarted an attempt by a CDC councillor to dig part of it up for a car park! It is a much loved open space.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Addressing Inequality in	Agree with suggestions about housing, training, employment, etc. We have an incredibly diverse population, including pockets of severe poverty, and we should do all we can to support everybody in the community.
LPR-B-769	Derek Evans	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	I am able to walk into town but use my car for the retail parks and supermarkets. I am recovering from surgery at the moment and yesterday I walked into town but needed to get a bus back (to the Horton/or the Bloxham Road). I went to the bus station but I needed to wait about half an hour for the next bus. On a cold miserable day this was too long to wait.
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 1	I fear that the promise to focus growth in towns and sustainable villages (noted in point 4.3) is false. As a resident in Adderbury I am aware of 4 new developments to the village in the past 5 years, with a new development having just been approved for the land off Berry Hill Road, adjacent to Last House. All of these developments have been put in place without resources for local families such as schools. The school in Adderbury is currently above maximum with neighbouring village schools in Bloxham and Deddington also reaching their maximum, meaning children in our village are having to go to schools in Banbury, which should be unacceptable. People move to villages for the appeal of having a local school where your children can get to know people in their village and build a community, this is no becoming impossible for the villages surrounding Banbury. There has also been no promise in the plan of improving the local hospital facilities despite the local area growing so vastly within the past 6 years. Despite the growth, downgrades to the much loved Horton hospital have continued and residents in Banbury and the local areas have suffered greatly for this failure. I feel that this plan is unsustainable and will ruin the communities and character of our much loved villages in the area. Our villages are already growing to the size of towns, but without the vital infrastructure for roads, schools and other resources much needed by communities.

Page 1997



LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 2	KO1. I feel that the draft objectives are completely in the wrong place. More than enough land has been used to enable the growth of the town, however you have not met the needs of thousands of local people who are still unable to afford housing in the area they were brought up in. With average house prices of new builds in the area over £300,000 and the governments Help to buy ISA having a cap on housing above £300,000 , added to the difficulties in young working families being able to afford mortgages means that the housing and land you have allocated for this purpose, is ineffectual to those that should be benefitting. KO3: Please could you detail that way in which you plan to extend education and training within the area? With schools and colleges already over worked, an increased incentive to encourage businesses to offer apprenticeships would be the only way? How much budget will you use for this? KO5: How will you support sustainable agriculture and farm diversification? Will you encourage local shops to sell farmers meat in their stores? Will you support subsidy for people who shop locally, supporting local farmers throughout our county and encouraging locals to eat a more varied diet so that we all contribute to sustainability? Will the impact on diet be taught in local schools to educate local people on this topic? KO9: Our local beauty has already been impacted by the amount of building works for both (unaffordable) housing and HS2. This is already an objective that has been failed, and this plan supports more building and more tearing down of our natural beauty
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. There has been many areas of land and planning already granted for many areas outside of the town. Therefore the town centre itself needs to be focused on driving up the local economy with shops, restaurants, and leisure facilities that can be used to help improve our economy
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	Policies that should be considered are to lower parking fees within the smaller towns in Oxfordshire such as banbury. The price of parking has a huge affect on shoppers spending time in our towns and the price to park often drives consumers out of town towards the retail park, meaning the council is left to bare the burden of centres such as Castle Quay, which is now a derelict site, which they are still paying off, whilst trying to build a Castle Quay 2.0, which went ahead, despite lots of units needing to be filled. Local towns such as Brackley give their residents an hours free parking in the centre of town which encourages people to use the town to go to their local stores including the butchers and bakers, as people are able to make use of them without having to pay for parking. A very small fee for parking (£1.20 for 4 hours) is seen in Buckingham and other neighbouring towns, all of which have a bustling centre of town at the weekend, unlike Banbury
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 6	Stop providing local "Affordable" housing that cannot be owned by people in the local area, and bring in stricter policies for those who rent housing from housing associations so that those who do not look after their housing or practice anti-social behaviours are not living next to people that have worked hard to buy their house in a nice place to live.
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 7	Encourage shared ownership rather than renting by creating schemes that are affordable to those who need housing to encourage people to be in a position to purchase a home.
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement. Do not rely on building associations to meet the standards for new builds. Ensure that local council are checking the builds meet quality assurances for damp proofing and noise protection.
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Question - Separation Distances	Yes. When building next to homes which are adjacent to land that will be built on, ensure the space does not encroach on the house. There should be at least 5 metres between each section of land.
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined allage areas of play Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Option 15	There are many derelict buildings in Banbury which could be used for projects such as recreational centres for communities. Please don't feel that you need to acquire more green space and land to build these centres and sports facilities. These can be created with buildings we already have, just like CQ2 could have been
LPR-B-770	Jessica Dixon	Adderbury	These sites include spaces in both Adderbury and Bodicote which have already seen extensive building in the past 5 years. Adderbury has already had 5 new estates built in the village, with an school that had already reached maximum capacity and a new plot (on Berry Hill Road) which goes against the neighbourhood plan as it was outside the boundaries of the village. The people that live in the village are keen to see this building work stop, to protect our village status and the community that we currently live in. If the current suggested spaces are used, there will be no gap between us and neighbouring villages and we will soon merge into the town of Banbury. This is a completely unacceptable plan, especially with the infrastructure we have. To increase the infrastructure to meet the building, we would need to completely reinvent the village into a town which is unjust, unnecessary and unfair on those that live in and have grown up in this community. I implore you to stop recommending the land in Adderbury to be built on for now. Houses are still for Sale having not been bought since built in the sites which were developed two years ago, and therefore development in this area is not need currently.

LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. North Newington is a category C village and as such has limited services. There is no public transport whatsoever, the once a day bus was discontinued again at the end of October, it was of little use as it came at 11.30am and returned from Banbury centre at 1.30pm. There are no footpaths or cycle lanes to any of the main roads out of the village. There is a primary school with appx 102 places, 1 small green area and a small playground, the village has 1 pub. There are no work opportunities within the village. The village is used as a rat-run and is a natural filter into Banbury from surrounding villages such as Shutford/Wroxton/Drayton and any further development within those villages would also have a huge negative impact on North Newington, traffic and parking is already a huge issue with the village becoming gridlocked at certain times of the day regularly leaving homeowners unable to access their properties. The drainage, electric supplies, broadband & mobile phone signal are all very poor and could not support any developments.
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. North Newington and other Cat C villages should remain as 'infill & conversion' development only and only at an organic rate of growth.
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Option 32	Yes. Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services. <u>Yes more weight should be given to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling</u>
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Question - Settlement	Yes: To prevent 'opening the floodgates' on developing every possible bit of green space, the likes of which we have seen with Hanwell Fields.
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Option 34	The Historic and Natural Environment is of paramount importance and should be protected. Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which <u>would be the subject of additional policy guidance</u>
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	By not pressuring rural areas to commit to offering sites for development or altering the Green Belt Boundaries.
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	Question - Development Management Policies	The district is continually under pressure to provide 'affordable housing' yet there is no criteria as to what that means or how much an affordable home should cost, CDC should have something in place within the planning process so that when our valuable beautiful countryside is ripped up and replaced with housing the houses are actually affordable, I see developments around the district with 3,4,5 bedroom homes being built all the time, these are surely not affordable for the younger generations but of course are more valuable to the developers. CDC should also have much tighter rules and regulations regarding planning for the big developers to ensure they are building good quality homes and providing things like enough parking spaces.
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	LPR-A-004	These sites in North Newington are not suitable for development for the reasons I have laid out in my answer to Q:19
LPR-B-771	Elaine Boswell	LPR-A-135	These sites in North Newington are not suitable for development for the reasons I have laid out in my answer to Q:19
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 1	Agree with much of it but there are some missing elements. Whilst it's right to celebrate improvement in some transport links, other transport links are deteriorating. Deregulated bus services have reduced services to rural towns and villages. Cross county links are poor, for e.g. you can't easily go from Bicester to Aylesbury unless you drive. Safe cycling for families is absent from the vision. If you want to improve family health, make it very easy and very safe for families to cycle to shops, schools and local community centres. There is almost no mention of this in the vision. Cycling from the villages to the main towns is almost impossible despite the fact the distances are very short. There is an overemphasis in the role of the economy and business. Charities, volunteering, community institutions are all vital parts of a vibrant community but appear lumped together under "other partners"
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 2	There are too many and they are rather vague. How do we know you have met the objectives? What are the priorities?
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges, Mostly on previously developed land At the larger villages
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). Far too much distribution capacity being built. Focus on affordable small business and startup spaces. Please ensure all new builds have local energy generation (solar, wind for eg)
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Supporting	Low cost pop up spaces for community meetings, training etc. many small businesses don't have space to run training events and current commercial provision is too expensive
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Free parking is essential and pedestrianised spaces in all the major towns. There is no need for cars to drive to shops directly. Build secure cycle storage and plenty of open spaces for the arts and community events
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. The definition of affordable is vague. Let's be honest 'affordable' is an oxymoron for many. The council should be a major builder of housing stock for social and affordable housing. Current building is creating ghettos- social housing is small, crowded and poorly served by broadband, leisure and community services.

LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Housing Policies	All new builds should be built around pedestrians not cars. Developers would be required to fund dedicated healthy transport corridors, not road building
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Separation Distances	The current provision around Bicester is absolutely rammed in. Small or no gardens, no drive ways (think how you are going to get people to charge their cars!), roads are impossible to navigate in the evening with all the cars parked on streets and so on. When we moved here estate agents told us Bicester was famous for tiny gardens and being overlooked. It hasn't changed.
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Travelling Communities	There should be a proper contribution of serviced, managed and well connected sites for travellers. The current provision is terrible. We can use compulsory purchase for HS2, we should do it to provide appropriate housing for people, to
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Consider other forms of energy generation that don't require direct modification to the building for e.g. community level energy generation, small scale energy from waste, ground heat source
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Our standards are far too low - we should be much more ambitious for construction standards
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Stop building massive warehouses everywhere
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes, agree with the approach. Needs more emphasis on protected cycle routes and regulating public transport. Deregulation of buses has robbed villages of regular, reliable, low cost public transport. It has meant many people are isolated without a private car. Option 3 for rural areas. It's time to be radical with (for eg) protected healthy transport corridors (have you tried to cycle along the A41??), regulated local bus services, and pool car or community car systems
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Unbelievable that some new homes currently being built don't have fibre broadband. Should never have been approved
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 22	focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Bicester
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 23	A combination of the above
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Stop building houses so close together Link all existing spaces with protected healthy transport corridors (dedicated cycle ways for eg)
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Local Green Spaces in Bicester	The transport plans need rethinking. Still looks like they are built around the needs of car users
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Safe cycle routes (dedicated not shared) Regulated bus services (deregulation has been disastrous for villages)
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 25	We need a space for performing arts and a gallery

LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 30	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Yes more weight should be given to accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Settlement	Yes. Try to preserve village identity and unique settings
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	This engagement exercise is a perfect illustration of the challenge. 116 pages of difficult to read text. (It should be presented differently using 'breakfast table' language) Developing a local plan would need dedicated support from staff who can help people get organised and present their ideas with good engagement. It's a good idea but it seems that communities spend a very long time developing them only to be overruled at a later stage. It has to be genuine opportunity for ownership of local decisions otherwise it's a waste of everyone's time (inc yours)
LPR-B-772	Tim Curry	General	It's taken me two sittings and 1.5hrs to read the doc and comment... and I read complex documents all the time. We must do better with creating local conversations using accessible information and genuine opportunities for engagement
LPR-B-773	Matt Winser	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-773	Matt Winser	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-773	Matt Winser	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Yes, more weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling
LPR-B-773	Matt Winser	LPR-A-148	Deddington Parish Local Plan; 148: Grove Fields (20.75 acres) to the south of Hempton Road and west of the A4260. This area is currently farmland, with a well used public footpath through the centre of it. It directly overlooks and is next to the boundary of our property. We would strongly oppose any future development of this land. The land proposed here would provide the opportunity for an enormous number of houses, which if permitted would place significant further pressure on village services. The primary school is now having to refuse places to siblings of children already attending due to being over-subscribed. The school is bordering on the position of not being able to accept all children from within catchment. The primary school has limited space and opportunity to expand. Any significant expansion of the school would be to the detriment of availability of outdoor space for the children to have secure access to. Additional households placed on this parcel of land would exacerbate this issue severely. Current access to this parcel of land is provided by a service lane off the A4260, which passes a retirement housing project (currently a cul-de-sac). Any increase of traffic flow to this lane would not be sustainable and would also cause disruption to traffic flow along the A4260 posing a safety risk. Additional access points would most likely require the removal of either property or land adjoining this parcel, meaning a further knock-on impact on the surrounding existing households. Suspected vulnerable properties would be along the Hempton Road where large detached properties could be targeted. Any significant development of this land would likely have a negative impact on the value of properties adjoining this parcel, as the benefit of unspoilt views and not being over-looked have always been a key asset of the neighbouring properties. The current rainwater drainage in the streets surrounding this parcel of land are frequently overwhelmed in heavy rain. Development of land in Grove Fields would remove the natural soakaway and likely cause increased pressure on these drainage.
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 1	Banbury is growing too fast and support services are not being expanded enough. The hospitals and local GP surgeries can not cope with the population growth. Roads are busy all the time, we really need to stop building boxes and develop buildings already in the town
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land. A combination of all the above
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Question - Supporting	Less huge ugly warehouses. Our M40 junction is getting too busy
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Our town centre is full if empty shops, parking charges encourage people to use retail parks instead. Free parking for one hour would encourage more people shopping in town.
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Parking charges need to be reviewed.
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Question - Supporting our Town	Chipping Norton is a bustling town with FREE parking
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures

LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Question - Travelling Communities	It seems these travelling communities do not want permanent locations as they like to roam. I don't believe the centre of town is a good location by using lots of little bits of 'free' land.
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Our town had many beautiful old buildings which need preserving.
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 19	Other - Save green belt, use old sites and redevelop them.
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. It's beautiful unlike huge warehouses.
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-774	Fiona Marriott	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Encourage users to respect the spaces better. Banbury litter pickers are always cleaning up after irresponsible individuals. Better signage to put rubbish in bins, install cameras at recycling sites and follow up fly tipping
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 1	We do not need any more house building in Cherwell. GP surgeries are under extreme pressure due to increased number of registered patients. The building is not being balanced with infrastructure. Schools Surgeries Hospital Roads. It is shocking. Also you are planning to dig up green areas and destroy wild life habitats
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Greener sustainability
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Question - Supporting Our Town	Banbury
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 6	Other - Make all housing environmentally green
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Question - Separation Distances	Don't know
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility. Cut back on new housing tearing up our green spaces
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. No housing should be allowed to be built unless sustainable and not wrecking green space!
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Ensure more sustainable travel eg more cycle lanes electric bus services for all schools to stop parents driving their children. Make shops pay higher costs for plastic waste
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Question - Green Belt	Protecting wildlife
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district

LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 19	Other - none of the above
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 21	Other - none of the above
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 21	Protect the green fields adjacent to the canal so they are not built on
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Do not give planning permission
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	More cycle lanes and bus/mini bus availability
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-775	Lin Richards	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Provide a system to reimburse parking fees when visiting Banbury town centre retail outlets or allow at least 2030 minutes free parking
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Question - Supporting Our Town	I cannot support the suggestion for designating several town centre sites for travellers
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Question - Separation Distances	Yes
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Question - Housing Policies	Designate town centre sites for self build plots
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Question - Travelling Communities	Travellers should only be allowed access to the services and facilities that they pay for in the same way that other residents pay for them. Travelling communities are exactly that - travelling by definition - ANY sites designated for travellers should be in outer areas of towns and NOT in the centre of town(s) AND permanent residence in them should not be allowed.
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach to support the Local Plan Review. Option 3
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 16	Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 18	focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 19	Other - Green Belt should not be allocated to development. Suggestion for a new site - Any brownfield sites
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes.
LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission. Free parking for 20-30 minutes and/or a system to allow reimbursement of parking fees when visiting town centre retail / leisure outlets

LPR-B-776	Kevin Marriott	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Protect public walkways along the canal side
LPR-B-777	Nicholas D'Costa	LPR-A-091	The sustainability of the proposed development site 'LPR-A-091' is unsustainable for housing. The available infrastructure alone within the parish is already stretched to its limits currently. Indeed, increased traffic, population and removal of greenspace will negatively impact the current residents of Bodicote parish. A key element of the proposed development site will be the removal of highly desired greenspace aesthetic value for houses and residents on the south side of the parish, for which the housing development would remove in favour of undesirable housing. Further, the Bodicote parish is largely home to sensitive receptors, namely an older population. The construction phase alone would cause torment to the parish through noise, and importantly traffic. The roads of Bodicote are not suitable for construction traffic, which would create traffic jams, noise and air pollution, harming the local residents. Quite frankly a proposal to such a village surrounded by the country side for favour of housing would severely diminish the Bodicote parish's village spirit and vibe, removing its characteristic village features and feeling, to become another generic housing block stemming from Banbury. To summarise, the proposed site 'LPR-A-091' would be unsustainable to the Bodicote parish, removing its village spirit and unique characteristics, as well as destroying significant aesthetic value of the Oxfordshire countryside cannot happen. Further the increase in residents would be unsustainable from an infrastructure perspective, and the harm caused to the sensitive populations during the construction phase is intolerable.
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 1	Vision is considered to be overly long but it is agreed
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 2	The Town Council consider that there are too many key objectives, and they are not expressed in measurable terms. Notwithstanding the above comments we consider that they are all important , but it is difficult to assign greater weight to some rather than others. Those concerning, housing, education, the economy and healthy well being are considered the most significant.
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges A combination of all the above. Good public transport connections/provision is significant in the locational preferences for employment development. The type of commercial use is also seen as significant, and therefore some sites will be more suitable than others depending on the use proposed. <u>Please note that at a later point in the survey development to the east of the M40 at Junction 11 is considered inappropriate</u>
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Supporting Employment	The Town Council consider that it is important to try to ensure that provision for start up companies and other small unit users are catered for in new commercial development and that therefore a policy should be that new development should provide a percentage of the new floor space in units under 100 sq. metres
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. It is vital, that the town centre is retained as a vibrant commercial centre
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. It is considered that additional affordable housing should be provided above current rates whenever it is financially possible to do so
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement. <u>No logic in making space standards only applicable to affordable housing</u>
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Separation Distances	yes. It would be good to have the frequently used development management tool of separation distance included as a policy
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Travelling Communities	No particular site identified, but as an inclusive society we should be making efforts to identify and provide sites to avoid illegal encampments etc.
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Yes , any retrofitting needs to be done in such a way that the character and appearance of the historic building is not harmed
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused

LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Definitely against third option
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. Other- Provide LEAPS and NEAPS in new development but discontinue provision of LAPS Need to provide more sensory and accessible play provision Opportunities should be explored for enhancing existing facilities. LAPS are very expensive to maintain . We consider as the authority charged with running such facilities that there is an identified need to add facilities to make them more inclusive. Best use should be made by enhancing existing facilities
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	Banbury Town Council would like to suggest that all its existing play and sports provision sites should be included in this designation. Plans can be supplied
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	By having a policy that provides weight to the Cherwell Design Guide
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	yes agree.
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure. Provide a criteria based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Is it possible to ensure that the traffic issues of Banbury are dealt with as a function of new development i.e. identifying the need for a new link road from the south of the town to the motorway and/or new junctions
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 18	consider further urban extensions. limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Other- The acceptability of particular directions of growth is dependent on the scale and type of development and the traffic implications of that development, and upon transport and road proposals linked to them or provided separately All new development must deal with M40 junction capacity and the need for a new link road
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 19	to the north of the town to the south of the town to the west of the town a combination of the above
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	LPR-A-185	The Town Council does not agree with development around Nethercote east of the M40. This is considered to be harmful to that small settlement and to the landscape setting of Banbury (LPR-A-185 and LPR-A-168) The Town Council has also received a representation concerning development north of Wykham Lane and coalescence with Bodicote/highway issues( LPR-A-185 and 116)
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	LPR-A-168	The Town Council does not agree with development around Nethercote east of the M40. This is considered to be harmful to that small settlement and to the landscape setting of Banbury (LPR-A-185 and LPR-A-168) The Town Council has also received a representation concerning development north of Wykham Lane and coalescence with Bodicote/highway issues( LPR-A-185 and 116)
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes. It continues to be a prominent and well loved building
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.Primary shopping streets should be afforded the protection of needing an application for consideration of the impact of a use upon the vitality and viability of a street
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. The first option is preferred , but in recognition of the difficulty of bringing the site forward it is recognised that it may be necessary to have a larger component of mixed uses
LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Banbury's open spaces	the spaces could and should be designated as local green spaces . The Town Council's ownership and covenants on the land protect many from alternative use however. Many spaces could be enhanced using capital from development



LPR-B-778	Banbury Town Council	Question - Addressing Inequality in Banbury	Going back to the key objectives the Town Council is keen to see policies that address issues of educational attainment and the need for greater skills training opportunities. A holistic approach to improving community and leisure opportunities is also needed involving the enhancing of existing facilities as part of a package of infrastructure from new development
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Question -Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Reduce business rates. Make town centre parking free
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	On a case-by-case basis
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 18	consider further urban extensions
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 19	to the north of the town to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11) to the west of the town
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance

LPR-B-779	Dr Kim Allcott	Adderbury	I wish to register significant concerns over the sites put forward by landowners and developers for potential housing developments within the parish of Adderbury. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since the 2011 census, where 1064 dwellings were registered. Owing largely to post 2015 developments on each of the roads into the village (the Oxford, Aynho and Milton Roads), the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built (for example, the recent controversial permission by appeal for the 40 houses east of Berry Hill Road, which will destroy the last uninterrupted view of the church from afar), and this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011, before any further development is considered. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past six years, particularly, has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which, in a few short years have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if the two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare several of the proposed sites, if developed in their entirety, would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. Three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure, in terms of both roads and many local services, is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village, making it more of a rat run. Congestion will worsen where queues at other junctions inevitably increase. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. There are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking at drop-off and pick-up times. And, although the school isn't currently at capacity, having been 5 or so pupils under capacity for the last couple of years, anything more than, for example, 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. The extra traffic substantial new development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, particularly at the junction between the Oxford/Aynho Roads, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area. Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is also of concern to nearby residents school children. Concerned about the effects that water run-off from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths. . One very attractive (but perhaps not obvious) characteristic of villages like Adderbury is the lack of light pollution.
LPR-B-780	Michael Cherry	Option 18	consider further urban extensions
LPR-B-780	Michael Cherry	Option 19	to the north of the town to the south of the town to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-780	Michael Cherry	LPR-A-004	strongly oppose the proposal for development of this site. Unsuitability of village for extensive development due to inadequate facilities and service's; No spare capacity at Bishop carpenter school. Poor provision of transport to warriner school. No shop. No bus service. This was stopped last month due to lack of use. No community leisure spaces. Loss of prime agricultural land. Public footpath crosses the proposed site. Site is elevated above all 20 of the properties closest to the site causing loss of privacy, light and view. This site would usually be classed as backlands development.
LPR-B-780	Michael Cherry	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-780	Michael Cherry	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 1	The size of the project is ridiculous
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 2	What has happened to the countryside
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 19	Other - no development
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes.
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 21	Allocate the site as a regeneration are to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	park and ride
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans

LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Yes - both.
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-781	Hazel Hunt	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 1	The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is a waterways and well-being charity, and we are the guardian of 2,000 miles of historic waterways across England and Wales. We are among the largest charities in the UK. Our vision is that “living waterways transform places and enrich lives”. The Canal & River Trust has already expressed our support for the wider Oxfordshire vision and look forward to working with Oxford City and Cherwell Council in particular to achieve many of its aims, particularly in relation to improving carbon neutrality, physical and mental health and wellbeing, protecting and improving heritage assets and the natural environment, particularly in relation to the Oxford canal and to improving opportunities for sustainable travel. Within the Cherwell district we feel we will be able to work collaboratively to support sections 1,5,10 and 11 in particular and therefore we support the vision.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 2	The Canal & River Trust supports the key objectives, in particular; Key objectives 6,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,18,22,24,25,26,28,and 30. The most important objectives to the Trust, are those which we can help deliver or influence. These include. 14- although this should be widened to protect existing green and blue infrastructure rather than just secure new. 16 – Promote the use of the canal towpath 25- The Oxford Canal is a great example of a multifunctional asset which relates to this objective. 26- We fully support improving access to blue infrastructure in relation to the Oxford Canal , and this should include improvements to the accessibility of the both the canal towpath and access to the waterspace itself
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	The Electric Vehicle charging policy should consider widening the provision, where appropriate and viable, of electric charging bollards to serve the boating community, such as those being installed in Banbury.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district. The Trust would also support option 3 and suggest that the Oxford Canal could be a suitable location for enhancement projects
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Please can water quality be included as well as water resources.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. Use financial contributions to provide a wider range of sporting facilities to reflect a wider range of sports, not just those than tend to require playing pitch space. As an example, paddle boarding has been the fastest growing sport in the UK throughout the pandemic. The provision of safe water-based activity access points and associated facilities such as equipment storage and changing facilities should be considered in appropriate locations, following discussions with the Canal & River Trust and possible user groups
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	An Oxford Canal heritage policy which recognises the Oxford Canal as an open access, linear item of working industrial heritage and provides a summary history of the waterway, the length of waterway within Cherwell, numbers of different types of extant/operational structure (including distinguishing masonry arch bridges from lift bridges), the breakdown of these heritage assets in terms of designations and the number and collective length of conservations areas. In addition, an overview of the special interest/heritage significance and defining characteristics or distinctive qualities of the canal (and remains of disused loops) would also be helpful. Enhancing connectivity is an objective common to both the 2nd and 3rd bullets in the extract pdf. There is probably a need here for the insertion of a cautionary rider, emphasising the importance of safeguarding the integrity and definition of the canal, towpath and associated operational structures that reflect/express the functional tradition of the waterway.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The Council may wish to consider whether specific guidance on waterside development would be of benefit, and if so the Trust would welcome the opportunity to provide input.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 17	The Canal & River Trust would welcome the opportunity to provide information for future IDPs

LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	No comment except to reiterate need to for electric charging stations for all types of vehicle, including boats.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 20	Any changes to Castle Quays 1 should explore options to open up views and access to the canal. Using some units for alternative uses which do not require storeroom or delivery space to such an extent may allow dual aspect development which would benefit the canalside area
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. It is important to control development alongside the canal itself to provide high quality, vibrant, publicly accessible open space. This may be best achieved by a mixed-use scheme. As the canal is a conservation area any lack of control over design standards on adjacent land would be of concern, thus reducing control over the standard of future development would not be welcomed. The Canal & River Trust suggest that there is a need to improve the public realm alongside the canal, including the towpath itself and although S106 money has been provided for towpath improvement work as well as the provision of an improved 'shortcut' from the railway station to the towpath' as part of the Castle Quay 2 development further towpath upgrades may be possible as a result of a contribution from a residential or mixed use development, but perhaps may be less likely if the area is designated as a regeneration area. Towpath width is restricted in places within Banbury and there are structures, pinch points and narrow sections of canal towpath, such as adjacent locks, which may be a challenge in terms of increased usage and integrating with other towpath users, visitor moorings and anglers. It should therefore be recognised that increased usage, either as a result of new development, or as a result in changes to the numbers of visits by existing residents may require enhancements / improvements to width to cope with additional usage that go beyond simply resurfacing. The improvement of existing access points may also be required to support the proposed development in the canalside area. Widening and improvements to the towpath (and subsequently the canal bank) may be required to provide a useable and meaningful public realm and access route. All of this requires control through a masterplan document or design code. This is less likely to be possible if uncontrolled development is allowed as a result of a regeneration area designation.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Existing off-road walking and cycling routes should be improved and new routes linking to them provided. However, any new infrastructure or linkage must consider wider implications on existing infrastructure. As an example, a new bridge over the canal at Longford Park should only be provided if the towpath is enhanced to cater and cope with the additional usage because of a new link to the residential area.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	The lack of suitable sustainable transport links in rural areas increases dependence on private car journeys and policy support to widen the choice of transport available and the promotion of active travel and recreational usage should not be forgotten. The canal towpath links many small communities in the Kidlington area as well as providing links within settlements to local facilities.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Several new housing developments are planned alongside the canal in the Kidlington area and the canal towpath will not only act as a link between them but will be used to access other parts of the town and open countryside. It is expected that these developments will provide funding for the towpath to be improved to meet the additional volume of usage as a result and this may require more than simply resurfacing. The Trust note that the towpath width is restricted in places and there may be structures, pinch points and narrow sections of canal towpath, such as adjacent locks which may be a challenge in terms of increased usage and integrating with other towpath users, visitor moorings and anglers. It should therefore be recognised that increased usage, either as a result of new development, or as a result in changes to the numbers of visits by existing residents may require enhancements / improvements to cope with additional usage and this may involve more than just towpath resurfacing works. The improvement of existing access points may also be required to support the proposed developments and increased use of the canal network. In addition, widening and improvements to the towpath (and subsequently the canal bank) may be required along with dredging and vegetation management should widening be required to support additional use. To encourage and support additional use of the canal for both walkers and cyclists, additional signage may also be required at pinch points to highlight pedestrian priority. Interpretation along the canal, with circular walks etc could also be required to support additional leisure use and recognise the importance of local heritage to the economy of the area as mentioned elsewhere in this document. Enhancements such as the removal of graffiti and measures to reduce any further instances of vandalism should also be incorporated as these would further enhance the attractiveness of the use of the canal corridor. Paddle sports, in particular paddle boarding, has been the fastest growing sport through the pandemic. To reflect this waterbased activity should also be encouraged, with consideration given to the facilities needed to support this such as safe launching areas, storage and changing facilities. This could be a joint use with other types of sporting facilities and should be discussed in more detail with the Canal & River Trust and local user groups.
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance No comment. however, if option 2 is chosen it is suggested that a heritage policy in relation to the Oxford Canal could benefit from a preamble that recognises the Oxford Canal as an open access, linear item of working industrial heritage and provides a summary history of the waterway, the length of waterway within Cherwell, numbers of different types of extant/operational structure (including distinguishing masonry arch bridges from lift bridges), the breakdown of these heritage assets in terms of designations and the number and collective length of conservations areas. In addition, an overview of the special interest/heritage significance and defining characteristics or distinctive qualities of the canal (and remains of disused loops) would also be helpful
LPR-B-782	The Canal & River Trust	Question - Development Management Policies	The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is a waterways and well-being charity and we are the guardian of 2,000 miles of historic waterways across England and Wales. We are among the largest charities in the UK. Our vision is that "living waterways transform places and enrich lives". The Oxford Canal runs for approximately 34miles from the north to the south of the District, and we recognise that the Council hold the canal and the benefits it brings to the district in high regard. The health and performance of the canal is directly linked to the quality of the neighbourhood through which it runs, and the benefit derived by the residents of those neighbourhoods is in part dependent on the quality of the canal environment. Policies which protect, promote and improve on the quality of the canal and its towpath will help support the waterway in the future as its recognition and therefore usage increases. We welcome the various policy suggestions made throughout the document and we will welcome any opportunities which arise to work in partnership with the council to improve the canal. However, a wider ranging specific canal related policy would be welcomed, and the Canal & River Trust would be happy to discuss this further.

LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 1	Statement #3 - neighbourhoods are sustainable - I question this as with some of the planned development it will have an extreme impact on infrastructure for surrounding villages. Statement #10 - Our distinctive natural and built environment and our rich historic heritage is cherished, protected and enhanced- This aim will not be achieved with the proposed planning development for some of the surrounding villages of Banbury, particularly Hanwell. The proposed housing development will essentially merge Hanwell with Banbury town meaning it is no longer a small village. Hanwell is circa 800 years old so it will not cherish its rich heritage and historic buildings such as the castle.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 2	KO 5: Support a sustainable rural economy - to repeat my points above, some of the planning development earmarked in rural areas does not support this objective. There are also development opportunities within Banbury town centre which should be explored first (such as the old shopping centre). Note that this is also mentioned in KO 18: 'reuse and recycling of existing buildings'- this should be explored for development opportunities to reduce the impact and surrounding villages and the risk to their heritage and identity. KO 23: 'Conserving and enhancing the countryside and the setting of its towns and villages'- the planned development does not support this objective, particularly for Hanwell and Drayton as they will essentially be merged with Banbury town with very little green space in between. Particularly, the development will not be 'conserving' Hanwell village as it will have a huge impact on an already under pressure infrastructure. (Note that Hanwell village is already used as a through road and traffic is already heavy). KO 25: The planned development does not support this objective of protecting and enhancing the historic and natural environment.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 19	to the south of the town to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	LPR-A-154	issues with all developments north of Banbury because they are merging Hanwell village with the town. When you look at the map there are huge spaces of land that have not been allocated that don't encroach on rural villages rich in culture and heritage. There are also some villages who have no development planned nearby such as Horley so it seems extremely unfair to encroach so much on Hanwell village - especially when there has already been development in recent years at Hanwell Fields. This should meet the criteria for developments north of Banbury as when these were built a promise was made that development would not go further than Dukes Meadow Drive. The new plan has broken that promise and is now going beyond Dukes Meadow Drive to join Hanwell with Banbury. Not only will this destroy Hanwell's village status, it will also destroy a plantation on the earmarked land which will have an environmental impact and an impact on climate change. My biggest concern of all is the development will have a massive impact on traffic in the village. People going to and from Banbury already use Hanwell village as a cut through, traffic is heavy and the 30mph speed limit is rarely adhered to. This makes it dangerous for many of the villagers who walk through the village- many of whom are elderly. There is also a huge risk to the historical housing as an increase in traffic and damage to infrastructure will devalue property. Finally, the historic village will lose its identity. I am objecting to the development North of Banbury for the people who have lived in Hanwell throughout its 800 year history, they would be devastated to see it being merged with Banbury.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	LPR-A-047	issues with all developments north of Banbury because they are merging Hanwell village with the town. When you look at the map there are huge spaces of land that have not been allocated that don't encroach on rural villages rich in culture and heritage. There are also some villages who have no development planned nearby such as Horley so it seems extremely unfair to encroach so much on Hanwell village - especially when there has already been development in recent years at Hanwell Fields. This should meet the criteria for developments north of Banbury as when these were built a promise was made that development would not go further than Dukes Meadow Drive. The new plan has broken that promise and is now going beyond Dukes Meadow Drive to join Hanwell with Banbury. Not only will this destroy Hanwell's village status, it will also destroy a plantation on the earmarked land which will have an environmental impact and an impact on climate change. My biggest concern of all is the development will have a massive impact on traffic in the village. People going to and from Banbury already use Hanwell village as a cut through, traffic is heavy and the 30mph speed limit is rarely adhered to. This makes it dangerous for many of the villagers who walk through the village- many of whom are elderly. There is also a huge risk to the historical housing as an increase in traffic and damage to infrastructure will devalue property. Finally, the historic village will lose its identity. I am objecting to the development North of Banbury for the people who have lived in Hanwell throughout its 800 year history, they would be devastated to see it being merged with Banbury.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	LPR-A-205	issues with all developments north of Banbury because they are merging Hanwell village with the town. When you look at the map there are huge spaces of land that have not been allocated that don't encroach on rural villages rich in culture and heritage. There are also some villages who have no development planned nearby such as Horley so it seems extremely unfair to encroach so much on Hanwell village - especially when there has already been development in recent years at Hanwell Fields. This should meet the criteria for developments north of Banbury as when these were built a promise was made that development would not go further than Dukes Meadow Drive. The new plan has broken that promise and is now going beyond Dukes Meadow Drive to join Hanwell with Banbury. Not only will this destroy Hanwell's village status, it will also destroy a plantation on the earmarked land which will have an environmental impact and an impact on climate change. My biggest concern of all is the development will have a massive impact on traffic in the village. People going to and from Banbury already use Hanwell village as a cut through, traffic is heavy and the 30mph speed limit is rarely adhered to. This makes it dangerous for many of the villagers who walk through the village- many of whom are elderly. There is also a huge risk to the historical housing as an increase in traffic and damage to infrastructure will devalue property. Finally, the historic village will lose its identity. I am objecting to the development North of Banbury for the people who have lived in Hanwell throughout its 800 year history, they would be devastated to see it being merged with Banbury. the earmarked development north of Banbury poses a threat to Hanwell village which is a conservation area and as which the heritage and village status should be preserved
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes. It's a historic building and that should be respected so the views should stay the same as much as possible. The view from Edghehill should be protected and with some of the planned development north of Banbury this will be compromised
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules

LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	LPR-A-152	this development is of huge concern (as stated in previous comments) as it will merge Hanwell village with Banbury, destroying the heritage and village status, and ruining the village infrastructure because of the impact it will have on traffic. the earmarked development north of Banbury poses a threat to Hanwell village which is a conservation area and as which the heritage and village status should be preserved
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 32	No- no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Question - Settlement	Yes, we need to protect a villages if we want to respect conservation and heritage. Development should not be allowed so that it merges small villages into a town, one should not be allowed to strip a village of its village status
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. The historic and natural environment (i.e. surrounding villages) should be protected
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Parish Profile - Hanwell and Drayton	Drayton and Hanwell. I have made my points previously however wanted to reiterate my objection to the planned development north of Banbury which severely affect Drayton PC and Hanwell PC.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	There needs to be funding made available to small villages.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Question - Development Management Policies	Where the town is encroaching on surrounding villages, there should be a policy that protects the land in between the villages and Banbury so that no village will ever lose its village status and their heritage is conserved.
LPR-B-783	Joanna Davis	Hanwell	Environmental impact on using the fields north of Banbury (there is a plantation) Merging Hanwell with Banbury is not conserving the village Development around the village will put pressure on an already weak infrastructure. The road through Hanwell is used as a through road already so the village will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic.
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 19	a combination of the above
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. There is little enough in Banbury that is of any age/architectural interest. Don't take away tge opportunity to see them as we move aroundtge town.
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Question - Banbury's open spaces	That's up to the planners to exercise their muscles and prevent them being arbitrarily taken away from local residents
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Buses frequently enough, for long enough hours in the day, on routes around Banbury. The only way to make it more favorable is to go back to the service available in the days when we did not all have cars.
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 32	Yes. Village Hall Local Shop Regular Bus services. Yes - both
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Question - Settlement	Yes - lockdowns have demonstrated beyond doubt how important rural spaces are fir mental wellbeing of both residents of and visitors to the countryside
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-784	Maggie Alcraft	Banbury	It is currently almost impossible at certain times of day to cross Banbury from the southern half to reach junction 11 of the M40. Until junction 10A is constructed to allow the southern half of Banbury to feed south eastwards onto the M40, no more planning consents for houses around Banbury should be given.

LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Robust methods for flood mitigation that are NOT passed onto homeowners. Increasing the acceptance of newer homes to the FloodRE scheme to ensure that houses retain value where authorities fail to develop and execute contracts that protect new homeowners from the increasing effects of flooding. Introduce clauses into Section 106 and developer's contracts that are enforceable in relation to poor practices and lowest bid risk assessors used by homebuilders. Ensure that the planning authorities prioritise water management and floods in a robust manner that does not place newbuild homeowners in a situation where poor contracts, engineering assessments and poor business practices result in distress and hassle for newbuild homeowners. Flooding will only get worse and newbuild estates should be leading the way, not penalised because of corporate profits and overworked staff.
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play. Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Option 19	to the north of the town to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Yes. If boundaries can exist between nations and country borders, boundaries restricting the size of a town or village should be established. Focus can then turn on the creation of new villages or towns rather than defaulting to the expansion of the existing. Forward thinking rather continuation of the same through expansion.
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	LPR-A-049	I provide a formal objection to the development of this site on grounds of green areas that are established and sustain wildlife and wilding projects. I object on the grounds of a lack of control of surface water within that area from farmland run-off, the quality of drainage and water management from the the existing farm and this agricultural area. The site is too close to the farm to provide suitable mitigation and retain value of the houses. I also object on the grounds of mental health benefits that green areas provide and the rural nature that is Bloxham Primary school.
LPR-B-785	Dr Christopher Kosmas	General	Thank you for your consideration. Water management and robustness of contracts is a key part of this feedback
LPR-B-786	Cliff Kinch	LPR-A-206	I note with a heavy heart the options that surround my home village of Milcombe. Farming space, green fields all in teh firing line for housing. It wasnt long ago that LPRA-119 was designated of historical interest as it is an ancient ridge & furrow field yet here it is on the list of potential brickwork. All the sites listed contain a vast variety of wildlife, as a keen photographer I can vouch for the hedgerows containing reed buntings, linnets, yellowhammers, dunnocks would be displaced through building. The open fields of LPRA-119, 231, 137, 158 are all prime hunting grounds for kestrels and buzzards. Only last week was a peregrine falcon seen in my own garden, ready for the hunt. The red kites, once absent from this area are now thnakfully permanently resident, but only because the area has plenty of food in the fields. Take that away and they will move off. Give nature a break, try using the brownfield areas in Banbury itself where you wont get that sort of interaction with wildlife
LPR-B-786	Cliff Kinch	LPR-A-119	I note with a heavy heart the options that surround my home village of Milcombe. Farming space, green fields all in teh firing line for housing. It wasnt long ago that LPRA-119 was designated of historical interest as it is an ancient ridge & furrow field yet here it is on the list of potential brickwork. All the sites listed contain a vast variety of wildlife, as a keen photographer I can vouch for the hedgerows containing reed buntings, linnets, yellowhammers, dunnocks would be displaced through building. The open fields of LPRA-119, 231, 137, 158 are all prime hunting grounds for kestrels and buzzards. Only last week was a peregrine falcon seen in my own garden, ready for the hunt. The red kites, once absent from this area are now thnakfully permanently resident, but only because the area has plenty of food in the fields. Take that away and they will move off. Give nature a break, try using the brownfield areas in Banbury itself where you wont get that sort of interaction with wildlife
LPR-B-786	Cliff Kinch	LPR-A-231	I note with a heavy heart the options that surround my home village of Milcombe. Farming space, green fields all in teh firing line for housing. It wasnt long ago that LPRA-119 was designated of historical interest as it is an ancient ridge & furrow field yet here it is on the list of potential brickwork. All the sites listed contain a vast variety of wildlife, as a keen photographer I can vouch for the hedgerows containing reed buntings, linnets, yellowhammers, dunnocks would be displaced through building. The open fields of LPRA-119, 231, 137, 158 are all prime hunting grounds for kestrels and buzzards. Only last week was a peregrine falcon seen in my own garden, ready for the hunt. The red kites, once absent from this area are now thnakfully permanently resident, but only because the area has plenty of food in the fields. Take that away and they will move off. Give nature a break, try using the brownfield areas in Banbury itself where you wont get that sort of interaction with wildlife

LPR-B-786	Cliff Kinch	LPR-A-119	I note with a heavy heart the options that surround my home village of Milcombe. Farming space, green fields all in teh firing line for housing. It wasnt long ago that LPRA-119 was designated of historical interest as it is an ancient ridge & furrow field yet here it is on the list of potential brickwork. All the sites listed contain a vast variety of wildlife, as a keen photographer I can vouch for the hedgerows containing reed buntings, linnets, yellowhammers, dunnocks would be displaced through building. The open fields of LPRA-119, 231, 137, 158 are all prime hunting grounds for kestrels and buzzards. Only last week was a peregrine falcon seen in my own garden, ready for the hunt. The red kites, once absent from this area are now thnakfully permanently resident, but only because the area has plenty of food in the fields. Take that away and they will move off. Give nature a break, try using the brownfield areas in Banbury itself where you wont get that sort of interaction with wildlife
LPR-B-786	Cliff Kinch	LPR-A-137	I note with a heavy heart the options that surround my home village of Milcombe. Farming space, green fields all in teh firing line for housing. It wasnt long ago that LPRA-119 was designated of historical interest as it is an ancient ridge & furrow field yet here it is on the list of potential brickwork. All the sites listed contain a vast variety of wildlife, as a keen photographer I can vouch for the hedgerows containing reed buntings, linnets, yellowhammers, dunnocks would be displaced through building. The open fields of LPRA-119, 231, 137, 158 are all prime hunting grounds for kestrels and buzzards. Only last week was a peregrine falcon seen in my own garden, ready for the hunt. The red kites, once absent from this area are now thnakfully permanently resident, but only because the area has plenty of food in the fields. Take that away and they will move off. Give nature a break, try using the brownfield areas in Banbury itself where you wont get that sort of interaction with wildlife
LPR-B-786	Cliff Kinch	LPR-A-158	I note with a heavy heart the options that surround my home village of Milcombe. Farming space, green fields all in teh firing line for housing. It wasnt long ago that LPRA-119 was designated of historical interest as it is an ancient ridge & furrow field yet here it is on the list of potential brickwork. All the sites listed contain a vast variety of wildlife, as a keen photographer I can vouch for the hedgerows containing reed buntings, linnets, yellowhammers, dunnocks would be displaced through building. The open fields of LPRA-119, 231, 137, 158 are all prime hunting grounds for kestrels and buzzards. Only last week was a peregrine falcon seen in my own garden, ready for the hunt. The red kites, once absent from this area are now thnakfully permanently resident, but only because the area has plenty of food in the fields. Take that away and they will move off. Give nature a break, try using the brownfield areas in Banbury itself where you wont get that sort of interaction with wildlife
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 1	Good, but could go further with commenting on interrelationships between villages and towns, as well as Cherwell in the wider context of Oxfordshire/surrounding counties. E.g. What distinctive contribution to Oxfordshire and surrounding regions, including the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, does Cherwell make
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 3	A combination of all the above. In order of preference, generally: 1) At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington 2) At significant transport interchanges 3) Mostly on previously developed land 4) At the larger villages
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above. Development outside existing settlement boundaries should be resisted Mixed use sites should specifically exclude leisure and retail Town centres should be protected by initiatives which encourage their renewal and out of town retail should be resisted
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Supporting	Avoid supporting businesses dependent on zero-hours contracts, push for sustainable employment plus apprenticeships which provide younger people with skills and a proper career pathway.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. It would be sensible to see more accommodation provided in town centres but each town has different characteristics and challenges, and so approaches ought to be tailored to each.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Encouragement of independent businesses over chains, perhaps through discounted rates and other initiatives
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 7	Other - I would generally prefer to see an increase of social rented housing, to 40 or 50%, but I also think it would be better to apply different levels in different locations, perhaps informed by existing levels and need as well as by local plans
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Separation Distances	yes.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government. Local authorities should retain the right to flexibility where there are local issues which may impact on this
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	I think we need tailored policies for specific types/age of buildings. Heating source and provision as well as costs are a significant challenge for historic buildings and existing housing stock. Special provision will need to be made for flexibility for Listed Buildings, and with regard to electric vehicle charging.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 11	other - Both options could be implemented



LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Better provision for electrical vehicle charging, especially in new-builds.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Green Belt	Would prefer to see more of Cherwell's countryside protected by the Green Belt, or at least becoming designated "Valued Landscapes"
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 12	other -Why does this have to be a choice- shouldn't all three not be implemented, in order of preference (top down)?
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. Would prefer a mixture of option 2 and 3.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Local Green Spaces	The sites designated as Local Green Spaces in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Many of the housing developments agreed since 2011 in Adderbury are far from beautiful, or sensitively designed, in comparison with, for example, Lake Walk. Crowded sites of small redbrick boxes with plastic pastiche chimneys, a complete lack of thoughtful design details, tiny gardens, meagre parking, and arbitrary landscaping and planting schemes all amount to generic, soulless places to live which could be anywhere in the UK. Nods to local stone are insubstantial and the numbers of houses to be built or faced in stone are often reduced by applications to amend permission once granted And so often, a site is refused planning permission, only for it to be granted on appeal, making a nonsense of any supposed rigorous design criteria! It's very difficult to improve standards once unfortunate precedents have been set, so consistency and rigor must be essential in applying these criteria in future.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes. And Adderbury currently is one, so please, let's keep it that way.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes agree.Acknowledge that traffic congestion creates a big proportion of emissions, as emissions higher in lower gears. Encourage tree planting near areas of congestion to help reduce the effect of emissions. More 20 speed limits through villages, and measures which slow but don't stop traffic (speed bumps over chicanes etc). Better, lower emission public transport links (many bus services cut in past 10 years'
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 16	Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Yes- consideration needs to be given to healthcare provision and location, and this isn't mentioned in the plan. Especially important given the pressures on and challenges facing the Horton and its site.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 18	Other-Any further extensions need to be sensitively planned so as to limit development in open countryside, and further encroachment on surrounding villages- i.e. using brown field sites. Infrastructure improvements/augmentation must be prioritised alongside any further development. The time has come to consider a ring road/bypass for the town and a further M40 extension between 10 and 11 to alleviate traffic through the town.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-152	LPR-A-152 sites down by the river, further east of Longford Park, is a flood risk. Redevelopment of brownfield sites welcome, but provision for the services currently using these areas needs consideration.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes. Because, along with the rest of the historic centre, it's the historic heart of the town and a landmark that has been visible from distant vantage points since the church was built. The views of the wider historic centre should be protected too
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Supporting our Town	Alleviating traffic congestion by making alternative provision for through traffic, and reducing/eliminating parking charges for town centre visitors.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes

LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	I already make very few trips into Banbury, and surely discouraging people from visiting the town is counterintuitive. It would be better instead to discourage through traffic
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 32	yes. Primary School Secondary School Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Proximity to rail links. Yes - both.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	Adderbury	I wish to register significant concerns over the sites put forward by landowners and developers for potential housing developments within the parish of Adderbury. I also wish to comment that it seems to me that the fact that this consultation closes before the 2021 census data has been published is unhelpful to say the least. 1. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since the 2011 census, where 1064 dwellings were registered. Owing largely to post-2015 developments on each of the roads into the village (the Oxford, Aynho and Milton Roads), the village now has more than 1250 dwellings. This constitutes a 17% increase in housing. If one adds to this the permitted developments yet to be built (for example, the recent controversial permission by appeal for the 40 houses east of Berry Hill Road, which will destroy the last uninterrupted view of the church from afar), and this amounts to a 21% increase in housing since 2011, before any further development is considered. 2. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past six years, particularly, has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which, in a few short years have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly. But if the two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. 3. More generally, several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. 4. Based on the presumption of a density of 30 homes per hectare, several of the proposed sites, if developed in their entirety, would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. 5. Adderbury's infrastructure, in terms of both roads and many local services, is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue, and several of the sites proposed would encourage driving into and through the village, making it more of a rat run. 6. Christopher Rawlins Primary School was extended and increased its intake by 50% in 2017, from 30 to 45 children per year, though scope for further development is limited by the constraints of the site. There are already tensions in the village associated with parents parking at dropoff and pick-up times. 100 extra houses in the village would mean the school will be over capacity. 7. The extra traffic substantial new development would bring to existing pinch points in Adderbury's highways, will add to the existing air quality pollution in this area. Additional car fumes and particulate emissions from traffic is also of concern to nearby residents and children. 8. Development of any or all of these greenfield sites will also have a hugely destructive impact on the regional ecology and wildlife habitats: 9. I am also concerned about the effects that water runoff from substantial developments might have on the existing floodplain. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths. 10. One very attractive characteristic of villages like Adderbury is the lack of light pollution.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-002	Although this site would constitute a narrowing of the gap between Adderbury and Bodicote, the relatively small scale of building, coupled with the less sensitive location, being at the more modern end of the village, makes it one of the more acceptable sites
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-081	Although contravenes the ANP by narrowing the amenity gap between Bodicote and Adderbury, the topography of the site renders building here less visually impactful than on LPR-A-156 (Land west of Banbury Road, further south), which has important sightlines to the historic village. Concern is development here, leaving a gap further south, will render infill development to the
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-041	Has the advantage of using an existing emergence road, but will change the character of the green space adjacent, where vehicular access requires adoption of a track as part of the access road. This will detrimentally impact the houses adjacent to this track and the proposed development. Although contravenes the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan settlement boundary, at least
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-077	modern development. Would harm wildlife habitats. The footpaths across these fields have lovely views of the countryside and the village and so are greatly appreciated. Water table is high here, close to the floodplain, and field is frequently boggy during the wetter months. Advise strongly object
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-086	Concerns over access and capacity for infrastructure (Berry Hill Road and recently installed chicanes) to cope with influx of traffic. Destroys valued landscape views toward Hempton Road, compromises footpath and habitat for wildlife such as deer. Far too big a site to be developed in its entirety. Lack of pedestrian access to other parts of village. Too large a site to be developed in its entirety. Concerns over access and infrastructure. Will compromise wildlife habitats. Adjacent to floodplain which is likely to expand with combination of greater frequency of severe downpours and increased built-up areas.

LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-146	Outside of the settlement boundary of the neighbourhood plan, but would at least be a small development, tucked away from major vantage points. Although would cause a degree of extra traffic through village, and potential for issues over emergence onto Horn Hill Road so close to Tanners Lane, the traffic on Horn Hill Road would more likely slow down for the junction.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-156	too large a site to be developed in its entirety. Traffic emergence and congestion on A4260 likely to be an issue if large number of houses proposed. Detrimental impact on green infrastructure as identified in ANP, as well as important wildlife habitats. Advise object.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-178	Far too large a site to be developed in its entirety, though a smaller amount of development could be sited here. Concerns over traffic/rat run issues emerging onto Twyford Road/Aynho Road likely to be an issue if large number of houses proposed. Advise object unless much smaller area/s proposed for development.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-218	Already has permission for 40 homes (CDC granted appeal after refusal, significantly undermining planning policy and Neighbourhood Plan) , spoiling the last uninterrupted sightline of the church from the village boundary. Milton Road already too much of a rat-run. Advise object.
LPR-B-787	Sophie Hammond	LPR-A-258	Narrows gap between Adderbury and Milton/Bloxham unacceptably. Further urbanises an existing footpath, and will compromise wildlife habitats for deer and other animals.
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	Question - Separation Distances	yes agree
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-788	Debbie Woodward	LPR-A-091	I wish to object to any houses being built on this land as it would cause terrible disruption to all living locally and affect local wildlife
LPR-B-789	Kate Ramsey	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. I wish to raise objection against the inclusion of LPRA-091. It would change the nature of the place of Bodicote if there was allowed to be development all around the village. It would be positive to the environment and well being of residents if the rural areas and walks at the southern edge (where the planning application has been made) were to be preserved as they are. The fields and views are admired and used by many walkers and villagers. More houses would lead to loss of the rural nature of this section of Bodicote and cause more traffic and overuse of the small area.
LPR-B-789	Kate Ramsey	LPR-A-091	I wish to raise objection against the inclusion of LPR-A-091 in the local plan. This land is of natural beauty and a great resource for the people of Bodicote and surrounds. Lots of people come to escape built up areas and walk their dogs and exercise and enjoy the views. Developing this area of Bodicote would put a strain on the natural environment and cause loss of valued space much needed for health and wellbeing and as habitats for nature it would lead to the loss of the beautiful views that surround the village. It would also result in surrounding Bodicote with an overload of housing putting pressure on existing roads and amenities.
LPR-B-789	Kate Ramsey	General	This form is unnecessarily long and complicated. I would have thought there could be an easier and more direct way to comment on plans
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. Now is the time to have a total rethink about land usage, space above shops currently unused, empty shops, offices
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). There is very little availability of light industrial units in Banbury, with small businesses having to often travel outside of the district to access. There has been much recent commercial development but this has not included light industrial units suitable for small business and start ups who need to be supported for their economic contribution to the district.
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Supporting Employment	Clearly the objective of a developer is to maximise their profit which is therefore going to focus more on larger commercial units, when allowing such sites it should be required that a certain amount of light industrial use units are provided to support small business and start ups in the area as well as the larger scale employers
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation. Flexibility within specific criteria will achieve more generation of renewable energy

P  
 2016

LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	A policy which encourages generation of renewable energy where not compulsory
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	There is very little undertaking within the district for collection of biodiversity or wildlife data. Current technology means that surveys can be set up to be supported easily & quickly by the general public that can be managed & fed into the National Biodiversity Network via freely accessible website and apps
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Local Green Spaces	Nethercote should be given the protection of a Local Green Space: it meets all of the criteria stated and this would preserve this area for the future. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Policies for heritage and protecting the historic environment need to address public awareness and a simple process that allows the public to suggest heritage that should be protected in order that none of our heritage or historic environment is overlooked and lost forever
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Option 19	Development to the east of the M40 is neither suitable nor feasible. The M40 provides a natural end to Banbury's urban spread and the green field sites to the East of the M40 are rural, presenting an appropriate green space at the edge of the district, before the border of Northamptonshire. Some commercial development has happened South East of the M40 J11, however the A361 becomes the replaced natural end at this point. We need to do better to preserve and protect these areas. Development to the East of M40 contradicts several of the points in both the suggested vision for Cherwell and the Key Objectives for maintaining and developing a sustainable local economy, meeting the challenge of climate change and healthy place shaping A further more detailed submission has been made by email relating specifically to the unsuitability of sites proposed at Nethercote (LPRA- 185) and land north of the A422 (LPR-A-034 and LPR-A-168) The infrastructure requires significant improvement in order to improve traffic issues and reduce congestion before consideration is given to any additional development in other directions.
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Settlement	Yes, in order to protect our countryside and prevent merging of settlements
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes.
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	The more local engagement, including members of the public will encouragement input that helps the communities to not only develop their own neighbourhoods but help in the resident's understanding of how the Local Plan contributes to the future of their community
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	LPR-A-185	Developing the area of Nethercote (LPR-A-185) and land north of the A422 (LPR-A-034 and LPR-A-168) for commercial use would have a hugely negative impact on our countryside; increase traffic and place further pressure on the M40 roundabout which is already insufficient for the volume; increase noise from alarms and machinery; remove the natural habitat for wildlife and birds; increase flooding risks by removing permeable surfaces to mention a few. The site submission is not supported by all of the landowners covered by the proposal. A more detailed response detailing why these sites are neither suitable nor feasible for development has been sent by email
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	LPR-A-034	Developing the area of Nethercote (LPR-A-185) and land north of the A422 (LPR-A-034 and LPR-A-168) for commercial use would have a hugely negative impact on our countryside; increase traffic and place further pressure on the M40 roundabout which is already insufficient for the volume; increase noise from alarms and machinery; remove the natural habitat for wildlife and birds; increase flooding risks by removing permeable surfaces to mention a few. The site submission is not supported by all of the landowners covered by the proposal. A more detailed response detailing why these sites are neither suitable nor feasible for development has been sent by email
LPR-B-790	Lisa Phipps	LPR-A-168	Developing the area of Nethercote (LPR-A-185) and land north of the A422 (LPR-A-034 and LPR-A-168) for commercial use would have a hugely negative impact on our countryside; increase traffic and place further pressure on the M40 roundabout which is already insufficient for the volume; increase noise from alarms and machinery; remove the natural habitat for wildlife and birds; increase flooding risks by removing permeable surfaces to mention a few. The site submission is not supported by all of the landowners covered by the proposal. A more detailed response detailing why these sites are neither suitable nor feasible for development has been sent by email
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries

LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Cycle route to Oxford Parkway station from Kidlington and surrounding villages should be improved and better maintained
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. I am very concerned by the potential amount of new housing that could be built in the rural areas. People who have chosen to live in the rural areas should have their decision and lifestyle choice respected. Villagers accept that amenities will be fewer and further away and in return have easy access to extensive green space and views, small close communities and peace and quiet. If the villages are extended they will become like Kidlington and the Cherwell towns and villagers have not chosen to live in those towns.
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Allocating sites and deciding the scale of housing developments should be done in meaningful consultation with the village community. It cannot be through an online 116 page document. Consultations should be face to face and the times and dates advertised through village organisations and in public places. Village services should be taken into account, for example whether the village school can accommodate a large influx of pupils, whether there is a GP surgery and if so how many villages does it already serve, are there transport links and how frequent and what is the capacity of those.
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Option 32	yes. I do not understand these questions on rural settlement hierarchies so do not think it was written in a clear, accessible manner. A meaningful consultation should be held in which inhabitants fully understand the choices they are being asked to make and can respond in an informed manner.
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Question - Settlement	Yes, each village should have an outer boundary and a maximum house limit to ensure it retains its historic and cultural nature and has services appropriate to its population size.
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district.
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Parish Profile - Islip	Islip. The proposed sites encircle Islip and if built upon, even to a small degree would completely change the village. The village has 645 inhabitants, building houses on one of the proposed sites alone could easily double that population. I do not agree with the prospect of changing a place beyond recognition and return to my earlier comments on how the choice of someone to live in a small rural village should be respected. Additionally, it is very apparent in the Parish Plan how I'll equipped Islip is for an influx of inhabitants, with limited bus routes, one volunteer run shop, one pub/restaurant no nursery or care home or employment sites etc. I would like information on how a village produces a Neighbourhood Plan and on why no feedback has been provided from Paris meetings when I am well aware of how active a village community Islip has. This again returns to my question about whether a meaningful consultation has been conducted as a 116 page document with annexed documents online is not accessible to the majority.
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	There needs to be information provided on how to develop a Neighbourhood Plan and then no decisions or actions should take place until those plans are developed, agreed by the majority of inhabitants and have been reflected in the Local Plan.
LPR-B-791	Hannah Binci	Islip	This site is not appropriate for building due to flood risk, historic character, wildlife and popular footpaths and views within its boundaries
LPR-B-792	Declan Malone	LPR-A-091	One of the few areas of natural beauty, a haven for locals for walks and views the proposal to include Bodicote is extremely disappointing. I note that the landowner has conveniently built on this land for himself. As usual, these greedy landowners, in line with a corrupt government, will no doubt plead that they have the local communities best interests at heart but in reality have no care whatsoever for the people they encourage to support their local shops and garden centres. The infrastructure in Bodicote does not support the proposals with congestion on the roads leading to the proposed areas already of great concern. The green belt around areas of natural beauty such as salt way and now these areas are the few walkways, bridlepaths and beauty spots for reflection, wildlife, exercise etc. left and to build here virtually on people's back gardens and breathtaking views, would be grossly inappropriate. For once think of the local community!
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 1	The use of what I regard as green belt should not be an item for discussion. We have lost too much green space already
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Question - Travelling Communities	Traveling Communities do not contribute to Cherwell and should not be provided with any facilities.
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan

LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Maintaining historic buildings should take priority
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 11	Other - Most renewable generation is not appropriate for Cherwell other than small CHP for industrial/distribution developments. I worked in this area as a Chartered Engineer and have some experience to support my opinion.
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach. Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. We have grandchildren who live in three different parts of the country and I have to say Kidlington has by far the poorest play facilities in the four areas we play with our Grandchildren.
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Yes. It needs to be stopped as Kidlington is losing it's character
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Restart and extend the pedestrian area. The existing barrier area failed due to complaints from a small vocal minority and the code being given to too many people
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Provide barrier cycle lanes
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-793	Michael Crowther	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	More provision is badly needed as Kidlington is poorly provided currently compared with say Bicester
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Get best advice starting with the Historic Buildings experts.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Green Belt	Proper explanation about why Green Belt no longer has any weight with the planners would be helpful.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Use local stone and brick; follow heritage guidance. More than anything, keep a mixture rather than have large estates. For many villages in Oxfordshire, stone terraced houses are a norm and should therefore figure in local plans.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	20 min neighbourhoods are undermined by car use. We need to opt for one or the other.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Transport & Connectivity	yes. Developing villages ipso facto means greater reliance on cars- this is at odds with all climate requirements. Rural areas are best suited by their development meeting ONLY local requirements, eg affordable housing for children of families already resident in those villages
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	How about ensuring that the sewage and water systems are adequate before granting planning permission? That would be a good start.

LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. Height considerations are vital in honouring Banbury's heritage. Protecting views of St Mary's Church would take height into account when considering new builds.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. A dead town centre is the biggest turnoff for any town. Better by far to allow residential use above shops to become a norm - it will revitalise the place.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Living in Banbury centre would virtually wipe out the need for car trips.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Oxfordshire's villages are a vital part of its heritage. Allowing villages to expand without a preplanned overview simply ruins villages - they are at the mercy of developers. Allocation of housing could at the least consider the character of individual villages. Some can accommodate quite a large number of extra housing settlements; others are destroyed by expansion. The introduction of the word 'beautiful' into planning considerations is unhelpful- too subjective. Well-planned, well built in locally sympathetic materials, with maximum use made of brown sites; these are strands to include in local planning for rural areas
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Sufficient sewage and water infrastructure before the granting of planning permission. Even before considering 'services', it could be considered that certain rural settlements are unsuitable for being part of a hierarchy; in some places (Hook Norton; Deddington) any increase of housing equals an automatic increase in car use
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Settlement	This would at least give certainty; but it depends who gets to define those settlement boundaries.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Support and properly consider the views of local people; and increase the range of information made available to the local population before planning decisions are settled beyond alteration.
LPR-B-794	Susie Carrdus	Deddington	Locals have been told that there will be no further development of this site. Is this overridden by its inclusion in your list of available sites?
LPR-B-795	Simon Woodruff	Option 1	With reference to the inclusion of LPR-A-091 in the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 I wish to make the following comments; The access to the proposed site is going to have a profound effect onto both Austin Road and Molyneux Drive . Austin Road in particular is very narrow and on road parking makes access to Sefton Place difficult with the present volume of traffic, this can only be exacerbated by this proposed development. The Government's NPPF highlights the importance of promoting access to the countryside and this proposed development would close off the final unimpeded access from the village on the southern side. The Northern, Western and Eastern side having already been developed and access impeded.
LPR-B-795	Simon Woodruff	LPR-A-091	With reference to the inclusion of LPR-A-091 in the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 I wish to make the following comments; The access to the proposed site is going to have a profound effect onto both Austin Road and Molyneux Drive . Austin Road in particular is very narrow and on road parking makes access to Sefton Place difficult with the present volume of traffic, this can only be exacerbated by this proposed development. The Government's NPPF highlights the importance of promoting access to the countryside and this proposed development would close off the final unimpeded access from the village on the southern side. The Northern, Western and Eastern side having already been developed and access impeded.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Separation Distances	No.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation

LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Green Belt	I would like matters relating to green belt development not to be left to the Oxfordshire Plan- I would like greater local involvement in decision-making as it will have such a significant impact on local communities.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 12	Other-Develop systems and partnerships with environmental organisations that would allow to assess the most appropriate measure on a case by case basis.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. The development of a reporting system post-development also seems essential here
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	policies need to address not only the development proposal stages, but also subsequent stages (e.g. during and post construction)
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Improving access and knowledge - perhaps building on initiatives such as the Oxford 'open doors' in September - would seem a key objective in order to increase the value placed on the historic environment
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Good, attractive public transport links that encourages people to leave their cars at home and green areas that encourage people to stay, linked to facilities such as public libraries, museums, cafes
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	yes - especially in a relatively compact suburb like Kidlington, with its very good public transport links.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Low emission zones on the model of London and other cities
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Yes. Issues such as road traffic, the availability of infrastructure, the impact on green spaces
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. The use of green belt land is often seen as the 'easy' option, but would seem to contradict all the other policies highlighted in the document reviewed here, which highlight the importance of solutions that prioritise healthy, sustainable, long-term development.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Option 27	I am unable to answer question 94 as I am not quite sure what each would entail. For example I am unclear of what expanding the village to include Exeter Close actually means. If any of these plans are being considered I would find it useful to have a consultation document that sets out the various proposals.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	I do not drive myself and suspect that the solution would be potentially unpalatable decisions such as parking charges and low emission zones. Other-both. Kidlington has a range of green spaces as well as amenities and public transport links that are important to protect
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	LPR-A-237	I would strongly support the proposal LPR-A-237 Outskirts of Kidlington Kidlington / Gosford and Water Eaton / Yarnton N/A Rachel Faulkner - Kidlington Parish Council Local Green Space.
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	LPR-A-187	This sounds to me like a large expansion of the airport - which seems to run entirely contrary to policies about sustainability and low carbon
LPR-B-796	Laura Ugolini	LPR-A-223	What on earth are they proposing to do in Islip?
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	We want more variety of retailers whether independent or bigger known retailers.



LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 7	Other - keeping maybe 50/50 on this
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Separation Distances	Yes
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Housing Policies	Modular homes would be good but also making designs that fit into there surroundings and the character of the town and local area
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. homes need to be sustainable in there construction and that older buildings should be looked at to make them more environment friendly
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	yes we should be retrofitting but the historic and heritage must be protected
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Green Belt	Protecting the town and not just the villages from urban sprawl so the countryside and the character of the towns villages and countryside can be maintained and protected.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. It is very important that the environment is looked at as to whether a development would do harm, damage or change an environment and whether changes in development plans need to be taken to make sure the environment is not harmed. damage or changed for the worse.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Bio diversity is important and should be as importantly looked at as the development proposed.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Our past is important in knowing who we are and where we have come. Whether buildings, parks and certain views in the town and local areas should be protected.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Using local materials and designs which do not clash with what is around them. that designs can be in keeping with the look but can be modern energy saving and good places to live inside. And that there is more green spaces around not just for the look but for the well being of people.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes overall I think they work well probably more for suburban but making more jobs and work in rural areas would help it work there too.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes agree. Connections for people whether work or leisure are important. So more links from villages to town on all 7 days and later in the evenings would be better. And working with local bus companies to make it easier for them to get around with out being delayed. Approach should be different for rural areas. People in villages will still need to come into town for work and leisure. making it easier to not have to use the car and better times as far as public transport is concerned. Lower emissions yes and alternatives to cars. And public transport priority.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Travelling Communities	Yes on the whole that better transport and that development impact should be high when decisions are made

LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 19	a combination of the above
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. St Mary's is a significant building and the general views need it to be protected. Building like the town hall and the general look of the high street and Horsefair ,South Bar, North Bar and the Market Place.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission? allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Trying to get a more mixture of shops and leisure as well as homes but done in a way that makes use of the buildings we have and encourages quality retrofits and developments. Better transport and more green spaces.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. The Canal side area is a bit messy but developments which involve residential and some commercial business. And that business that are their already are consulted and given options to stay or find other suitable sites within the town or areas as they wish. Also that the canal side is not developed with buildings and architecture that are just boxes and straight lines but show good design but also take in the industrial and heritage of the area and town.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Banbury's open spaces	Yes they should be enhanced and protected. Some probably need updating but maybe a proper athletics track and more mixed sporting parks.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Addressing Inequality in	Making sure that homes rental social and private are better looked after and are insulated. Encouraging closer ties between different communities.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Better more reliable transport , transport cycling walking need to take priority.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for)
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Other- I think all villages need to look at what they need and that development needs to be proportionate to that village.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 32	yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services Other - Local sporting and business facilities. Yes both
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Settlement	Yes that places have space between them. So do not merge without local involvement
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance. Historic buildings and lands must be protected, but if they can be used for the good of the rural communities then yes that should be looked at. Natural Environment must be protected and encouraged to prosper.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Making it simpler and easier for people to understand and not be overawed by the planing process.
LPR-B-797	Ian Bazeley	General	I know that theses areas are probably going to be developed but more consideration should be taken on not just building more houses or warehouses and that greening some of these areas with forested and natural environments are as just as important especially by the east side around the motorway and on all main roads and entrances to the town. All housing developments should have a high degree of tress and green spaces and space from houses to the roads not as like ( e.g Longford park road from school to bankside.)
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 1	We need to protect and enhance the nature of Cherwell as a predominantly rural district or we run the risk of an urban spread that will connect Oxford with Bicester, obliterating everything between already Kidlington is becoming part of the spread of Oxford, even though it is outside the ring road. The part of Cherwell in which I live is already prone to severe flooding and allowing more open space, fields, forests, hedges etc to be dug up and concreted over will exacerbate the problem. We've learned during the pandemic how important our open spaces are- we need to protect them.

LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 2	The most important objectives - KO5 KO9 KO15 KO18 KO23 KO25 - any new development must be net zero, but that does not mean we should promote new development - COP26 is ongoing - we have to start to act on climate change and not just pay lip service to it- economic growth and development is no good if we no longer have a planet - re-development of existing buildings should be maximised before new green spaces are concreted over
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	not sure
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Question - Supporting our Town	not sure
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Question - Separation Distances	don't know
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 12	Other - We should not go ahead with any development that threatens biodiversity, the natural environment, or is likely to cause additional flooding or other problems
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	Flood risk and air pollution are already big problems in this area and all measures should be taken not to exacerbate these further
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 28	Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-798	Amanda Roberts	LPR-A-223	These sites are wholly inappropriate in scale - Islip is a small village and development of this scale would turn it into a town. All of the land is greenfield and Green Belt and should be protected from development. Mill Street is a narrow road along which access is already difficult, so further development of important green space is not only inappropriate but would increase traffic problems on Mill Street. One of these spaces is noted in the conservation plan as an important open space. Development along the river after the Ray and Cherwell meet is ridiculous as this land floods badly and forms part of the Oxford flood defences - where is the water going to go if it can't flood those fields? If the fields around Islip towards the A34 are all build on, the village itself, which is low-lying, will suffer more problems with flooding. We have a lot of biodiversity in Islip and this should be protected. It's crazy to be talking about sustainable development and how to enhance the environment and biodiversity etc and do what we can to counter climate change and then carry on destroying the environment and biodiversity that we do have. There's nothing sustainable about that. The Church Commissioners are absent land owners - they don't care what happens to the village or whether their proposals are appropriate or not - they are motivated purely by money.

LPR-B-799	Colin Scott	LPR-A-041	strongly object. Sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues. proposed development sites will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply.
LPR-B-799	Colin Scott	LPR-A-086	strongly object. Sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues. proposed development sites will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for the site would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. The proposed sites listed as LPR-A-086, to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Berry Hill Rd, would, if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have already suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose their existing connection with local farmland. Constructed in the 1950s/60s, St Mary's Rd and Norris Close provide lowdensity housing with large gardens backing onto fields. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to these houses being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply.
LPR-B-799	Colin Scott	LPR-A-146	strongly object. Sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues. proposed development sites will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Additional development around Henge Close would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase runoff and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply.
LPR-B-799	Colin Scott	LPR-A-218	strongly object. Sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues. proposed development sites will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply.

LPR-B-799	Colin Scott	LPR-A-258	strongly object. Sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015/2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. It is accepted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council that Adderbury suffers from traffic issues. proposed development sites will directly place additional cars on these already dangerous roads. The site is entirely unsustainable and every single household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. The largescale developments proposed for the site would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development of the field adjacent to the existing Adderbury Fields estate would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook. Once the latest phase of Longford Park, the new developments on the Bloxham Rd and the additional housing to the north of Banbury are complete, it is inconceivable that Cherwell will not have at least a 5 year housing supply.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land. think it is a great mistake to destroy the integrity of the villages which characterise this region of Oxfordshire. If there are to be larger towns they should be on the immediate fringe of the three main urban centres.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Question - Supporting our Town	not sure
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 8	Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Question - Separation Distances	yes.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. The Ray Valley is especially vulnerable to flooding and increased building in its immediate surrounds can only make matters worse. The minimum statutory requirements of flood amelioration are inadequate
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Question - Green Belt	The Green Belt was conceived to preserve the countryside, quality of life, and the balance between human kind and nature. You should respect the Green Belt absolutely.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 12	Other - I don't understand your point one in this section. Biodiversity is clearly a fundamental building block of environmental stewardship, benefitting people's well-being as well as contributing to the balance of nature, impinging on such matters as clean air and carbon absorption.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are

LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Kidlington is the nearest shopping centre to villages round and about. Vehicular access must be maintained.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 27	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. This section claims to about Kidlington and its surrounding villages, but the questions only relate to Kidlington. I have put my comment about the villages in the next sector
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. It is vital to protect the community atmosphere of villages and not to turn them into towns. Therefore development must be proportionate
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services. Yes - walking/cycling. Many roads are inadequate for the number of houses being proposed in villages like Islip. A new infrastructure would be expensive and destructive of the local character. In Islip for example, the bridge is completely inadequate for the kind of development envisaged
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Question - Settlement	Yes, because we do not want the area to become one great conurbation.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 33	None of the above. This is an example of a question that gives false alternatives and no opportunity for proper dissent
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Parish Profile - Islip	Islip. The Parish profile for Islip shows applications for development in every single field around the historic village. It is one of the prettier villages and is in danger of being swamped in physical and community terms. There are currently 298 houses in this village and 3000 more are proposed. This is disproportionate on a massive scale. The village, no doubt, should have a small amount of proportionate development, but this should not exceed another 200 houses on sited that will not ruin the rural beauty of the Ray and Cherwell riverscape. There is a former oil facility site North of the Station which is ideal for this.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	There must be much better communication with villagers. The existence of this survey, for example, is unknown to the very great majority of citizens. And its length and obscurity is well beyond the scope and IT skills of, for example, many elderly, retired, and disadvantaged people.
LPR-B-800	Revd Brian Mountford	Islip	There must be much better communication with villagers. The existence of this survey, for example, is unknown to the very The call for sites has created a disproportionate request from the Church Commissioners for the complete overdevelopment of Islip. The land around Islip represent one of their largest estates and naturally they want to make as much money as possible from it. Local and Central Government should beware of exploitative over-development to satisfy the greed of any one institution or individual
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Essential any redevelopment takes into account the character of area, green space, car parking/access arrangements, and considers neighbours!
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. Green belt MUST be preserved - no use of "exceptional use" get out clause!
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Option 27	Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close. The centre is no longer able to serve the current population and sadly with 4400 new homes on the way it is no longer fit for purpose. Better provision is essential and urgent - residents need to be able to shop and access services locally to avoid travel and its implications on environment. There should be trams/fast non stop bus services to Summertown and Oxford. <u>Should focus on protecting an enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way. All green spaces must be retained, they are too few already</u>
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Enhancement of Gosford SC and acquisition of other sites eg off Langford Lane which would introduce competition, 4400 new homes = population increase of more than 10k!
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs

LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Option 32	The following are most important. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services Yes, we should give more weight to accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling. Settlement boundaries should be extended beyond where development would not normally be permitted to preserve and protect.
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Option 34	Both must be fiercely protected with tight regs so that developers cannot find loopholes. Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	LPR-A-024	Green belt land and must be protected from ANY development
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	LPR-A-156	Site of natural interest - MUST be protected from development
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	LPR-A-224	Green belt site - must be protected from ANY development
LPR-B-801	Jane Rendle	Question - Green Belt	Cherwell DC must this time take full responsibility for protecting the remaining Green Belt through the Oxford Plan process. Cherwell DC must not accept whatever is proposed in the Oxfordshire 2050 plan - it has a say in that plan and must vehemently reject any proposals for any more Green Belt development. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. There should be a agreed % of business rates charged on out of town developments which should be ringfenced to support town centres and high streets.
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 22	limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 24	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Option 25	Bicester has very limited open spaces and Garth Park is too small to support a town the size of Bicester as it is today. Any available green space should be protected as much as possible.
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	Question - Bicester's Heritage & Historic Buildings	Gavray Meadows. The community in Langford has fought long and hard to try and protect this valuable habitat for wildlife and its unique landscape. It provides a natural buffer between the railway and the community and supports a wide variety of unique fauna and flora. The recent flooding at Langford has highlighted the fact that meadow land should be retained as far as possible and is vital that it is protected. Climate change and the development of housing and warehouses on open farmland in Bicester has resulted in more surface water run off and this will result in even more frequent flooding events in the near future. The council has a duty of care to its population and also to the natural landscape and it would be failing in this fundamental duty if Gavray Meadows was not protected from further development as much as possible. Gavray Meadows should be designated a Local Green Space.
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	LPR-A-071	The site will block a natural wildlife pathway from Gavray Meadows and is designated greenfield land.
LPR-B-802	Iain Armstrong	LPR-A-125	I support the application for Local Green Space designation. It is a unique landscape and provides a natural habitat for a wide variety of fauna, flora and wildlife. It provides a green buffer for the residents of Bicester and provides a vital nature corridor for wildlife
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. It is very important that centres are allowed to evolve and not be artificially set in aspic, ecom developments mean we must reduce the amount of retail space and allow it to be converted to residential, at the same time we may need more space developed for warehousing and other uses. Reduce rates so that they are not the burden/tax that they have become and which is unfair when outlets are trying to compete with on line only retailers. Reduce parking costs to make town centres more accessible by car.

LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 8	Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Sites should be considered to the north of town.
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 21	Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 32	Primary School Village Hall Local Shop Recreation facilities for children, food and drink outlets. No - no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	Adderbury	All of these sites fall outside the Residential Settlement Boundary as set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore contravene Policy AD1. Between 2015-2021, there have been 198 housing completions in the parish of Adderbury, with outline permission for 40 more new homes approved at appeal on the site north of Berry Hill Rd. These developments have already begun to change the fundamental character of the village, in particular of West Adderbury, which has traditionally been rural in nature with a limited number of more modern houses. The proposed developments will place additional cars on already dangerous roads. The proposed development sites are unsustainable and every household in these locations would need to drive to access facilities such as schools and healthcare. West Adderbury is a haven for wildlife of all kinds, including hedgehogs, buzzards, kites, badgers, foxes, bats and several varieties of deer. Development of the proposed sites would disrupt existing green corridors and habitats, and result in a severe reduction in biodiversity, particularly amongst pollinators. In an area known for its high water table and numerous springs, development of these sites will dramatically increase run-off and inevitably increase the flood risk to properties around the Sor Brook.
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	LPR-A-041	Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 and -041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east.
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	LPR-A-086	The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 and LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. The proposed sites listed as LPR-A-086, to the north and south of the junction of the A4260 and Berry Hill Rd, would, if developed, double the size of West Adderbury overnight. Such large scale development is entirely inappropriate for a village the size of Adderbury and is far more suited to a large town or even a city. The few facilities present in Adderbury would be completely swamped by a development of this scale, placing massive pressures on local schools and services. Precious public footpaths over these sites, which are in daily use by local residents, would be lost forever. The residents of St Mary's Rd, many of whom have already suffered from loss of privacy following the construction of Adderbury Fields, would lose their existing connection with local farmland. Constructed in the 1950s/60s, St Mary's Rd and Norris Close provide low-density housing with large gardens backing onto fields. Development of LPR-A-086 would lead to these houses being completely subsumed by new estates, fundamentally changing the character of the southern edge of West Adderbury.



LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	LPR-A-146	Additional development around Henge Close at LPR-A-146 and -041 would directly abut the Conservation Area and would therefore be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings on Horn Hill Rd. Development of these sites would also be detrimental to the open nature of the Henge Close estate and to the green space and play area to the east.
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	LPR-A-258	The large-scale developments proposed for sites LPR-A-086 and LPR-A-258 would utterly change the approach to the village and would create a jarring transition from agricultural land to modern, dense housing. Development of the field adjacent to the existing Adderbury Fields estate (LPR-A-258) would lead to a substantial decrease in the green space between West Adderbury and Milton, increasing the risk of coalescence and impacting upon the character of both villages. A popular footpath would be lost, and irreversible damage would be caused to the amenity of the homes to the north of Adderbury Fields, and to the adjacent green space.
LPR-B-803	Joanna Dyson	General	I feel that much more should have been done to make this consultation more widely known including an email or letter to all council tax payers, mandates for parish councils to advise all residents etc
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 1	Rural communities continue to see a lack of investment in transport infrastructure and service provision, despite an increase in housing of 13%. This is not sustainable and contrary to the vision.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 2	Protect rural areas by clearly defining development boundaries for towns and villages
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 6	Increase the percentage levels in Banbury and Bicester where transport and service infrastructure is present. Reduce the percentage for rural communities where poor transport exists (e.g. public - buses, trains).
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Question - Green Belt	A wider part of Cherwell should be considered part of the Green Belt- e.g. oxford canal/cherwell valley stretching from Kidlington to Banbury
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes, but it should be limited to a set distance not a time to cover the distance- saying "be met within a short walk or cycle of no more than 20-minutes" is meaningless - someone could cycle 6 miles in 20mins. I suggest it is limited to a ~0.5 mile radius, where individuals may feel inclined to walk to use services rather than drive.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Keep development of settlement compact and centralised around the available services, and direct non-local traffic around/away from driving through. Footpaths and cycleways away from roads.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 18	Consider further urban extensions limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 19	To the north of the town. To the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 20	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules

LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 22	Consider further urban extensions
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 23	To the south of the town. To the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11).
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 24	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 26	Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 27	Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close. Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for)
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 32	Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services Wight should be given to walking and cycling.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance.
LPR-B-804	Mr Wilkie	LPR-A-100	Land North and South of Milton Road, Bloxham Development here is the furthest extremity of Bloxham- the primary and secondary school are the opposite sides of the village and the village centre is not accessible by footpath or cycleway. Existing footpaths in the village are too narrow. The Milton Road is already busy, with a pinch point at the Barford Road/A361 mini roundabout in Bloxham. At the other end of this road in Adderbury they have recently added traffic calming measures. The A361 through the centre of Bloxham suffers from terrible traffic during school start/finish times as children are dropped off by car.
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Option 30	Additional new development on a large scale in Deddington would be detrimental to the historic unique character of this village. Capacity is currently stretched, parking issues, traffic queues, full doctors surgery, space at primary school.
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Option 32	Yes settlement boundaries should be defined beyond which development would not normally be permitted, so villages are separate entities and not becoming sprawling conurbations.
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Deddington	In Deddington we have had recent development at Deddington Grange and currently opposite the windmill centre in the north west quadrant of the village. The plots of land put forward for housing range widely in size and the largest possibly having space for 400+ properties which would be over development. Consideration should be given to much smaller plots spread geographically in other quadrants of the village to limit impact and meet local needs. In Deddington some of the sites submitted are very large and if used will change the character of this historic village and lead to problems resulting from overwhelming the facilities of the area. Consider only sustainable development on small sites preferably brown field ones that serve local needs.
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Make sure local parish councils are involved at all stages and local views taken into consideration. Villages should not be placed at risk of over development, harm to local character and landscape, increased pressure on infrastructure and road congestion and pollution from additional commuting.
LPR-B-805	Helen Worrell	Option 30	Oxfordshire has some lovely rural villages that have individual character which is the attraction for people living there. They have a small community feel where people know and care for each other partly due to their small size. Whilst small expansion can occur without too much pressure on infrastructure most villages soon become completely overwhelmed and changed forever if unsympathetic development is permitted.

LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 1	The vision seems divorced from the national and Oxfordshire context. The vision should acknowledge that Cherwell District Council has effectively handed over its planning authority to the unelected quangos driving the Oxford-Cambridge Arc (CaMKOx) and the Oxfordshire Growth Board driving the Oxfordshire spatial plan for 2050. The combination of these two central government or Growth Board initiatives, as well as contributing to the deficit of local democracy in Cherwell, actually leaves very little of any certainty in the Cherwell Local Plan. Many residents in the south of the District experienced the washing of hands of Cherwell District Council in the Partial Review resulting in excessive removal of Green Belt and consequently the coalescence (and loss of identity) of Yarnton, Begbroke, Kidlington and Water Eaton. The Oxfordshire 2050 and CaMKOx plans will simply ensure a similar topdown, non-democratic approach on the entire district (including, as section 6.4.4 makes clear) those areas that have already lost any effective voice on strategic planning matters
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 2	Clearly climate change has to be prioritised. It should not be about 'promoting' or 'supporting' or 'maximising opportunities' but rather 'enforcing' and 'making essential'. All new development must be net zero carbon, for example. Biodiversity net gain must be in situ, not using so-called offsets (with the same failures attributed to carbon offsets). Recognise that technology enables remote working and therefore economic sustainability is not dependent on people moving into the district. Build less and instead prioritise biodiversity. Actually take the green belt and greenfield sites seriously and enhance their biodiversity as a matter of priority rather than always seeking opportunities to remove green belt and green fields in favour of housing and industry (which usually means in favour of landowners and developers). Imagine if Cherwell's vision was one of a biodiverse conservation area coupled with a strategy for enabling non-resident workers. Imagine, Cherwell could be an active enabler of the UK's levelling-up agenda, helping to make it an actual thing rather than an empty slogan. Imagine, sadly, is not what the vision and objectives encapsulate.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. Why mostly? Why not 'only'? I note that the Oxfordshire Plan, driven by the unelected Growth Board, will make the substantive decisions about employment requirements so I guess residents feedback has little value here
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. It is vitally important to move away from zoning town centres. Ideally, they should be a mix of residential and 'local' business, minimising the need for travel simply for shopping. Prioritise local small business, including freehold pubs and restaurants. Minimise regulations relating to pavement cafes, for example.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. There should be developments comprising only affordable housing, but at least 50% should be affordable (Cherwell has no problem using Oxford City's affordable housing metric in the Partial Review though, as it turned out, that included a dubious policy on who would actually benefit from the affordable component). The current system is broken. Having to increase the overall number of housing units in order to increase the percentage of affordable housing is ridiculous. We need to break the link between genuinely affordable housing and so-called viability (whereby a developer is guaranteed a 20%+ profit on a development). It is also a fallacy to believe that increasing the number of houses will somehow result in a fall in house prices. No developer will permit that
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Question - Housing Policies	Once again, it is disheartening to read that, "The housing requirement for Cherwell to 2040 will be set by the Oxfordshire Plan. It is likely to be above the standard methodology set by government, which for Cherwell is currently 756 homes per year." It seems that Cherwell District Council has handed over the key, foundational policies to the Oxfordshire Growth Board which, by definition, will seek as high a rate of economic growth as it can get away with, and excessive housing numbers to match (as we saw very clearly in the Partial Review and the assessment of Oxford City's housing want).
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation. Give priority to community-led renewable energy initiatives.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Question - Green Belt	Once again, a key foundational policy, the green belt, has been handed by Cherwell District Council to the Oxfordshire Growth Board for decision. We know that Board is driven by economic growth and we know, from the outcome of the Partial Review, that neither the Growth Board nor Cherwell District Council, gives any priority to retaining and indeed enhancing the green belt and green field spaces more generally. A more courageous, visionary Council would seek to extend the Green Belt and use it to drive actual biodiversity, prioritising planet over profits.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 12	Reject the development. Offsets are flawed. You cannot offset damage to mature woodland by planting saplings or installing bird boxes. If a developer cannot demonstrate genuine biodiversity gain onsite then reject the development
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain

LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Question - Local Green Spaces	Green belt sites submitted by landowners for development and which were rejected in the Partial Review should be prioritised as local green spaces, resulting in community-led projects to increase biodiversity and so-called natural capital.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The concept of 'place-making' is far too human-centred and assumes humans are God setting eyes on formless voids and turning them into 'places'. The reality is that many of these 'formless voids' are thriving natural spaces that would benefit from less, not more, human intervention. Placemaking should have biodiversity as its over-riding principle. Beauty and good design is nature-centric.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	We note that Kidlington and the forthcoming suburban sprawl resulting from the Partial Review is not included amongst the examples of 20minute neighbourhoods. As a principle it is a good one but I fear that prior strategic planning failures will not permit, for example, good green spaces, local food production, affordable homes, and keeping jobs local to co-exist in the south of the District.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Disagree with approach. Cherwell has little influence on transport infrastructure. Focus should be on low carbon technology, but if Cherwell actually planned neighbourhoods better then perhaps it would be less necessary to travel even from villages
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development. Digital infrastructure is as essential as other forms of infrastructure. New developments should contribute to digital infrastructure for the wider area, not just the development itself. For example, the major developments planned in Begbroke and Yarnton should have as a condition the provision of fiberto-the-premises for all households in Begbroke and Yarnton.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. There is no reliable and regular public transport linking Kidlington with Begbroke and Yarnton. The (unnecessary) closure of Sandy Lane will only result in longer car journeys. The closure of Sandy Lane without replacement public transport in place is not a sustainable action. Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way. Both options -- create new, accessible green spaces and protect existing green spaces, including green belt. But the priority must be on increasing biodiversity not simply having nice places for humans to walk and exercise.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans. I would trust the Parish Council more than I would Cherwell District Council to identify housing need and sites.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 32	Yes more weight to certain services and facilities. Primary School Local Shop GP Surgery No more weight to accessibility of settlement by public transport. The rural settlement hierarchy is flawed when it prioritises transport to urban centres. Begbroke, for example, only has a village hall, pub and a church, but because it has a regular bus service to Oxford, was selected as one of the sites for 2,000 houses to serve Oxford City workers. In any other metric it would have been considered unsustainable to put so many houses there. Yes, define settlement boundaries beyond which development would not normally be permitted, given that the existence of green belt demonstrably no longer provides the protection from sprawl and coalescence of settlements.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Option 33	Use a combination of the above. Rural economy will be boosted by a policy that ensures provision of equitable digital infrastructure.
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	Begbroke	Begbroke: the Parish Profile should reflect the outcome of the Partial Review which would demonstrate more clearly the loss of identity between Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. In turn, this would show just how unviable for development are sites such as LPR-A-063 and LPR-A-181 (presumably LPR-A-181 is there for housing in addition to that already allocated as part of the Partial Review?). As the profile states, "The flat agricultural landscape between Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton provides an important separation of the villages in maintaining their individual identity and character however this is already eroded by the larger scale developments [of the Partial Review?]"
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	LPR-A-063	Begbroke: the Parish Profile should reflect the outcome of the Partial Review which would demonstrate more clearly the loss of identity between Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. In turn, this would show just how unviable for development are sites such as LPR-A-063 and LPR-A-181 (presumably LPR-A-181 is there for housing in addition to that already allocated as part of the Partial Review?). As the profile states, "The flat agricultural landscape between Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton provides an important separation of the villages in maintaining their individual identity and character however this is already eroded by the larger scale developments [of the Partial Review?]"
LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	LPR-A-181	Begbroke: the Parish Profile should reflect the outcome of the Partial Review which would demonstrate more clearly the loss of identity between Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. In turn, this would show just how unviable for development are sites such as LPR-A-063 and LPR-A-181 (presumably LPR-A-181 is there for housing in addition to that already allocated as part of the Partial Review?). As the profile states, "The flat agricultural landscape between Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton provides an important separation of the villages in maintaining their individual identity and character however this is already eroded by the larger scale developments [of the Partial Review?]"

LPR-B-806	Dr Michael Fraser	LPR-A-063	PR-A-063 Land between Woodstock Road, Begbroke / Kidlington Langford Lane and Begbroke Lane, Begbroke/Kidlington: This site plays an important role in separating Begbroke from the Langford Lane area of Kidlington, particularly now that the technology park is being developed to the north of the site. The site is green belt and, given the release of green belt for large developments in the vicinity, the significance of this site as green belt in protecting what remains of the identity of Begbroke is even greater. As an alternative, this site would be ideal to be allocated as a biodiversityfirst site, for communityled rewilding (it is in the vicinity of Rushy Meadows, for example). Begbroke has a community orchard and developing a wild flower meadow. The site PRA-063 should be protected from development and reserved for increasing biodiversity through a programme of rewilding (including woodland and hedgerow development)
LPR-B-807	Susan Weston	LPR-A-091	I wish to comment on the two Bodicote CP sites reference LPR-A-091. I believe this to be an unsustainable development which offers no benefit to the area and would be disproportionate in its conflict with the village, The impact would be considerable on the village aspects and surrounding countryside. The village has already been subject to significant development in recent times which has increased the population significantly. The sites also would create major access issues as well as pressure on other resources. I would like to object to the approval of these sites.
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Should consider better infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists to make walking and cycling to shops a more pleasant experience. More bike racks and dedicated bike lanes (eg. Parsons St, through market, Bridge St, to station). Block off traffic in town centre (excepting handicapped). Use current parking area by market for planting, green space, seats for shoppers, a small play area for children. Restrict traffic from Bridge St traffic lights towards Market square, to Handicapped, buses, and bikes only.
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. We desperately need more affordable housing.
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Historic buildings can and should be retrofitted to comply with carbon neutral standards
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Sustainable building materials for roads and houses. Tree planting. Public transport (electric). Solar panels on all roofs, rainwater butts fitted as standard to guttering downpipes, use rainwater for all outdoor watering.
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. All planning should take into account the need for wildlife corridors, plus curated green spaces for children.
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes, 20 minute neighbourhoods are helpful; they create a community, and reduce the need for transport other than on foot or bike.
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The Transport Hierarchy is very good. Rural areas need to be 20 minute neighbourhoods too, with the things people need within easy walking distance. There should be better public transport, cycle lanes and bike racks and footpaths.
LPR-B-808	Jane Rogers	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Option 18	Consider further urban extensions.
LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Option 19	A combination of the above.
LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Question - Important views of Banbury	Views should be protected through policy as landmarks reinforce character and sense of historic belonging.

LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission.
LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Cycle and pedestrian routes to join up the network of parks and play areas, encouraging shift to environmental friendly methods of getting around
LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Question - Addressing inequality in	Residential Parking permit schemes, stop commuters parking in residential areas. reduction of speed limits to reduce noise and air quality impacts on arterial roads into the town.
LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Question - Reducing car dependency in Banbury	Real time information provided at bus stops saying when the next bus is due, first hour parking refunded by shops following minimum purchase level
LPR-B-809	Mark Hassall	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Sharing planning advice and support, structure and best practice, performa approach locations could adopt, support with how to carry out the consultation element required and the technology side to enhance engagement
LPR-B-810	Iain Wilson	LPR-A-077	This proposal has been kept very low key with many residents unaware. The proposal looks be increasing Adderbury beyond village status causing environmental, traffic, infrastructure issues. Loss of precious countryside. Building in areas that can flood quite badly. This online objection is not the easiest to navigate therefore descriminating against the many of the public who may not be able to use such a platform. The lack of knowledge of this proposal to the public and residents reaks of nothing other than a money grab and nothing to do with what is best for the village
LPR-B-810	Iain Wilson	LPR-A-081	This proposal has been kept very low key with many residents unaware. The proposal looks be increasing Adderbury beyond village status causing environmental, traffic, infrastructure issues. Loss of precious countryside. Building in areas that can flood quite badly. This online objection is not the easiest to navigate therefore descriminating against the many of the public who may not be able to use such a platform. The lack of knowledge of this proposal to the public and residents reaks of nothing other than a money grab and nothing to do with what is best for the village
LPR-B-810	Iain Wilson	LPR-A-086	This proposal has been kept very low key with many residents unaware. The proposal looks be increasing Adderbury beyond village status causing environmental, traffic, infrastructure issues. Loss of precious countryside. Building in areas that can flood quite badly. This online objection is not the easiest to navigate therefore descriminating against the many of the public who may not be able to use such a platform. The lack of knowledge of this proposal to the public and residents reaks of nothing other than a money grab and nothing to do with what is best for the village
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above. Consider environmental impact of the industry and ethics
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. Banbury needs a 3G pitch, and more floodlit sports resources, and speedy transfer. Enable online booking of facilities
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Improved bus services and using green technology buses. Electric on street charging in residential areas without off street parking, e.g terraced housing.
LPR-B-811	Kate Hassall	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).

LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 1	In theory the KO make sense. In practice, many of the KO won't happen if current evidence from housing developments on green field sites are taken into account. See Sibford Ferris and the Gade homes current plan for development and future plans for expansion on green field site on Hook Norton rd and other potential sites identified in the village. Points KO9/13//15/21/23/25, all refer mainly to sustainability, protection of the environment, biodiversity, protecting the character of rural villages, ensuring adequate infrastructure, etc. Given what we can see from the large developments around Banbury, Bloxham, Hook Norton and surrounding village locations, it seems Cherwell will only pay lip service to these otherwise reasonable KO.
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 2	As above. All good KO but I am afraid I just don't believe that housing developers and developments won't take precedent over protecting the environment, local character, agricultural land for food growth, bio diversity etc.
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land.
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. There should be a mix of retail, homes, converting empty buildings to dwellings, leisure facilities in town centres, free parking!
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Question - Housing Policies	yes, why not. In this area, affordable isn't affordable. Stop second home owners.
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Question - Green Belt	Continued building on green field sites is further damaging biodiversity. We need to avoid granting planning permission for large scale developments confin them to inner town brown sites and in fill.
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Question - Local Green Spaces	All edge of villages where green sites, agri land is being put up for development
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes, it's great in theory and you say we need to develop housing where there is adequate transport but this isn't happening. Here in small villages we have little public transport, increased road traffic, it's too far to walk to nearest sizeable towns and yet developers are still getting the green light for developments.
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs

LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 32	Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services. More weight should be given to public transport. Yes, settlement boundary should be defined beyond which development would not normally be permitted to protect the character of villages, to prevent the spread and biled of villages into each other such as is happening with Bloxham and Banbury, to protect wildlife, bio diversity, to stop air and noise pollution and more traffic congestion in local settlements
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-812	Helen-Louise Pearce	Sibford Gower and Sibford ferris	No more sites should be considered for adoption on the rural areas
LPR-B-813	Sheila Adams	LPR-A-091	The plan to build to the West of Bodictoe is ill conceived The only side of the village that has not been build upon and gives access to rural area that is not overlooked by development should be preserved at all costs. This area is used by thousands for recreation, the access of the development and location puts this all under threat. This plot is not suitable for planning it encroaches upon the Western Edge of Bodicote which has already been subjected to a high level of development disproportional to the infrastructure or availability of release from population density. The Western Edge affords residents the release from overcrowding into the rural countryside. Thousands walk down the lane as daily exercise which saw over a thousand a day during the recent lock down. If the boundary of the village isn't now tightly secured at it existing line then we allow the gate to be nudged open for further transgression down to the brook and beyond. ?If it time to draw a line and stop
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land Development of larger villages will change their character and also the countryside for ever. It will destroy habitats and green spaces. Develop land with less environmental and wildlife destruction. <b>Brown field, close to roads that exist and transportation hubs.</b>
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above. Consider environmental impact of the industry and ethics. There should be little visual impact. Close to transport hubs <b>to minimise travel. Along M40 corridor is an obvious area.</b>
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. I think the traditional model has changed forever. Town centres need to grow and thrive but through other avenues than traditional retail. Shared spaces, community spaces, green spaces, outside eating. Housing as long as the quality is good and doesn't bring down the area. People need to visit historic sites and enjoy the experience. Rates need to be kept at a realistic level that businesses can sustain. Possibly rates being reformed and the revenue coming partially from other sources.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 6	Do we really know how many of any kind of home we need? Changes in population. Changes in demographics. Brexit. WFH. I think it is somewhat un knowable. So how can we plan effectively when we don't know who we are planning for?
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Question - Housing Policies	High energy efficiency. Why not consider solar panels on all South facing roofs? Easy when constructing compared to retro fit.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation. Solar on new South facing roofs. Cycle paths through and connecting new communities
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements



LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	LPR-A-056	There are beautiful views to the North of Deddington. Many people walk Cosy Lane and enjoy the views towards Adderbury and Milton from high on the ridge. The land North of Deddington, LPR-A-056 has been submitted for development. It includes Kings Spring field and wood. This is a huge area and would not only blight the village of Deddington if developed but destroy the habitat for wildlife. There are deer and buzzards living inside Kings Spring wood. This wood is a decent size and an asset for the future. The walk is part of the Deddington circular walk and place of rest, relaxation and well-being for all.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Question - Local Green Spaces	Provide provision for local green spaces, protect character of buildings and materials such as the local stone which is used so impressively for new buildings. I am proud that the council prioritises the use of local stone. It is important that new developments have quality areas for play, cycle paths and trails and other infrastructure to allow a community to flourish.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes there is good merit to the idea. However, there are exceptions with small developments in isolated areas in natural beauty.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Connectivity is as important as the transport provided. We need to get to the places we want to! Need both a reduction in need to travel as well as low carbon tech. I am a Specialist and need to travel for work to large urban areas. If I don't travel, my patients would have to. So probably net gain for me to travel to their communities. But a low carbon method would be preferable. Connectivity. But this is difficult across large spaces. Busses if completely reliable. Maybe a clever booking system, so you know your bus is coming. They seem good here but if I have an appointment I am still reluctant to take a bus as prefer to be under my own control.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 19	To the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Question - Banbury's open spaces	Yes more green spaces
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Question - Reducing car dependency in Banbury	Ultra reliable, frequent buses. It just takes longer by bus. Also have to factor in uncertainty. Cheap reliable bus service / park and ride? I want to be able to take a bus to and from the station. Then have good train service Instead, I drive to Oxford Parkway for London.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Keep the character of villages. Some housing, small scale, infilling only. Don't let urban sprawl destroy the villages. I live in Deddington and chose to be in a rural village not a large town or the outskirts of Banbury
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 31	We do not know what our needs are in this post Brexit and post CV19 world. Life is changing, demographics are changing. Population has probably reduced. But we do not know. Don't over develop based on old data and demographics. Just because land has been offered up. Does not mean it needs to be developed especially green field.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 32	Yes, give weight to accessibility of settlement to urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling. Yes, define settlement boundaries beyond which development would not normally be permitted as otherwise urban sprawl will creep up on villages. Defined boundaries. If people want to live in a bigger conurbation then they can move there! We don't need to turn villages into towns
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	LPR-A-056	I cannot agree with Deddington P3 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. There is no mention of the fabulous views to the North of the village. The document majors on the views from the South of the village and central conservation area. There are fabulous view from the North, from The Daedings and Cosy Lane. Just because there has been some development to the North of Deddington does not mean there should be significantly more. LPR-A-056 is a huge area with huge visual impact for us personally in The Daedings and anyone enjoying Cosy Lane and the Deddington circular walk.
LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Allow local green belts. We cannot know numbers or population at present. Don't go rushing into development based on old pre Brexit and pre CV19 data.

LPR-B-814	Dr Rachel Manning	LPR-A-056	I object whole heartedly to the development of site LPR-A-056 in North Deddington. It is an area with fabulous views, used by the community to walk Cosy Lane. It has a fairly large wood, Kings Spring wood which is a habit for wildlife and a resource. It is beyond the parish boundary. Just because land has been offered DOES NOT mean it needs to be developed. LPR-A-056 is a huge area and would massively impact the village if developed. It is way too large. It would destroy countryside. Who benefits? The farmer - yes The developers - yes indeed The legal teams - always Local people..... No they lose their green spaces, their place for quiet, beautiful views, loss of habitat. Look at small scale infilling.
LPR-B-815	Bryan Pacey	LPR-A-091	Profile for Bodicote, I wish to object to the inclusion of LPR-A-091 within the local plan. Development of this site is unsustainable and would conflict with the National Planning Policy with reference to transport, access, sustainable development and enjoyment of the countryside. The current two means of access are very narrow and there are no other practical means of accessing the site. Both roads/tracks are used extensively by cyclists and walkers who would be endangered if the access was more widely used by vehicles. Already there has been and continue to be difficulties for these groups as a result of construction work for the "barn conversion", Brookland, by Roland Bratt and the road surface and verges are badly damaged by heavy goods vehicles delivering to site. These access routes cannot be widened due to the proximity of homes to them. The site is totally unsuitable for further development which would also destroy a defining edge to Bodicote village which has already had to take more than its fair share of housing, despite parish boundaries being changed to benefit Banbury.
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8). Two large warehouses have been built at J11 and A361. These are an eyesore and the additional planning application for a hotel and food outlets will only increase the amount of traffic in this area. The A361 is a notoriously bad area for accidents and fatalities:
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Question - Supporting	Support should be given to small local businesses rather than multi-national chains. Local business brings local employment.
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Question - Travelling Communities	Before providing areas and services to Travelling Communities, CDC should ensure that planning conditions are met and be prepared to take action should any breach occur (ie number of caravans, suitable electrical and sewerage requirements, etc)
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Look at redevelopment/repurposing of brownfield and empty retail sites for regeneration to sustainable housing, thus utilising a resource which is already available. Historic buildings should be given priority for protection and should be kept, as far as possible, in their original state. Retrofitting should be subject to considerable scrutiny to ensure that historic buildings are not lost or impaired
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Maintenance of green spaces is paramount whether in town or rural areas. Planning policy should reflect the need to keep these areas and not to simply utilise them for building space. Concrete blocks and additional traffic will not ease climate change.
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 13	Major development proposals should be subject to the most stringent policy objectives. Therefore simply planting a few trees as compensation is not sufficient. The best option is not to allow development in these areas
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Policies for heritage and historic environment should consider what the loss of such would mean for the area. The policy should not only include buildings, but land, particularly ridge and furrow, and areas historically used for keeping of livestock.
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Stringent review of planning requirements.
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Additional development in rural areas will, eventually, mean that they become towns! Villages must be able to sustain and integrate new development without it becoming detrimental to the existing residences, businesses, schools and medical services. Any rural development should not impact, impair or inconvenience existing swellings and should be concomitant with services already provided.

LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 32	Yes, define settlement boundaries beyond which development would not normally be permitted, particularly in rural areas/villages to ensure that each village retains its identity and is not swallowed up by overdevelopment
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	The Local Plan should pay great heed to the Neighbourhood Plan. These are, after all, the people, businesses and services, which will be impacted by any development in the future and thus their views should be of paramount importance.
LPR-B-816	Nicola Jackson	LPR-A-155	This land has been the subject of several planning applications over recent years, all of which have been rejected. The last application went to appeal in 2018 with The Planning Inspectorate where the application was again dismissed. Many of the generic reasons for dismissal are pertinent today and will remain so for many years to come. This land is a benefit to the local community as it is a green space easily accessible by all residents and allows access to a number of marked footpaths used for exercise and enrichment. The land has no light pollution and thus is suitable for astronomy. There is an abundance of wildlife using both the open space and wooded area surrounding. The railway line borders this land and at the last planning application, British Rail indicated they they would seek to erect a 3 metre fence topped with razor wire to ensure the safety of their line. This is not in keeping with the village and would deter from any potential development. The access to the site is via an unmade private road, residents on this road would be impacted and inconvenienced by construction vehicles and the provision of services to the site. Indeed, the whole character and appearance of Spring Lane- a village setting - would be impaired irrevocably. There are other sites proposed on the periphery of the village which would offer selfcontained construction as has been the case with the previous developments of Cherry Fields and Kyetts Corner, which did not impinge on any existing dwellings during construction and new access was included in plans without disruption to existing infrastructure. These other sites outlined in the Call for Sites offer mixed development and not purely residential thus bringing new opportunities for potential employment and amenities to the village. Further, in 2018, following a survey of households in the village, 89% were against development of this land. The local school and doctors' surgery have finite capacity and development would only increase the demands on these services. As an ancient village, dating pre-Civil War, the road structure, particularly Station Road, is barely coping with current weight of traffic which would inevitably increased with development at this site. I would respectfully suggest given the history of rejected planning applications for this site and the unwillingness of the village as a whole to see this land developed, that it is removed from the Local Plan at least until the next revision in five years time.
LPR-B-816	Maura Cordell	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land At the larger villages
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Question - Travelling communities	Land in Begbroke close to the A44
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Question - Green Belt	Keep the green belt it was designated for a reason and it shouldn't just turn into Oxfords unmet housing need. It is well used by local people for recreation and health and wellbeing, key areas identified by the government that individuals need to focus on to not over run our NHS- keep residents healthy, happy and able to engage with nature. Government said there will be no more development on green belt therefore it should be removed from any Local plans or growth deals and concentrate on brownfield site
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain

LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. Much of the play areas are old and updates are few, new equipment and areas for play, sport and recreation are critical to support residents across the area
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Ensure design is considered early on and design review panels are involved in all large development proposals
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	15 or 20 minute always important to concentrate on delivering good infrastructure, services and retail offerings.
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 16	Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Question - Transport Policies	Lack of car parks as they are turned over to developing flats. Large increase in housing provision will require that the infrastructure is strengthened and public transport options increased and reviewed.
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 19	a combination of the above
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 22	Consider further urban extensions, focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Bicester
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 23	A combination of the above
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 25	Facilitate such developments through a criteria based policy
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Look at the whole area and identify the number of infill and flats/ apartments being built, is this what the village needs does this support the local population effectively. Are plans submitted ever refused permission for infills in Kidlington?
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential. Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 28	Please keep the green belt as it should be, any changes would remove character and recreation from the area and reduce the enjoyment of the residents, their families and animals.
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Good what we have always room for more pitches or MUGA for the winter time
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 32	Village Hall GP Surgery Regular Bus services Green areas also important. Yes, give weight to availability of services and facilities and access by public transport options, walking and cycling. Yes, define settlement boundaries beyond which development would not normally be permitted as the current plan does not consider the green belt boundary
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	LPR-A-227	how do they work out what is a good site or is it down the financial viability for the developer in question. Are the local residents, services, schools etc ever a consideration. Is there local need for development here or is this in response to the financial need of a developer. This area is green belt and well utilised by the local community, families and dogs there isn't extra infrastructure to support large scale development and this is in close proximity to the River Cherwell and Oxford Canal so I wonder how much of this area is flood plain and could cope with being developed on, Why not look for Brownfield sites.

LPR-B-817	Maura Cordell	LPR-A-224	how do they work out what is a good site or is it down the financial viability for the developer in question. Are the local residents, services, schools etc ever a consideration. Is there local need for development here or is this in response to the financial need of a developer. This area is green belt and well utilised by the local community, families and dogs there isn't extra infrastructure to support large scale development and this is in close proximity to the River Cherwell and Oxford Canal so I wonder how much of this area is flood plain and <u>could cope with being developed on, Why not look for Brownfield sites.</u>
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 2	Development of land north east of the moors is totally inappropriate for the purpose because of flood risk and the loss of habitat for wild life such as deer, foxes, badger and birds
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. Abutting land currently used for the purpose NOT residential areas.
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Question - Housing Policies	All new build should include renewable energy supply eg Solar power
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Question - Green Belt	Open spaces between Kidlington and the river Cherwell and between the villages should be maintained.
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Any development towards the river will seriously damage biodiversity
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Question - Local Green Spaces	Area between The Moors and the River Cherwell
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Churches should be protected through policy
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Question - Transport & Connectivity	There are no buses operating along the Moors where most of the Sheltered housing provision stands. There should be electric buses
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 26	Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses
LPR-B-818	Kidlington Baptist Church	Option 27	Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close. Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way

LPR-B-819	Timothy Mayes	Islip	The opportunistic housing proposals put forward again by the Church Commissioners for Islip are totally inappropriate and would damage the fabric of a historic village. The surrounding area Kidlington, Yarnton, Bicester and Heyford seem likely to experience large population growth in the next 20 years. The last Village Plan supported small scale growth for local requirements .
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Local Green Spaces	A new Hanwell Forest at Land north of Banbury and south of Hanwell, east of Warwick Road is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 1	Looks like greenwashing, with more and more of Cherwell's natural capital and landscapes being destroyed with further new developments and the expansion of Banbury into nearby rural villages, there is nothing in this vision about 'Protecting the landscape' we have left in the district to off set Banbury's emissions. Protect and enhance the rural identity of the district to combat the global climate emergency should be key in this vision.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 2	Yes there should be objectives to increase the amount of housing within town centres such as Banbury, to use empty shopping centres and retail spaces to have new quality homes for everyone with the existing public transport access, networks and links towns have already. To have children's playgrounds in the heart of town centres like Banbury to bring back families living in the town. Build on brown field sites in towns rather than using the countryside
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. By continue building further into green spaces, the Council is adding to the climate change emergency and should be accountable for their actions.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Supporting	More about tourism and using the district's natural capital as an asset and resource to create new jobs in the area.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. In Banbury town centre focus on creating mini districts of independent retail, living spaces, playgrounds, and leisure giving it a new mix to residents why to visit and use the town centre
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments but this should be within the existing footprint of a town and not continuing to extend into rural areas, destroying the landscape and joining nearby villages to towns such as Banbury. Hanwell village is slowly being dragged into Banbury, and could lose its rural village identity as more development comes its way
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. New homes should only be allowed to be build if they have solar panels and new ways to source natural energy
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Most of your vision in this area looks like greenwashing and lacks protecting the landscape and natural capital in the district. Protect farmland and green spaces. Plant trees and forests around towns like Banbury to off set emissions.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Green Belt	Banbury needs and should have a green belt or the Council's could develop its own green belt initiative to plant new forests around Banbury to off set carbon emissions from the town, M40 and the Hennef Way.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 12	Expand this out of Conservation Target Areas to broader areas in the district
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	This section needs to be worked on, its the most important section of this document to fight the climate change emergency and it lacks the urgency and importance.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements

LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Enhance conservation areas and extend these areas into the landscape to protect the view to and from the area.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 19	To the south of the town. Stop building on green spaces and focus on the town centre for new affordable homes
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-152	I object to any of the above site, I believe that Cherwell District Council should not be considering development of these sites to the north of Banbury. I feel especially strongly that development must not be allowed at the following two sites, which would most adversely impact upon Hanwell village. I strongly believe that there's been too much development to the north of Banbury already, contrary to the former planning policy that Dukes Meadow Drive should form a firm northern boundary to the town. Allowing any of the above green sites for development would end Hanwell's 800 years of being a historic rural village. Traffic to the north of Banbury is already a huge problem and the village of Hanwell cannot cope with increasing volumes of traffic through its conserved historic core
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-214	I object to any of the above site, I believe that Cherwell District Council should not be considering development of these sites to the north of Banbury. I feel especially strongly that development must not be allowed at the following two sites, which would most adversely impact upon Hanwell village. I strongly believe that there's been too much development to the north of Banbury already, contrary to the former planning policy that Dukes Meadow Drive should form a firm northern boundary to the town. Allowing any of the above green sites for development would end Hanwell's 800 years of being a historic rural village. Traffic to the north of Banbury is already a huge problem and the village of Hanwell cannot cope with increasing volumes of traffic through its conserved historic core
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-205	I object to any of the above site, I believe that Cherwell District Council should not be considering development of these sites to the north of Banbury. I feel especially strongly that development must not be allowed at the following two sites, which would most adversely impact upon Hanwell village
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-154	I object to any of the above site, I believe that Cherwell District Council should not be considering development of these sites to the north of Banbury. I feel especially strongly that development must not be allowed at the following two sites, which would most adversely impact upon Hanwell village
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-047	I object to any of the above site, I believe that Cherwell District Council should not be considering development of these sites to the north of Banbury. I feel especially strongly that development must not be allowed at the following two sites, which would most adversely impact upon Hanwell village
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission. Bring back people living in the heart of the town centre
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. Stop building along it. Protect and enhance what is there. It needs more open green spaces and especially to the north of the town and the town centre
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Housing and developments should be focused in towns like Banbury and Bicester, Develop brown field sites and empty retail spaces instead of rural areas
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 32	Yes- public transport
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy. The natural capital assets north of Banbury's edge should be used to further enhance the rural economy and to conserve and protect vital landscape and woodland that is regionally important not just to agriculture, tourism and leisure but for everyone's wellbeing and mental health.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Option 34	Protect Hanwell's village character and identity. Planting a new tree line or forest north of Banbury will help combat climate change on a local scale and continue to provide access to the countryside for residents in both Hanwell and Banbury. Once development has taken place there's no going back to restore the landscape to its natural setting and character. Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-047	LPR-A-047 I strongly opposed the above site for development as its an encroachment of Banbury's urban area on to the landscape and setting of Hanwell village.Hanwell Parish This is very depressing viewing, the following sites up for even more housing development: LPR-A-047, LPR-A-154, LPR- A-205, LPR-A-152 and LPR-A-214. Pretty, historic Hanwell will be lost and swallowed up with new housing developments on the north of Banbury. Hanwell is a small village with a narrow and sometimes single track running through its historic conserved core. Allowing more housing developments to come even closer to the the village will mean Hanwell will be lost forever. Hanwell needs conserving and protecting, it is an asset to the Cherwell District for its historical listed buildings, character, history and its new role in fighting climate change with the submission of a new forest to be planted between Banbury and the village. Drayton Parish Echos of the above, protect Drayton and the farmland in the parish.

LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-154	I strongly opposed the above site for development as its an encroachment of Banbury's urban area on to the landscape and setting of Hanwell village.Hanwell Parish This is very depressing viewing, the following sites up for even more housing development: LPR-A-047, LPR-A-154, LPR-A-205, LPR-A-152 and LPR-A-214. Pretty, historic Hanwell will be lost and swallowed up with new housing developments on the north of Banbury. Hanwell is a small village with a narrow and sometimes single track running through its historic conserved core. Allowing more housing developments to come even closer to the the village will mean Hanwell will be lost forever. Hanwell needs conserving and protecting, it is an asset to the Cherwell District for its historical listed buildings, character, history and its new role in fighting climate change with the submission of a new forest to be planted between Banbury and the village. Drayton Parish Echos of the above, protect Drayton and the farmland in the parish.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-205	I strongly opposed the above site for development as its an encroachment of Banbury's urban area on to the landscape and setting of Hanwell village.Hanwell Parish This is very depressing viewing, the following sites up for even more housing development: LPR-A-047, LPR-A-154, LPR-A-205, LPR-A-152 and LPR-A-214. Pretty, historic Hanwell will be lost and swallowed up with new housing developments on the north of Banbury. Hanwell is a small village with a narrow and sometimes single track running through its historic conserved core. Allowing more housing developments to come even closer to the the village will mean Hanwell will be lost forever. Hanwell needs conserving and protecting, it is an asset to the Cherwell District for its historical listed buildings, character, history and its new role in fighting climate change with the submission of a new forest to be planted between Banbury and the village. Drayton Parish Echos of the above, protect Drayton and the farmland in the parish.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-152	I strongly opposed the above site for development as its an encroachment of Banbury's urban area on to the landscape and setting of Hanwell village.Hanwell Parish This is very depressing viewing, the following sites up for even more housing development: LPR-A-047, LPR-A-154, LPR-A-205, LPR-A-152 and LPR-A-214. Pretty, historic Hanwell will be lost and swallowed up with new housing developments on the north of Banbury. Hanwell is a small village with a narrow and sometimes single track running through its historic conserved core. Allowing more housing developments to come even closer to the the village will mean Hanwell will be lost forever. Hanwell needs conserving and protecting, it is an asset to the Cherwell District for its historical listed buildings, character, history and its new role in fighting climate change with the submission of a new forest to be planted between Banbury and the village. Drayton Parish Echos of the above, protect Drayton and the farmland in the parish.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	LPR-A-214	I strongly opposed the above site for development as its an encroachment of Banbury's urban area on to the landscape and setting of Hanwell village.Hanwell Parish This is very depressing viewing, the following sites up for even more housing development: LPR-A-047, LPR-A-154, LPR-A-205, LPR-A-152 and LPR-A-214. Pretty, historic Hanwell will be lost and swallowed up with new housing developments on the north of Banbury. Hanwell is a small village with a narrow and sometimes single track running through its historic conserved core. Allowing more housing developments to come even closer to the the village will mean Hanwell will be lost forever. Hanwell needs conserving and protecting, it is an asset to the Cherwell District for its historical listed buildings, character, history and its new role in fighting climate change with the submission of a new forest to be planted between Banbury and the village. Drayton Parish Echos of the above, protect Drayton and the farmland in the parish.
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Help fund it
LPR-B-820	Chris Brant	Question - Supporting our Town	I believe that building new housing is important and should be focused on existing sites, town centres and regeneration of retail spaces, in order to protect and enhance the natural capital in the district in order to combat climate change
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 1	I agree with the vision but the implementation of the existing 2031 Plan has often failed to match them. Too much building on green sites in villages, little infrastructure improvement [particularly the condition of rural roads ] and a further decline in local service:
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 2	Too many of these objectives are tasks for national and regional government not local authorities . Energy and limited resources would be better directed to tasks which a LDA are likely to ba able to deliver.
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Retail cannot "be supported" the market will always win out. Adaptation is required not support
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Question - Housing Policies	No. Not the task of local government.
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Question - Green Belt	Agree
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible



LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Option 3 for approach to rural areas. Better broadband would help reduce emissions from transport.
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-821	John Perriss	Sibford Gower	All the sites in Sibford Ferris and Gower should be rejected for the reasons listed in the submissions of the respective parish councils, Robin Grimston and Andrew and Chris Tinsley.
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Introduce policies requiring new dwellings to have solar pv panels, solar hot water panels EV charging points and waste water recycling
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Recognise that natural environment is destroyed with every greenfield site development
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	The setting is important. Historic environment can be ruined by allowing new development in close proximity.
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Avoid uniformity – introduce a policy that requires any development of more than three dwellings to have different designs, and to use different materials.
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. This must take account of the deficiency in the local sewage treatment systems, which overflow to the watercourses. Pause development until this is stopped.
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans. Allow Neighbourhood Plans to determine the suitability of development sites.
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 32	Regular Bus services. Yes, more weight to accessibility of settlement to urban centres- public transport. Give additional weight to protecting the existing character of settlements. Allowing modern estates to be built in close proximity to a conservation area can destroy its setting. Settlement boundaries should be defined, to concentrate development where it is most sustainable
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 33	Allow Neighbourhood Plans to determine suitability of sites affecting the rural economy.
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Include a policy in the Local Plan to establish the authority of the Neighbourhood Plan in the allocation of development sites.

2016

LPR-B-822	Richard Broadbent	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Assessment of sites should be left to Neighbourhood Plans
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 201 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Question - Travelling Communities	There should be no provision for Travelling Communities on Green Belt land
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Question - Green Belt	Our precious local Green Belt should be protected from development of any kind. Its value to the local community became abundantly clear during the recent Covid lockdown and travel restrictions when it offered a priceless escape for local residents to take walks and enjoy the countryside and as such was used much more heavily than ever before.
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Biodiversity should be an overriding consideration in the selection of sites for development. Local wildlife should be protected at all costs, especially where endangered species are concerned, such as the skylark in the countryside behind the Moors in Kidlington. And of course the protection of the local countryside itself should be the major factor in development decisions. This is more relevant than ever when the intense coverage given to the recent Glasgow Climate Change Conference showed how environmental issues are finally being taken seriously worldwide, witness the commitments of governments, not least the UK's, to protect the environment
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Question - Local Green Spaces	Whether as Local Green Space or High Value Green Belt, the countryside around Kidlington should be protected from development for the reasons stated above
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Local roads which still retain something of a traditional rural character or have old houses which now qualify as historic, such as Mill St., The Moors, Crown Rd. in Kidlington should be protected at all costs. The Moors, for example, still one of Kidlington's more picturesque roads, would be wrecked by any development on the countryside behind.
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Infill housing, at least as far as I am able to understand it, is eminently preferable to new housing development
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. As stated above, the local Green Belt should be protected at all costs from development for any purpose, whether it be for employment or for housing
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	More frequent and reliable public transport would be an incentive for us to use the car less
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 27	Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way. Kidlington's Green Spaces should be protected at all costs. They are the lungs of Kidlington and highly valued and enjoyed by local residents
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Rural areas and villages should never be spoilt in order to cater for Oxford's housing needs
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 32	No - no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres. Yes to defining settlement boundaries in order to protect rural villages from development sprawl.

LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	LPR-A-224	It seems incredible that Sites LPR-A-224 and LPR-A-424, ie the fields to the east of The Moors, could ever be considered for development because: a) they are High Value Green Belt heavily used by walkers and providing local residents with beautiful countryside and picturesque access to the River Cherwell b) Any development there would totally destroy the nature of The Moors, one of Kidlington's most pleasant roads c) It is well known that the fields behind the Moors are extremely vulnerable to flooding d) Any development of those fields would be a disaster for the wildlife present there, including the endangered skylark and great crested newt in the pond
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	LPR-A-424	It seems incredible that Sites LPR-A-224 and LPR-A-424, ie the fields to the east of The Moors, could ever be considered for development because: a) they are High Value Green Belt heavily used by walkers and providing local residents with beautiful countryside and picturesque access to the River Cherwell b) Any development there would totally destroy the nature of The Moors, one of Kidlington's most pleasant roads c) It is well known that the fields behind the Moors are extremely vulnerable to flooding d) Any development of those fields would be a disaster for the wildlife present there, including the endangered skylark and great crested newt in the pond
LPR-B-823	John Wainwright	Question - Green Belt	The local Green Belt should be preserved at all costs and Kidlington's precious green spaces never sacrificed to cater for Oxford City's housing or employment needs
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 32	Yes more weight to accessibility- walking/ Cycling. Yes to settlement boundaries. It's important to retain rural areas and villages rural identity. It's indispensable to maintain the individuality, uniqueness and a sense of the village's history
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	Option 30	It's important to retain rural areas and villages rural identity. It's indispensable to maintain the individuality, uniqueness and a sense of the village's history.

LPR-B-824	Dan Eisenberg	LPR-A-223	The development of this site would completely destroy the village identity and devalue all the surrounding properties. It's important to retain rural areas and villages rural identity. It's indispensable to maintain the individuality, uniqueness and a sense of the village's history
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 1	The so-called Theme "Challenge of Climate Change" should be the main priority. Doing so would encourage a wiser approach towards growth, both in terms of building homes and encouraging employment. The present plan reads at times as a manifesto for Concretopia
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 2	Meeting the Challenges of Climate Change should be priority one. If so, the first point listed under the so-called "Maintaining and Developing a Sustainable Local Economy" ("Allocate sufficient land to meet our housing and employment needs") should be placed very much towards the bottom of the list, particularly in view of the valuable experience gathered during the Covid-19 crisis that supports the view that much of the work can be carried out remotely at home (i.e. not necessarily in Cherwell). Point 16 ("Reduce dependency on the private car as a mode of travel, facilitating the creation of a zero-carbon transport network") sounds fanciful when no action is currently been taken to reduce the number of private airplanes flying from London-Oxford airport (a low-employment facility for residents in Cherwell) which contribute far more highly to the carbon print of the region.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above. Private health and educational establishments should be considered.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units. The percentage should be increased for all housing developments of 5 or more units.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes. Accessibility standards should be applied to all new homes (not only a proportion).
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Housing Policies	Environmentally friendly materials and methods should be used in all new buildings. Gardens and other green areas should be included in all designs.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Separation Distances	Buildings should be separated by gardens and/or substantial green areas.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Land (brown sites) should be allocated for the installation of wind and solar power energy plans. Solar panels could also be added to all new home buildings.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Reduce the number of planned new homes and consider repurposing the London-Oxford airport (ex. as a residential area or for the installation of renewable energy plants/distribution area).
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Green Belt	Cherwell Council is leaving all the big decisions about growth and the Green Belt to the Oxfordshire Plan. In fact our elected representatives (parish, district and county councillors and MP) can and should have a big say in these decisions.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. The 25 Year Environment Plan requires Cherwell to 'leave our environment in a better state that we found it and to pass on to the next generation a natural environment protected and enhanced for the future'. There is no way that this commitment will be met by destroying the Green Belt and with that the biodiversity of the county.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain

LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	As indicated above: The 25 Year Environment Plan requires Cherwell to 'leave our environment in a better state that we found it and to pass on to the next generation a natural environment protected and enhanced for the future'. There is no way that this commitment will be met by destroying the Green Belt and with that the biodiversity of the county
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all age areas of play
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Local Green Spaces	Local Green Spaces must be included within all "Housing" areas and perhaps also within the so-called "Commercial" areas.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Heritage not only need to be protected, but also needs to be revealed and reexamined in view of changing social attitudes (ex. decolonization and social inclusion).
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	The concept of 20-minute neighbourhoods should not be used as an excuse to create the need for services that can be accessed remotely or easily elsewhere.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Transport & Connectivity	More importance must be given to low polluting and environmentally friendly public transport (ex. trams, bicycle networks, etc). There is no need to have an airport in the county (consider repurposing the London-Oxford airport). The need to travel can perfectly be satisfied with low carbon public transport - the dichotomy is false. The need to travel can perfectly be satisfied with low carbon public transport both in urban and in rural areas - the dichotomy is false. Network of trams and bike lanes should be established.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	It should be proportional to the existing size of the communities nearby (i.e. should not exceed the number of houses already existing in the area).
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. Accommodate both housing and employment land outside then existing Green Belt boundaries.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Provide regular and reliable low carbon public transport and establish a bicycle network linking the villages with the rest of the county and Oxford city.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 28	Do not destroy the Green Belt. The wording used in the report is already eloquent of its negative approach towards the Green Spaces. For example, Point 6.4.1 . says that Kidlington and its surrounding villages are predominantly insets "constrained" by the Oxford Green Belt. These villages have never been "constrained" by the Oxford Green Belt, but rather the opposite! Both the villages and Oxford have managed to enjoy a relatively good quality of life as a result of having a Green Belt
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 32	Primary School Secondary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services Consider other low carbon public transport facilities (ex. trains, bicycle lanes). More weight to public transport
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district

LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Begbroke	They are highly misleading and seem to have been redacted with a view to justify high carbon development. For example, the Parish profile of Begbroke describes this village as follows: "Begbroke Village is located to the west of Kidlington, split either side of the A44 Woodstock Road and set within a landscape comprising urban, commercial and industrial elements". In reality, Begbroke is set within a landscape comprising vast areas of green land with only small commercial and industrial elements. The problem is that the present plan will erase the existing green areas. It is indeed concerning that not a single green area has been allocated in the table of projects. It is also untrue that the so-called "flat agricultural landscape" between Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton that provides an important separation of the villages in maintaining their individual identity and character is "already eroded" by industrial and commercial developments.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Conducting more inclusive methods of consultation.
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	LPR-A-008	As indicated earlier, the absence of green areas in the plans for Begbroke is alarming. See sites LPRA-008 , LPR-A-063 , LPR-A-069 , LPR-A-108 , LPR-A-142, LPR-A-181,LPR-A-191
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	LPR-A-063	As indicated earlier, the absence of green areas in the plans for Begbroke is alarming. See sites LPRA-008 , LPR-A-063 , LPR-A-069 , LPR-A-108 , LPR-A-142, LPR-A-181,LPR-A-192
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	LPR-A-181	As indicated earlier, the absence of green areas in the plans for Begbroke is alarming. See sites LPRA-008 , LPR-A-063 , LPR-A-069 , LPR-A-108 , LPR-A-142, LPR-A-181,LPR-A-193
LPR-B-835	Dr Graciela Iglesias-Rogers	LPR-A-191	As indicated earlier, the absence of green areas in the plans for Begbroke is alarming. See sites LPRA-008 , LPR-A-063 , LPR-A-069 , LPR-A-108 , LPR-A-142, LPR-A-181,LPR-A-194
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 1	The COVID-19 pandemic has taught humanity that bold action is required to meet big challenges. The biggest challenge facing humanity during the period of the Cherwell Local Plan up to 2040 is climate change. Mitigation of climate change MUST be at the forefront of all public policy. The town and country planning system has a vital role in promoting carbon neutral living, more sustainable use of resources and preserving our environment.  Expansion through building new housing estates on high-value farmland is not the answer. This has tended to create residential areas even more dependent on private transport. Through such expansion of towns natural capital around our towns is lost forever, whilst so-called "unviable" sites in town centres remain neglected. The planning system has the power to curtail market forces and protect our countryside. The Vision for Cherwell is good. The opening sentence ("Cherwell, a place of distinctive, vibrant, and diverse towns and villages, lies at the heart of the country.") lends support to preserving distinctive villages. This includes Hanwell, which is an historic village and strong community separate from Banbury for over 800 years. The Vision could be improved through giving greater prominence to goal 10 of the Vision ("Our distinctive natural and built environment and our rich historic heritage is cherished, protected and enhanced. Cherwell maintains its rural character where its landscapes, its vast range of natural and built heritage and its market towns define its distinctiveness."). This must be taken account of when developments expand larger towns to directly threaten historic rural villages and communities
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Local Green Spaces	The Village Playing Field, off Muddy Lane, Hanwell is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 2	I place value on the objectives relating to Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, which is a responsibility of all of us. As such, I consider the following objective most important: Key Objective 11: "Support a local zero- carbon energy system that reduces Cherwell's reliance on global fossil fuels and prioritises community energy." The following objective is also important to me: Key Objective 23 "Focus development in Cherwell's sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and the setting of its towns and villages."
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land Whilst employment land should be focussed across a combination of sites, greater focus should be given to those locations most suitable to development. This is likely to be transport interchanges, and previously developed land, which can be developed in sustainable way
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. Policies should discourage new out-of-town development and promote use of vacant town centre retail premises. Policies should promote design of premises in keeping with the historical significance of the built environment
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation

LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Planning policy for provision of new homes should have policies that promote carbon neutral living, such as:- promoting local community food production (such as through allotment provision). - improving provision of public transport (and enforcing planning conditions with new developments).- promoting domestic energy production. - specifying design and location of electric vehicle charging points. - specifying arrangements for improved community recycling. - promote communal use of shared spaces in housing areas (including safer pedestrianised spaces without car-parking in front of houses).
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. The Local Plan should include obtaining clear demonstration of environmental gains from development and holding developers accountable for delivering against these
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	The Local Plan should include policy on dark skies. This should take account of the impact of edge of town housing development on light pollution for neighbouring countryside. Dark skies are important to help protect wildlife and stop light pollution. The Local Plan should include policy on preservation of minimum distances between settlements (particularly between towns and neighbouring villages) to protect countryside and habitats for wildlife
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocketparks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	As part of protecting the historic environment, policies should protect the surrounding landscape to ensure that landscapes and views of historic sites, such as ancient churches, are preserved. Preservation of views of historic sites should prevent development in the open countryside where applicable.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	I agree with the principle of 20-minute neighbourhoods. Well designed and sustainable neighbourhoods can greatly enhance quality of life. I don't feel these are obtained through "bolt-on" housing development on the edge of towns. Indeed, such development (as proposed north of Banbury towards Hanwell village) goes against these principles by increasing dependence on car travel to reach facilities and services. Features of 20-minute neighbourhoods that would work in rural settings include greater provision of allotments to encourage local food production and reduce dependence on purchasing food with a greater carbon footprint.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Transport & Connectivity	In rural areas the need to travel (to reach services) will be higher than inside urban areas (due to distribution of community services). This can be supported through designation of cyclingfriendly routes, or promotion of other environmentally friendly forms of transport. Greater provision of cycle lanes that are more integrated and safer would promote less driving. Our family are willing to make local journeys (<5 miles) by bicycle, but the lack of cycle lanes and traffic calming measures on some routes would make many journeys too unsafe.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	LPR-A-047	Whilst I oppose additional development requiring greenfield sites when unused urban sites remain dormant, the current asymmetrical development of Banbury would support further development to the East, so long as sites can be developed without causing coalescence with neighbouring villages. The specific sites that I would like to comment on are: LPRA-047 – Land at Hardwick Farm, West of Southam Road, Banbury LPR-A-154 – Hanwell Rise, Land at Hardwick Hill, Southam Road, Banbury LPR-A-205 – Land off Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury I strongly oppose the further development to the north of Banbury, particularly as this is where previous "strategic" allocations on the edge of town (e.g. Hanwell Fields) have provided the majority of housing delivered since 2011. The names of new housing developments are a clear indication of the direction of recent development, which has seen Hanwell Fields, Hanwell Chase, Hanwell Rise and Hanwell View.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	LPR-A-205	Whilst I oppose additional development requiring greenfield sites when unused urban sites remain dormant, the current asymmetrical development of Banbury would support further development to the East, so long as sites can be developed without causing coalescence with neighbouring villages. The specific sites that I would like to comment on are: LPRA-047 – Land at Hardwick Farm, West of Southam Road, Banbury LPR-A-154 – Hanwell Rise, Land at Hardwick Hill, Southam Road, Banbury LPR-A-205 – Land off Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury I strongly oppose the further development to the north of Banbury, particularly as this is where previous "strategic" allocations on the edge of town (e.g. Hanwell Fields) have provided the majority of housing delivered since 2011. The names of new housing developments are a clear indication of the direction of recent development, which has seen Hanwell Fields, Hanwell Chase, Hanwell Rise and Hanwell View.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	LPR-A-154	Whilst I oppose additional development requiring greenfield sites when unused urban sites remain dormant, the current asymmetrical development of Banbury would support further development to the East, so long as sites can be developed without causing coalescence with neighbouring villages. The specific sites that I would like to comment on are: LPRA-047 – Land at Hardwick Farm, West of Southam Road, Banbury LPR-A-154 – Hanwell Rise, Land at Hardwick Hill, Southam Road, Banbury LPR-A-205 – Land off Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury I strongly oppose the further development to the north of Banbury, particularly as this is where previous "strategic" allocations on the edge of town (e.g. Hanwell Fields) have provided the majority of housing delivered since 2011. The names of new housing developments are a clear indication of the direction of recent development, which has seen Hanwell Fields, Hanwell Chase, Hanwell Rise and Hanwell View.

LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Important views of Banbury	The view from fields north of Banbury towards the village of Hanwell include the view of the ancient St Peter's Church, which is within the Hanwell Conservation Area. Like Cherwell Council's duty to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of town conservation areas, there is an equal duty to protect the conservation area for the historic heritage of neighbouring settlements. As with the existing Local Plan policy to protect the views of St Mary's Church (built in the 18th Century to replace an earlier medieval church) per Policy C34, there should be a policy to protect views of other significant Places of Worship. This extension of the policy should apply to St Peter's Church in Hanwell (dating from the 12th Century). This church can still be viewed from open countryside in the south, which is a vista protected for centuries. This is especially important now as it is under threat from the latest proposals for more housing development north of Banbury.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Greater provision of cycle lanes that are more integrated and safer would promote less driving. Our family are willing to make local journeys (<5 miles) by bicycle, but the lack of cycle lanes and traffic calming measures on some routes would make many journeys too unsafe.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for)
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans. The Local Plan must acknowledge that certain rural villages may only be suitable for infill development, and not expansion. This would be true of villages such as Hanwell. For rural settlements, the Local Plan should confirm that a minimum level of open countryside is required surrounding such villages to maintain their rural character. Such a buffer zone is a "need" of the existing housing and residents within villages (to preserve their distinct character and identity).
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 32	Primary School Village Hall Local Shop Regular Bus services No - no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres. It should not only be existing services and facilities that determine whether a rural settlement is prioritised for rural growth, since planning conditions can require provision of such facilities to promote sustainable development. The planning system has the power to create sustainable growth (at sites like Heyford Park). The expansion of urban areas can result in facilities associated with urban settings becoming more accessible to nearby villages. It would be wrong for such accessibility to move such villages up the rural settlement hierarchy, and thus promote their development, as this would be detrimental to preservation of their identity discrete from the neighbouring urban area. Settlement boundaries should be used to prevent towns expanding too close to existing villages (and so preserve the countryside buffer between settlements). Settlement boundaries in villages should be applied to restrict their expansion as a measure to preserve our natural capital and countryside.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Option 34	Additional policy guidance should include the historic parklands and natural environment and emphasise those areas of countryside where protection has become more important due to the necessity of retaining a strategic "buffer" between towns and villages. Following previous expansion of towns, such parts of our natural environment are important to prevent coalescence of settlements and protect the character of the Cherwell District. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Cherwell Council could make presentation to village meetings, through Parish Councils, to advise of the benefits of Neighbourhood Planning and promote community involvement. The Local Plan could include provision of guidance and finance for communities wishing to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan.
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	Question - Development Management Policies	A "settlement boundaries policy" for towns that can prevent towns expanding up to existing villages (and so preserve the countryside buffer between settlements). Settlement boundaries in villages should also be applied to restrict their expansion as a measure to preserve our natural capital and countryside. A "green buffer policy" would be useful to clarify the local development management approach in respect of maintaining buffer zones between towns and nearby villages. Such a policy would clarify the framework under which future planning decisions are made in respect of expansion of towns into the countryside. This is especially valuable where development is proposed for land that was described in previous approved Local Plans as permanent green buffers. For example, residents of Hanwell were previously advised that further development northwards of "Strategic Development: Banbury 5- North of Hanwell Fields" would not be considered due to the proximity to Hanwell village. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (at C.149, referred to "The improvement of woodland to the north [of Banbury 5] would help permanently establish a green buffer between the site and Hanwell." However, the Cherwell Local Plan Review (September 2021) contains Appendix 2 with further development site being considered to the north of the Banbury 5 site.



LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	LPR-A-214	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to development of the following sites: LPR-A-214 - Land to the East of Warwick Road, Banbury (Parish: Hanwell/Drayton) LPR-A-152 - Land North of Drayton Lodge Farm, Banbury (Parish: Drayton) LPR-A-205 - Land off Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury (Parish: Banbury) I live in Hanwell. It is an historic village distinct from Banbury for over 800 years. I get very emotional at the thought of this distinct history being eroded. There are so many reasons why this type of development is bad for the people of Cherwell and beyond. These reasons are especially vivid from the perspective of a resident of a village that faces the prospect of being irreversibly coalesced with a nearby town through development of yet more housing that will forever harm our quality of life. The reasons for my objections are as follows: 1. Development counter to fundamental principles of town and country planning Whilst the town and country planning system is a balancing act of competing demands, the system must restrain market forces. There are housing targets to be met, but these don't have to be met in a way proposed by devel pers. An apparent laissez faire approach that permits large housing companies to devour greenfield sites to expand towns at the expense of nearby villages and our environment is NOT what the residents of Cherwell District want. Building more houses in the countryside does NOT help meet the challenge of climate change. Cherwell District Council Whilst the direct impact of developing these specific local sites on levels of global warming may not be directly quantifiable, they will have an impact. There is a choice between: a) sustainable development (building to high standards in locations where people can minimise their environmental impact) and b) unsustainable development (edgeof-town expansion at sites thatdevelopers can most easily profit from but result in far greater environmental degradation and ultimately climate change). The volume of traffic is a direct threat to village residents. A significant proportion of Banbury's housing development since 2011 has been to the north of the town. In the last 10 years there has been a clear increase in traffic through Hanwell. This is directly linked to greater levels of housing, with vehicles such as taxis and delivery vans using Main Street through Hanwell as a cutthrough from Warwick Road to Southam Road. The number of houses being proposed with the development sites north of Banbury will undoubtedly lead to increased traffic through Hanwell, from vehicles seeking quicker routes between the new houses and Banbury or the motorway junction. This volume of traffic is a direct threat to village residents. 4. Impact on quality of life of Hanwell residents – access to countryside and mental health A significant reason that many residents of Hanwell village have chosen to live on the village is it's rural setting. It is currently surrounded by countryside. It is a small village with a strong identity – this helps build a strong community. Many residents access the surrounding countryside for exercise and mental wellbeing. Although existing development of Banbury is closer than many Hanwell residents expected we are still able to enjoy walking in the countryside, and enjoy views back to the village, including the historic church and castle. The proposed development sites would take away the open countryside south of Hanwell Village, and severely impact the mental health of village residents. many residents of north Banbury make use of footpaths towards Hanwell village, and make use of the playground and recreation ground in the village. We are not opposed to this per se, but the increase in walkers to the village has correlated with an increase in littering. we are facing irreversible destruction of our countryside. There are clear alternatives where existing land can be redeveloped, and where housing provision can be met without development that robs villages of their rural setting.</p>
LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	LPR-A-152	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to development of the following sites: LPR-A-214 - Land to the East of Warwick Road, Banbury (Parish: Hanwell/Drayton) LPR-A-152 - Land North of Drayton Lodge Farm, Banbury (Parish: Drayton) LPR-A-205 - Land off Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury (Parish: Banbury) I live in Hanwell. It is an historic village distinct from Banbury for over 800 years. I get very emotional at the thought of this distinct history being eroded. There are so many reasons why this type of development is bad for the people of Cherwell and beyond. These reasons are especially vivid from the perspective of a resident of a village that faces the prospect of being irreversibly coalesced with a nearby town through development of yet more housing that will forever harm our quality of life. The reasons for my objections are as follows: 1. Development counter to fundamental principles of town and country planning Whilst the town and country planning system is a balancing act of competing demands, the system must restrain market forces. There are housing targets to be met, but these don't have to be met in a way proposed by developers. An apparent laissez faire approach that permits large housing companies to devour greenfield sites to expand towns at the expense of nearby villages and our environment is NOT what the residents of Cherwell District want. Building more houses in the countryside does NOT help meet the challenge of climate change. Cherwell District Council Whilst the direct impact of developing these specific local sites on levels of global warming may not be directly quantifiable, they will have an impact. There is a choice between: a) sustainable development (building to high standards in locations where people can minimise their environmental impact) and b) unsustainable development (edgeof-town expansion at sites thatdevelopers can most easily profit from but result in far greater environmental degradation and ultimately climate change). The volume of traffic is a direct threat to village residents. A significant proportion of Banbury's housing development since 2011 has been to the north of the town. In the last 10 years there has been a clear increase in traffic through Hanwell. This is directly linked to greater levels of housing, with vehicles such as taxis and delivery vans using Main Street through Hanwell as a cutthrough from Warwick Road to Southam Road. The number of houses being proposed with the development sites north of Banbury will undoubtedly lead to increased traffic through Hanwell, from vehicles seeking quicker routes between the new houses and Banbury or the motorway junction. This volume of traffic is a direct threat to village residents. 4. Impact on quality of life of Hanwell residents – access to countryside and mental health A significant reason that many residents of Hanwell village have chosen to live on the village is it's rural setting. It is currently surrounded by countryside. It is a small village with a strong identity – this helps build a strong community. Many residents access the surrounding countryside for exercise and mental wellbeing. Although existing development of Banbury is closer than many Hanwell residents expected, we are still able to enjoy walking in the countryside, and enjoy views back to the village, including the historic church and castle. The proposed development sites would take away the open countryside south of Hanwell Village, and severely impact the mental health of village residents. many residents of north Banbury make use of footpaths towards Hanwell village, and make use of the playground and recreation ground in the village. We are not opposed to this per se, but the increase in walkers to the village has correlated with an increase in littering. we are facing irreversible destruction of our countryside. There are clear alternatives where existing land can be redeveloped, and where housing provision can be met without development that robs villages of their rural setting.</p>

LPR-B-825	Tom Sadler	LPR-A-205	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to development of the following sites: LPRA-214 - Land to the East of Warwick Road, Banbury (Parish: Hanwell/Drayton) LPR-A-152 - Land North of Drayton Lodge Farm, Banbury (Parish: Drayton) LPRA-205 - Land off Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury (Parish: Banbury) I live in Hanwell. It is an historic village distinct from Banbury for over 800 years. I get very emotional at the thought of this distinct history being eroded. There are so many reasons why this type of development is bad for the people of Cherwell and beyond. These reasons are especially vivid from the perspective of a resident of a village that faces the prospect of being irreversibly coalesced with a nearby town through development of yet more housing that will forever harm our quality of life. The reasons for my objections are as follows: 1. Development counter to fundamental principles of town and country planning Whilst the town and country planning system is a balancing act of competing demands, the system must restrain market forces. There are housing targets to be met, but these don't have to be met in a way proposed by developers. An apparent laissez faire approach that permits large housing companies to devour greenfield sites to expand towns at the expense of nearby villages and our environment is NOT what the residents of Cherwell District want. Building more houses in the countryside does NOT help meet the challenge of climate change. Cherwell District Council Whilst the direct impact of developing these specific local sites on levels of global warming may not be directly quantifiable, they will have an impact. There is a choice between: a) sustainable development (building to high standards in locations where people can minimise their environmental impact) and b) unsustainable development (edge-of-town expansion at sites that developers can most easily profit from but result in far greater environmental degradation and ultimately climate change). The volume of traffic is a direct threat to village residents. A significant proportion of Banbury's housing development since 2011 has been to the north of the town. In the last 10 years there has been a clear increase in traffic through Hanwell. This is directly linked to greater levels of housing, with vehicles such as taxis and delivery vans using Main Street through Hanwell as a cut-through from Warwick Road to Southam Road. The number of houses being proposed with the development sites north of Banbury will undoubtedly lead to increased traffic through Hanwell, from vehicles seeking quicker routes between the new houses and Banbury or the motorway junction. This volume of traffic is a direct threat to village residents.</p> <p>4. Impact on quality of life of Hanwell residents – access to countryside and mental health A significant reason that many residents of Hanwell village have chosen to live on the village is it's rural setting. It is currently surrounded by countryside. It is a small village with a strong identity – this helps build a strong community. Many residents access the surrounding countryside for exercise and mental wellbeing. Although existing development of Banbury is closer than many Hanwell residents expected, we are still able to enjoy walking in the countryside, and enjoy views back to the village, including the historic church and castle. The proposed development sites would take away the open countryside south of Hanwell Village, and severely impact the mental health of village residents. Many residents of north Banbury make use of footpaths towards Hanwell village, and make use of the playground and recreation ground in the village. We are not opposed to this per se, but the increase in walkers to the village has correlated with an increase in littering, we are facing irreversible destruction of our countryside.</p>
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 1	I am very concerned about South Newington becoming a 'suburb' of Bloxham. There are no amenities and the amenities of Bloxham are already insufficient for it. Traffic is already a real blight in Bloxham and creates real issues considering air pollution and the amount of school children in the village
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 2	I am very concerned about South Newington becoming a 'suburb' of Bloxham. There are no amenities and the amenities of Bloxham are already insufficient for it. Traffic is already a real blight in Bloxham and creates real issues considering air pollution and the amount of school children in the village.
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Question - Green Belt	Yes preventing urban sprawl into the smaller villages that do not have the amenities to cope. It can lead to fragmented and isolated communities lacking proper cohesion.
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas

LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the towncentre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. I am very concerned about South Newington becoming a 'suburb' of Bloxham. There are no amenities and the amenities of Bloxham are already insufficient for it. Traffic is already a real blight in Bloxham and creates real issues considering air pollution and the amount of school children in the village.
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 32	Yes- Both. Yes to settlement boundaries to prevent sprawl of village identities
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	General	The call for sites is a fundamentally flawed exercise. It promotes subjective and self interested promotion. Those who own or want to develop sites have their own interests directly in mind when recommending a site. The site may now be remotely suitable for development but given the huge financial gains for the developer they will argue it is so. Development needs to be based on objective criteria that chimes with Cherwell's green and sustainability agenda. In my view this means looking at sites that can offer green transportation (foot or cycle) into existing urban areas. It means supporting existing infrastructure rather than replicating it piecemeal.
LPR-B-826	Michael Rapp	LPR-A-025	The field flagged as a site in just outside South Newington is an obvious example of a unsuitable piece of land. It is the wrong side of the A road to the village and would create a fragmented area of housing disconnected to the village
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 1	I am concerned that the importance of smaller communities that allow for healthy , kind social interactions will be lost with rapid housing developments that ignore the mental wellbeing of integrated communities that have evolved over time
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 2	Huge increase in numbers of cars is certainly against reducing carbon emission and the larger proposed communities does not support a healthy community
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Supporting our Town	have affordable rent for small businesses to keep variety. Bring affordable accomodation into the town centres in buildings that are empty to bring people back into the towns.
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 6	The developers seem to build many more houses that are not affordable and this excludes younger potential home owners
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 7	There should be much more affordable housing
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 8	rather than minimum requirement the space should be better than that as developers will always try to produce the least space in order to build more properties
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Housing Policies	New houses should have high standards re; insulation; solar panels , environmentally good quality heating etc; Builders and developers should have new builds rigorously assessed
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Green Belt	The Church Commissioner's development plan for Islip completely ignores the importance of Green Belt
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Local Green Spaces	Not building on the green spaces that are close to current housing

LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	respect the flood areas and limit housing that impacts adversely on the water table thereby increasing the risk of extra flooding
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Houses should be sound proof so that adjoining properties cannot hear what's going on next door eg toilets backing onto next door's living room. Design gardens so that neighbours can see each other passing thereby encouraging social interaction; Mix the old people with the young.
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Transport & Connectivity	More safe cycle tracks are needed. It's so dangerous cycling on country roads. More buses and cycle tracks in rural areas.
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	Increasing number of houses beyond about 300 in Islip will cause heavy congestion on the country roads so even the Charity Commissioners plan to provide a ring road round Islip would just load the Wheatley Road and Woodeaton Road with impossible amount of traffic.
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 26	The Green belt should be respected as it prevents merging of housing estates
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Better safer cycle tracks
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Islip, for example, has just under 300 houses and so could cope with another 300. But more than this will have detrimental impact on important social cohesion and the community that is so valuable for people's mental well being.
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. It is crucial to build in a proportionate manner and with the knowledge and support of the local communities
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 32	Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services Siting building of new houses so that the extra cars have easy access to already bigger roads eg A34 and don't get funnelled down small country roads. Yes, both weight to availability of certain services and facilities and to accessibility of the settlement to urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling. <u>Yes to settlement boundaries as this will prevent developers finding loop holes and developing beyond acceptable expansion limits</u>
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Option 34	As our concern for the impact of climate change increases we have to respect the natural environment and all the benefits it brings to nature and to us and not overload the environment with buildings, concrete and cars. Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Have well advertised local meetings and have the views generated respected and not simply given "tick box" status and the outcomes more or less ignored
LPR-B-827	Annette Mountord	Islip	The Church Commissioners development plans for Islip for 3000 homes is depressing and completely out of keeping with community well being and climate change principles
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 19	Please develop areas within the town - make use of empty buildings currently being land banked by outside landlords. Create smaller shops downstairs and apartments upstairs - renovating and preserving the heritage of our local town - whilst injecting the economy
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Question - Supporting our Town	Please look at empty units on Bridge Street, High Street and Cherwell street as well as canal side units
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Question - Important views of Banbury	The view of St Mary's Church is part of our heritage and can be seen beyond Banbury.
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. By renovating/restoring/enhancing the town centre, you could create many apartments perfect for young couples with excellent access to the public transport routes.

LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Better public transport from Cropedy at work times and in the evening. Transport to school.
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Development should be sustainable. Development should be capable of producing skilled workforce. For instance instead of allowing mega firms to develop mega housing estates in our valuable green spaces, instead allow smaller developments through sustainable self build schemes, allowing people to learn innovative construction techniques.
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 32	Yes - public transport. Don't destroy areas of tranquility, natural biodiversity for the sake of building large scale developments in larger villages. Instead build small sustainable developments throughout rural areas, allowing all infrastructures to build incrementally. Thousands of houses have been built in Cherwell over the last 5 years and we have already lost a lot of green space. Settlement boundaries need to be protected.
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 34	Sustainable building design and technology should be innovative and fit for modern purpose. Design should reflect what young people want to live in rather than recreating faux victorian residential housing estates that all merge into one another. We should be protecting our green and tranquil spaces
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	LPR-A-155	As a resident of Kyetts corner, I overlook this site. 6 of my 11 windows have views of this site. I am opposed to this site being considered for development because development here would: Have a negative impact on the natural environment. Destroy the biodiversity of the area. Negatively effect the ecological resilience of this rural area. Negatively effect the rural economy by destroying farmland. Provide a flood risk, as development on this site would mean the area would no longer be able to act as a sponge. Destroy a natural winter spring. Delay this areas ability to recover after the impact of the marina build which saw the spoil of the basins spread across the entire field, causing damage to the soil structure. Permanently effect the views and therefore mental wellbeing of 34 households which overlook this site. • Permanently effect the tranquillity of the area. Expanding the village in this direction goes beyond our settlement boundaries. In order to make a development in this area carbon neutral we would need to off balance the destruction of this piece of land with creation of a green space elsewhere. This field should be seen as part of our natural capital and supplying an ecosystem service and therefore protected. Instead I would suggest this land is put forward to be a green space. Perhaps a community forest
LPR-B-828	Paul Gellatly	Option 30	In my opinion we should be questioning the need for these massive housing estates. Is it driven by a desire for developers to make money out of the destruction of green space, and the quick delivery of unsustainable housing that isn't really fit for purpose, or by a true need for housing in this area. Is the reason got more to do with greed than need. If there is a need to carbon offset these developments, don't destroy the green spaces in rural areas that already provide the carbon sinks!
LPR-B-829	Dr Oliver Sampson	LPR-A-091	I Object to this site being considered for development and its encroachment onto green fields. It will create traffic problems for an already busy village in addition to adding to the huge traffic problems experienced in Banbury town

LPR-B-830	Iain Osenton	LPR-A-091	With reference to LPR-A-91, Bodicote. Comment – Objection. The highlighted land presents conflicts within the national planning policy framework, and existing Cherwell local plan. Site access, conflicts are present with: • NPPF 2, sustainability, point 8. • NPPF 9, Promoting sustainable transport, point 105, 106, 110. ). The proposed sites are unlikely to contain sufficient volume to include provision of retail, community assets or open space, as such residents would need to travel through Bodicote to access these, placing unsustainable pressure on infrastructure unable to accommodate increased volume, in turn conflicting with existing communities. Mitigation of this point, by hypothetically including areas of open space/retail etc. within the proposed land would reduce the number of houses the site could accommodate, lessening the sites contribution to the districts housing target whilst continuing to offer conflict with existing communities. The points made above are also relevant to newly build properties adjacent to Cotefield Drive, which, in addition would create conflict with NPPF 15, as significant portions of woodland would need to be removed to create access to the proposed site. Sustainability. Conflicts are present with: • NPPF 2, sustainability point 8. • NPPF 11, effective use of land, point 120, point 124, point 125. Existing communities have, for generations benefited from rights of way passing through the east aspect of the proposed site, with the proposed sites value to the community further enhanced during the Covid19 pandemic. Surrounding Bodicote, access to countryside spaces characteristic to the villages aesthetic is becoming harder. Longford park to the East, Banbury to the North and ongoing development West of White Post Road makes the southern aspect of the village the final, undeveloped, accessible area of countryside. In line with NPPF 11, development should consider the value areas of undeveloped land offer, and improve access to the countryside. Development of this land will only hinder access and enjoyment of the final undeveloped corner of the village. The proposed sites will, without mention offer conflict with existing properties of Sefton place, Austin way, Wards Crescent and Deer's Farm, in conflict with NPPF 11 point 124 (D) as southern facing gardens will be overlooked by proposed development, further conflicting with existing communities. The proposed sites, hypothetically, once accommodating of access, infrastructure etc. will only sustain a limited volume of properties.. It is noted the landowner has planted a strip of woodland to the south of the proposed site, which I expect is preemptive planting in order to screen proposed development within this site. To move properties an acceptable distance away from this woodland would reduce the volume of houses permissible within the site, further lessening the sites contribution to the districts housing targets. In addition, should access through Austin way be considered, the removal of numerous young/mature oak trees will be required in order to create a road wide enough to support two-way traffic. In conclusion, considering all above points. The proposed site offers numerous conflicts with the national planning policy framework, and existing communities within the village of Bodicote. Whilst development is expected surrounding the village, the local plan should seek only to incorporate areas of 'sustainable' development, which, I strongly feel is not achievable within the proposed site given its limited capacity in meeting housing needs, whilst offering unacceptable conflict with the village.
LPR-B-830	Iain Osenton	Option 30	See attached additional image of Church street, demonstrating unsuitability to support increased volumes of two way traffic, damaging to the villages aesthetic, particularly in the oldest part of the village.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Call for Sites Promotion - Land to the east of Warwick Road, Banbury	Land to the east of Warwick Road, Banbury is promoted for housing. A site plan; a Vision Document; a Review of Access Strategy and Accessibility to Local Facilities and Services Technical Note; Initial Civil Constraints Review; and Representations in Respect Ecological, Landscape and Heritage Circumstances have been submitted.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 1	Supports the suggested Vision set out at Section 4.7 of the consultation document. Vistry notes the text at point 7 of the Suggested Vision which focuses on taking advantage of the excellently located urban areas within Cherwell District, and building upon present and on-going economic success of the urban areas. Vistry are keen to explore the detailed meaning behind the text at point 12) which acknowledges that "Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington are 'reshaped and adapted' to maintain their roles as attractive, vibrant, retail, culture and social centres for communities and visitors". In the case of Banbury, Vistry continues to play that role and it is unclear how the town needs to be 'reshaped and adapted'

LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 2	Support KO1. However, it is essential that the Local Plan allocates sites which are deliverable and provides sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances (for example sites stalling or market changes). The Plan should make appropriate provision for unmet needs arising from neighbouring authorities. Vistry support the Council's aspirations to meeting the challenges of climate change, however it will be important that the Council consults with leading housebuilders such as Vistry to ensure that their future proposed policies are deliverable. Acknowledge the text under KO10, broadly noting the need to promote sustainable development and construction standards. Vistry aligns itself with Government targets including a commitment to delivering high quality homes that are zero carbon ready and sustainable by 2025. Vistry supports KO11 which sets out that the Council will support a local zero-carbon energy system that reduces Cherwell's reliance on global fossil fuels and prioritises community energy. Supports KO13 which seeks to protect and maximise opportunities for biodiversity net gain and enhancing Cherwell's natural capital and minimising pollution. Vistry notes the text at KO16 which seeks to prioritise active travel and increase the attraction of, and opportunities for public transport whilst encouraging a reduction on the dependency of private cars as a mode of travel. Vistry notes the text at KO 21 which seeks to deliver safe, well-designed and maintained mixed- tenure affordable housing in Cherwell to meet identified needs, including supported, wheelchair accessible and adaptable dwellings whilst ensuring the viability of housing development and a reliable supply of new homes. Supports KO22 which seeks to create sustainable, well designed, distinctive places where healthy behaviours are the norm and which provide a sense of belonging and safety, as well as a sense of community. KO23 seeks to "Focus development in Cherwell's sustainable locations". Vistry fully support this aspiration. Vistry notes KO 24 which seeks to support active travel as a first choice, providing streets and service centre environments which are well connected, greener and more attractive for walking, cycling and socialising. Vistry supports the text at KO 30 which seeks to create more sustainable communities by providing high quality, locally distinctive, and well- designed environments which increase the attractiveness of Cherwell's places for living and working which contribute to the well-being of residents. Vistry acknowledge the text at KO31 which states that the Council will support vibrant rural communities by seeking to protect and expand local services and facilities; and provide new affordable housing to meet identified local need. Key Objectives reflect a key theme for the Local Plan 2040, being the aspiration for new development to be sustainably located and able to support sustainable travel. Vistry consider that Banbury is one such location and that by focusing development at the town, the Local Plan will address a number of Key Objectives.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 3	Supports At main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington) in order to support sustainable growth. Vistry suggests taking a similar approach and focusing future residential development in these locations as this is likely to provide the greatest opportunities to minimise the need to travel between home and work.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 5	Vistry recognise the need for flexibility for different town centre uses, it is essential that these areas can continue to play a fundamental role at the heart of the District's communities. Whilst town centres may provide an element of residential development, the District Council should recognise that such schemes are unlikely to provide family housing and so a diverse range of sites will be required
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 6	Support the Council's aspirations for affordable housing however consider the Council will need to consult further on the detail of the policies in the future. Vistry acknowledges the need for affordable housing and is committed to delivering the right affordable housing, this must be supported by the evidence base which should set out the various tenures and market housing mix. Vistry reserves the right to comment at a later date. Vistry has a strong track record of affordable housing delivery as both Vistry Housebuilding and Vistry Partnerships and would welcome further engagement with the Council in this regard.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 7	It is difficult to provide commentary without reviewing the Council's evidence base. Support the Council's aspirations for providing affordable housing however consider the Council will need to consult further on the detail of the policies in the future
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 8	Supports introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? unless there are site specific or viability reasons why this is not achievable in any particular development and so any future policies should retain flexibility in this regard. Bovis Homes house types achieve national space standards and Vistry are refreshing Linden Homes house types to align with national space standards.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Separation Distances	Vistry suggest that the Council should not introduce a policy that requires minimum separation distances as this would be arbitrary and not take account of local conditions and design ingenuity. We suggest there are better ways of ensuring good design that is neighbourly and protects amenity, through compliance with the principles of the National Design Guide and any local design code or SPD that is in place.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 9	Advocate continuing to rely on the Building Regulations, a per 2), however if the Council are minded to proceed with 1) it should be reflected in the Council's viability evidence and is set at an appropriate level to meet identified needs (i.e. not required for all properties)
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 10	Support the Council's aspirations for sustainable construction however consider the Council will need to consult further on the detail of the policies in the future. Vistry notes that national standards continue to evolve to reflect changing expectations in relation to sustainable design and construction, however we would emphasise that policies should align with national targets
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 11	Support the Council's aspirations for renewable energy however consider the Council will need to consult further on the detail of the policies in the future. Vistry suggest that both options are pursued.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Green Belt	The preparation of this Local Plan will need to assess non-Green Belt sites in a manner which is consistent with the approach set out in the NPPF (July 2021). In particular, the Council must ensure that all non-Green Belt options are assessed in full before deciding that exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt.

LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 12	There will need to be flexibility on compensatory and proactive measures whilst parties learn how to approach delivering Biodiversity Net Gain, particularly if the Council is to seek standards higher than those mandated through the Environment Bill. Vistry support the Council's aspirations however consider the Council will need to consult further on the detail of the policies in the future. The Council should correct the title of Option 12 as <u>it relates to Biodiversity Net Gain, not sustainable construction.</u>
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 13	Without a standardised methodology for Environmental Net Gain, it will be extremely difficult to measure and prove at this point. Moreover, until the measures in the Environment Bill legislation are translated into the NPPF and guidance for plan-making and decision-taking, it is difficult to make an objective comment on this question. Vistry would contend that the current EIA regulations, requiring the assessment of significant environmental effects for schemes that trigger certain thresholds, already cover a key component of what might be required and could be adapted to reflect the need to consider natural capital. Overall we suggest that the development industry needs to gain more of an understanding around the requirements for assessing and proposing Biodiversity Net Gain before implementing further requirements. Vistry suggest the answer should be to not require major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 14	Vistry notes that the provision of play is clearly a sound aspect of place-making and constitutes fundamental social infrastructure. We look forward to <u>engaging with the local authority and provide further comment in due course.</u>
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 15	Vistry suggests that a blend of 2) and 3) is helpful to deliver meaningful sports and recreation facilities in the best locations for communities – but that 1) is also appropriate where strategic development is of a scale to warrant on-site provision, and where no facilities exist locally that can be upgraded. The 2017 CDC Sports and Recreation Assessment <u>by Nortoft should be updated to reflect latest needs and supply issues.</u>
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Vistry note that any policy should be in accordance with the NPPF, but do not provide commentary at this stage. We reserve the right to comment once any policy is published in detail.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	We suggest this can be best supported by avoiding ambiguity between the National Model Design Code and local codes and guidance which will help to provide developers with clarity and certainty. If the Council intends to produce a Local Design Code, any standards must reflect those that have been tested through this Local Plan process to ensure that they do not negatively impact upon the viability of developments as this runs the risk of <u>compromising the deliverability of the Plan.</u>
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Vistry are supportive of the 20-minute neighbourhood principles as part of our work to support proposals at land east of Warwick Road, Banbury. <u>Vistry contend the site is sustainable and would meet the criteria of a 20-minute neighbourhood.</u>
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Vistry agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach. We support aims of moving towards a net zero transport network and agree that spatial planning has a clear role in supporting a decarbonised transport system. The site east of Warwick Road, Banbury that is promoted by Vistry presents a good opportunity to make a significant contribution to this agenda when compared with other rural locations that are less sustainable and isolated meaning that opportunity for sustainable modes of transport is limited. Vistry note that in order to reduce the use of the private car, and to promote the use of public transport, the District Council should take locate new development, including new homes, in sustainable locations where there are opportunities for alternative and <u>sustainable modes of travel.</u>
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Transport Policies	Support the range of policies and documents identified, but would highlight the additional work that the Council have commissioned regarding transport network capacity. Vistry reserve the right to comment on this question and any detailed policies once the additional work has been <u>undertaken.</u>
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 18	Vistry supports directing development to Banbury and notes that the location continues to be highly accessible and sustainable having been identified in the adopted Local Plan Part 1 as one of the most sustainable locations in the District for growth. We acknowledge Banbury is a highly sustainable location providing access to services, facilities, employment and access to strategic transport links (namely the M40 and mainline rail connections). Vistry are of the view that further opportunities for further development in the south are not present as these schemes should be built out in the first instance. Similarly, a review of the Government's flood mapping tool identifies a large part of the south east of Banbury to be located within Flood Zone 2/3. In relation to point 3) which suggests considering sites to the east of the town, including east of the M40 (Junction 11), we do not consider this to be a suitable location for future development. Development here would likely lead to the physical separation and segregation of Banbury and any new developments, which would present fewer opportunities for sustainable growth. A review of the adopted Local Plan policies map identifies a large part of the west of Banbury to be located within a 'Special Area of Conservation' or is identified as a Having established that Banbury is sustainable, the Council will need to consider sites which contribute towards achieving sustainable <u>development and are also accessible.</u>



LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 19	We note that the Council have acknowledged that Banbury is a sustainable location for development and further growth given the existing leisure, retail and employment opportunities it presents for future residents. Do not support point which suggests limiting development at Banbury, as this would be somewhat contradictory to the Council's 20minute neighbourhood suggestion as locations to the outskirts of Banbury would be meeting this criteria and encouraging sustainable movement within the district. Vistry are supportive of the opportunity for further urban extensions to Banbury as per point 1) and notes that the Cherwell District Council studies will include assessment of landscape sensitivity in order to consider appropriate places for future development. At paragraph 6.2.33 of the consultation document, the Council suggests that Banbury has experienced significant investments in order to improve the sustainability of the town. This has included a number of improvements including bus services linking residential areas with the town centre and improvements to walking and cycling facilities at Southam Road, Hanwell Fields and Duke Meadows Drive. We note that Banbury is assessed within the Council's town centre and retail study (September 2021). Paragraph 5.20 of the study set out that the northeastern part of the centre is currently being redeveloped, suggesting that there is significant investment being injected into Banbury town centre to improve the sustainability of the town and the variety of facilities and services available for local residents. Locating development at Banbury will create neighbourhoods where residents can walk, cycle and use public transport in order to access local amenities and services within Banbury. We contend that directing growth north of Banbury represents a sustainable option for growth that would reflect the Council's aims to encourage sustainable travel and connectivity.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Addressing Inequality in Banbury	We note in the Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment that the evidence suggests that there are substantial numbers of households (almost 9,600) on Council housing waiting lists across Oxfordshire as of April 2019. There is a clear need for affordable housing across Oxfordshire which can be provided through allocating sites for development around Banbury, including the site north of Banbury that is being promoted by Vistry.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 32	Vistry would advocate an approach where the urban centres and the connectivity available to them is given additional weight, as these centres provide the greatest range of facilities, services and employment opportunities for residents living in rural locations
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Policies which specifically restrict development are often found to be inconsistent with the NPPF, with the presumption in favour of sustainable development being applied in s.78 appeals. In Vistry's submission, a restrictive policy such as that suggested in this case would not reflect the positive approach to Planmaking advocated in the NPPF. Settlement boundaries may play a role in defining a place, but must be flexible to allow for changing circumstances. Defining the settlement and setting a policy which establishes a rigorous restriction on development outside those boundaries often leads to circumstances where LPAs resist development in otherwise sustainable locations, even when there is a housing shortfall, for policy reasons.
LPR-B-831	Turley for Vistry Group	Option 34	Point 2 does not reflect the NPPF which requires Councils to take into account the different roles of different areas. Vistry do not encourage the option of defining 'valued landscape' as this is not a matter that should be directed through local policy guidance and requires detailed analysis
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Call for Sites Promotion - Land at M40 Junction 11, Nethercote, Banbury	Land at M40 Junction 11 is promoted for employment. An Illustrative Framework and Transport Strategy Appraisal have been submitted to support the representation.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Call for Sites Promotion - Land south west of Graven Hill, Bicester	Land south west of Graven Hill, Bicester is promoted for housing / mixed uses. A site location plan; a plan indicating the south eastern relief road; an illustrative framework plan; Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 (extract); a wider opportunities plan; and a preliminary transport issues report have been submitted with the representation.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 1	We support the Vision, in principle, which seeks to create a healthier, more prosperous, resilient and sustainable District. This Vision provides a positive framework for the Strategic Objectives and is generally aligned with the three overarching sustainability objectives set out at paragraph 8 of the NPPF (July 2021). Indeed, paragraph 3.1.1 that the CIP2 confirms the location of CDC within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc (the OxCam Arc). The Government has identified the OxCam Arc as a globally significant area between Oxford, Milton Keynes and Cambridge which will be the focus for housing and economic growth up to 2050 and beyond. Once published, the Spatial Framework will have the same status as national planning policy. It will be necessary to ensure that the Vision fully accords with the Spatial Framework to ensure that the growth aspirations of the OxCam Arc are fully met through the emerging Local Plan.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 2	We are supportive of the Key Objectives, particularly in relation to climate change, health and wellbeing, promoting sustainable transport, enhancing the natural and built environment, and meeting infrastructure needs. The proposed objective at KO1 to allocate sufficient land to meet housing and employment need is fully supported. It is considered critical for the emerging Local Plan to provide sufficient sites to meet the needs of Cherwell District but also to accord with the Government's wider growth aspirations for the OxCam Arc. It is considered that an employment development at the Site would align with these Key Objectives, especially Key Objectives 1-3, which aim to allocate sufficient land to meet employment needs across all sectors, in addition to encouraging local companies to invest in the education, training and skills of the local workforce. We consider that the Site, which has the capacity to deliver an employment (industrial and/or logistics) development of circa 900,000 sq. ft and units ranging from circa 20,000- 120,000 sq. ft. in a sustainable location, would assist Cherwell in achieving these Key Objectives and would support the diversification of Cherwell's economy.

LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 3	<p>Part (b) of NPPF Paragraph 82 requires strategic policy-making authorities to set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the Plan period. In addition, paragraph 83 of the NPPF (July 2021) states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries, and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. An Economic Needs Assessment (September 2021) has been prepared to identify the future economic and employment needs for Cherwell to 2040. The Assessment identifies that Oxfordshire’s industrial market has remained strong with robust demand and high levels of speculative development. Covid19 has led to a significant increase in demand for e-commerce with the proportion of online sales increasing substantially compared with 2019. The logistics market has been remarkably strong as many of the changes since lockdown, and particularly the shift to online shopping, favoured the sector. Whilst the greatest demand for logistics space has been in the Big Box market, there is still strong demand for midbox and last mile logistics. The e-commerce sector for regional hubs, last-mile logistics operators and parcel delivery companies have placed increasing importance on smaller regional hubs as part of supply chains. This increase represents an acceleration of the underlying trend rather than a temporary anomaly. Overall demand for space has grown and is expected to continue to grow in the long term. Banbury is identified as the largest industrial market within Oxfordshire. Much of its commercial success is due to its close proximity to the M40, which provides a direct route to London and the Midlands. In addition, the Cherwell Economic Needs Assessment confirms that rents are comparatively low when compared to the wider Oxfordshire and South East Market, and this is seen to be attracting occupiers to the locality. Indeed, the M40 is a cheaper location than the ‘Golden Triangle’ (centred around the M1, M6 and M42), increasing its attractiveness. The Economic Needs Assessment identifies that key demand is for logistics unit sizes of between 200,000-300,000 sq. ft. This would typically require minimum site requirements of around 8-10 ha. The M40 corridor is identified as an expanding market for regional logistics operators. The local workforce is also cited as a positive factor, particularly with regards to J11 at Banbury. It is considered that the Site is suitable, available and deliverable to meet the demand for Strategic Employment Sites and meets all the established criteria for such sites. Economic Needs Assessment identifies strong demand from locally based companies, comprising manufacturing and smaller warehouse units of around 25,000 sq. ft. located closer to Banbury town centre, providing access to the existing labour supply and town centre amenities. The Assessment emphasises a need for sufficient new land to meet non-strategic B2 and B8 use needs arising from within and/or related to the Banbury area and its local economy. This is supported by the findings of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Cherwell Local Plan Review (August 2021), which concludes that employment land must be in accessible locations, and in locations where the effect will not be to increase traffic (including HGVs) on problematic parts of the road network. Cherwell is a very attractive location for industrial and warehouse development with the most attractive locations being determined by proximity to the M40 and the local workforce. There is strong demand at these locations from a wide range of occupiers including very large sites for national operators as well as demand for smaller units for local operators.</p>
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 4	<p>Part (b) of NPPF Paragraph 82 requires strategic policy-making authorities to set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the Plan period. In addition, paragraph 83 of the NPPF (July 2021) states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries, and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. An Economic Needs Assessment (September 2021) has been prepared to identify the future economic and employment needs for Cherwell to 2040. The Assessment identifies that Oxfordshire’s industrial market has remained strong with robust demand and high levels of speculative development. Covid19 has led to a significant increase in demand for e-commerce with the proportion of online sales increasing substantially compared with 2019. The logistics market has been remarkably strong as many of the changes since lockdown, and particularly the shift to online shopping, favoured the sector. Whilst the greatest demand for logistics space has been in the Big Box market, there is still strong demand for midbox and last mile logistics. The e-commerce sector for regional hubs, last-mile logistics operators and parcel delivery companies have placed increasing importance on smaller regional hubs as part of supply chains. This increase represents an acceleration of the underlying trend rather than a temporary anomaly. Overall demand for space has grown and is expected to continue to grow in the long term. Banbury is identified as the largest industrial market within Oxfordshire. Much of its commercial success is due to its close proximity to the M40, which provides a direct route to London and the Midlands. In addition, the Cherwell Economic Needs Assessment confirms that rents are comparatively low when compared to the wider Oxfordshire and South East Market, and this is seen to be attracting occupiers to the locality. Indeed, the M40 is a cheaper location than the ‘Golden Triangle’ (centred around the M1, M6 and M42), increasing its attractiveness. The Economic Needs Assessment identifies that key demand is for logistics unit sizes of between 200,000-300,000 sq. ft. This would typically require minimum site requirements of around 8-10 ha. The M40 corridor is identified as an expanding market for regional logistics operators. The local workforce is also cited as a positive factor, particularly with regards to J11 at Banbury. It is considered that the Site is suitable, available and deliverable to meet the demand for Strategic Employment Sites and meets all the established criteria for such sites. Economic Needs Assessment identifies strong demand from locally based companies, comprising manufacturing and smaller warehouse units of around 25,000 sq. ft. located closer to Banbury town centre, providing access to the existing labour supply and town centre amenities. The Assessment emphasises a need for sufficient new land to meet non-strategic B2 and B8 use needs arising from within and/or related to the Banbury area and its local economy. This is supported by the findings of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Cherwell Local Plan Review (August 2021), which concludes that employment land must be in accessible locations, and in locations where the effect will not be to increase traffic (including HGVs) on problematic parts of the road network. Cherwell is a very attractive location for industrial and warehouse development with the most attractive locations being determined by proximity to the M40 and the local workforce. There is strong demand at these locations from a wide range of occupiers including very large sites for national operators as well as demand for smaller units for local operators. The Council should ensure that a range of sites are provided at these attractive locations to support this range of demand.</p>

LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 10	We are generally supportive of all sustainable construction options which relate to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. However, it is important to note that sustainable design and construction standards may not always be practicable or viable in new developments. It will be important for any policy requirement within the emerging Local Plan to state that industrial developments can still come forward in instances where <u>sustainable design and construction requirements are not practicable or viable.</u>
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 12	NPPF Paragraph 32 advises that Local Plans should address relevant environmental objectives, including opportunities for net gains. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered). Moreover, Paragraph 174 advises that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Supportive of the biodiversity net gain objectives. Indeed, we consider that all three offsite measures set out under Option 12 would be appropriate in the event that biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures cannot be achieved on site. Greater flexibility in securing offsite enhancements or contributions would enable development proposals to achieve a biodiversity net gain, particularly when considering differing site circumstances. We consider that a flexible policy providing multiple option for securing offsite compensatory measures <u>would be more appropriate.</u>
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 13	Natural Capital is defined as the elements of nature that directly or indirectly produce value to people, including ecosystems, species, freshwater, land, minerals, the air and oceans, as well as natural processes and functions. Natural capital maps have been developed through a series of research projects with funding from various partners (including NERC (Natural Environment Research Council), OPEN (the Oxford Policy Exchange Network) and the Environment Agency) using a habitat scoring system to allow spatial patterns to be identified. The method has been adapted from work being carried out by Natural England to develop an eco-metric scoring tool for assessing net gains or losses in natural capital due to land use changes. Support the use of Natural Capital Assessments in terms of their capacity to inform spatial policies as part of the preparation of the Local Plan, the benefits of requiring major development proposals to be supported by such Assessments is unclear. In particular, the Consultation document and supporting evidence base does not explain how the requirements of Natural Capital Assessments differentiate from the current planning application requirements and processes relating to environmental factors. Further clarification is required in relation to these assessments and the benefits that they would achieve for major developments and the environment.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The Consultation document notes at paragraph 5.12.2 that Oxfordshire County Council is responsible for several areas of transport related policy, and Oxfordshire County's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) 'Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 4 2015-2031' sets out the transport strategy Oxfordshire, with area strategies for Bicester and Banbury. Policy BAN1 of the Local Transport Plan identifies a series of improvements to address the existing transport issues in Banbury, and to manage the increased travel demand that will be generated by development in the town, including the provision of a link road east of M40 Junction 11 (Overthorpe Road to A422). The Local Transport Plan identifies that, in the longer term (post2024), there is likely to be a need for additional road capacity to manage anticipated traffic growth at M40 Junction 11. The Plan emphasises that a new link road east of Junction 11 will provide a strategic solution to helping mitigate the impact of traffic travelling to/from Banbury from surrounding areas including from the M40. The route of the proposed new link road east of M40 Junction 11 between Overthorpe Road and the A422 is located within Gallagher Development's Site. As shown on the submitted Illustrative Framework Plan submitted in support of these Representation (Appendix 2), in addition to the Transport Strategy Appraisal prepared by Eddisons Transport Planning and Design, the proposed link road could be incorporated as part of any employment development at the Site, providing opportunities to help mitigate the impact of existing traffic travelling to/from Banbury. Gallagher Developments would therefore welcome the opportunity to be involved in the preparation of Oxfordshire's Local Transport Plan review. Strongly support the proposed transport and connectivity approach to support the Local Plan Review and consider that the proposed development located directly to the east of M40 J11, Nethercote would help deliver the County's aspirations for mitigating the impact of traffic travelling to/from Banbury and minimising carbon emissions. Support for delivering Southern Peripheral Corridor and would be agreeable to take an active role in delivering the relief road within the site and to make appropriate contributions towards its wider delivery. The relief road is of critical strategic importance not only to the delivery of the Graven Hill site, but to facilitate wider growth within the area.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 17	Generally supportive of this suggested approach, owing to its conformity with national planning policy. Welcome the opportunity to comment on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, once a draft has been prepared.

LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 18	<p>The Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Cherwell Local Plan Review (August 2021) explores the likely effects of the emerging Plan and its spatial strategy options, with a view to minimising adverse effects and maximising the positives. With regard to landscape, the Interim SA notes that Banbury is strongly influenced by the Cherwell valley, but has expanded westwards up the valley side and now risks ‘spilling’ out of the ‘bowl’. There is a risk of creep along the north/south axis of the valley, which is an inherently sensitive landscape. These factors lead to a concern with higher growth and further urban extensions into the open countryside to the north, south and west of the town. The Interim SA identifies that some developed areas of central Banbury along the route of the Cherwell are subject to flood risk. The Interim SA has considered it appropriate to flag a potential concern with limiting development at central Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages, owing to the potential for increased flood risk. Equally, Banbury is sensitive in historic environment terms and/or registered parks and gardens. It is considered that there is an opportunity for greenfield sites to facilitate new link/relief roads, to the benefit of Banbury’s strategic road network. Oxfordshire County Council’s Local Transport Plan identifies a need for a new link road east of Junction 11, between Overthorpe Road and the A422 (located within Gallagher Development’s Site) to provide a strategic solution to help mitigate the impact of traffic travelling to/from Banbury from surrounding areas, including from the M40. It is considered that an employment development at the Site, which is located to the east of the town and to M40 Junction 11, could serve to reduce unsustainable pressure on the already congested road network. The Cherwell Economic Needs Assessment (September 2021) emphasises that employment (manufacturing and logistics) development in Banbury should be directed to sites with access to the strategic road network, principally the M40 motorway, but close to the town centre to provide access to the existing labour supply and town centre amenities.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a preference for manufacturing and smaller warehouse units to be located on the M40 side of Banbury owing to Banbury’s specific traffic issues which have resulted in business vehicles and commuting flows within the town being very sensitive to traffic delays. The Site meets the locational requirements of larger scale logistics uses identified in the Cherwell Economic Needs Assessment (September 2021) owing to its location immediately adjacent to the strategic highway network, principally J11 of the M40, in addition to the A422, which provides direct access to Brackley from M40 J11. The Site has good access to an existing labour supply and town centre amenities due to its close proximity to Banbury town centre, which is located approximately 1.1 miles to the west of the Site. The Site provides an opportunity to incorporate the proposed new link road between Overthorpe Road and the A422 identified by OCC. Strongly support the option of directing additional development of greenfield sites to the east of the town, including to the east of the M40 Junction 11.</p>
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 19	We maintain that employment development should be focused at existing or new settlements well connected to Banbury. It is considered that the Site’s location in close proximity to the M40 and to Banbury town centre is suitable for a large scale warehousing and logistics development, in addition to manufacturing and smaller warehouse units (or a mix of these uses) and would significantly assist in meeting Cherwell’s identified employment land needs.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Question - Green Belt	Paragraph 140 of the NPPF (July 2021) states that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. As such, the preparation of the emerging Local Plan is considered to be an appropriate opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of the Green Belt to identify opportunities for growth. It is important to note that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to the Green Belt, paragraph 141 of the NPPF (July 2021) confirms that the strategic policymaking authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. In assessing all other ‘reasonable options’, the Council should firstly consider the opportunity for development on non-Green Belt sites. It is noted that the Site would provide the opportunity for residential development to come forward outside of the Green Belt.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 22	Bicester was considered to represent a suitable and sustainable location to focus strategic growth within the District. Policy BSC1 confirms that 22,840 additional dwellings will come forward within Cherwell over the Plan period 2011 to 2031. This will include a total of 10,129 dwellings coming forward within Bicester – equating to 44.3% of the Council’s total housing requirement. 33519/A3/AB/bc -5- 10th November 2021 The importance of Bicester in accommodating strategic growth has already been established through the adopted Local Plan and, as such, should equally be considered as a suitable location for development through the emerging Review. If Bicester is identified as a location for further growth, major urban extensions should be considered as the most appropriate approach for this to be delivered. This will ensure that development can come forward in the most sustainable locations, in close proximity to existing services, facilities and transport connections. The allocation of large-scale strategic development allows the opportunity for supporting infrastructure to be fully funded and delivered.
LPR-B-832	Barton Willmore for Gallagher Developments	Option 23	If development is directed to greenfield sites at Bicester, sites to the south of the town should be considered for development in the first instance. It is a clear aspiration of Oxfordshire County Council to deliver a new Relief Road that connects through the Graven Hill development through to the A41. As such, the allocation of largescale development to the south of Bicester will provide the opportunity to secure the necessary land and funding to ensure this route can be delivered in full.
LPR-B-833	Alan Divall for Lone Star Land Ltd		Rep provided WeTransfer link only - no rep content
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	Option 30	I believe that development should have a proportional relationship to the size of the existing rural communities that are to accommodate new housing, not based on a proportion of the whole district
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	Option 31	Use a combination of the above

LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	Option 32	Primary School Secondary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services Yes to both availability of certain services and facilities and accessibility of settlements to urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling. Yes to settlement boundaries as they help avoid inconsistent planning decisions about developments on edge of settlement sites
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	Sibford Gower	Sibford Gower & Ferris The Sibford Gower & Ferris parish profiles suggest prospective development sites of a frankly ludicrous scale. The whole classification of the Sibfords as a Category A Village is tenuous at best in my opinion. The villages are set apart by a steep valley and the facilities schools, shops etc. are on opposing sides. It is possible to see how you can satisfy tick box criteria with the facilities in planning terms however, the reality is that there are very limited facilities between the two villages. Treating as one entity provides a convenient shoe horn for prospective development purposes in planning terms. The proposed development sites could facilitate development on a wholly unsuitable scale for the existing Sibford communities. CDC's planning policy advocates limiting growth in our rural areas and directing it towards larger and more sustainable towns and villages. I agree with this strategy particularly on the basis of accessibility of facilities. Development in the Sibfords would be contrary to this objective. The affect of the proposed development sites would in my opinion be detrimental in terms of access and movement. The Sibfords have some facilities however, these are spaced apart with no real public transport links between them. The village shop is 2.2 miles away from the proposed sibford gower development sites . This 2.2 miles crosses a steep valley and would be completely impractical for anybody with mobility issues. Existing roads are in a terrible state and are clearly suffering from a significant long term lack of maintenance. There are no dedicated cycleways. There are limited footpath routes that are poorly maintained Street lighting. The Sibfords are a dark sky village. Large scale development would have a very negative impact on this characteristic. Development on the scale proposed would inevitably erode the character of the village as has been seen in other surrounding villages like Hook Norton and Bloxham with homogenised modern housing estate design. The proposed development would seemingly conflict with key objective 15 which seeks to protect, conserve and enhance natural capital assets such as soils, woodlands, hedges and ponds in order to capture and store carbon The proposed development would seemingly conflict with key objective 16 which seeks to reduce dependency on the private car.
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	LPR-A-107	LPR-A-107 This site is of a wholly unsuitable scale for the village of Sibford Gower. I do not object to site as an option for some development. I mainly object to its scale.
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	LPR-A-045	This site is huge, totally out of proportion with the existing settlement and would ruin a particularly attractive greenfield site
LPR-B-834	Tom Elliott	LPR-A-068	This site is ridiculously big in comparison to the village of Sibford Ferris. I strongly object to it as being totally out of proportion with the existing settlement. It would ruin a particularly attractive greenfield site
LPR-B-836	Tim Tozer	LPR-A-077	My partner and I live in Croft Lane Adderbury. We are concerned that housing development on this site will undermine the traditional character of Adderbury village both physically and in terms of its character as a balanced and diverse community of families, all age groups, whether working or retired by expanding Adderbury into a dormitory suburb of Banbury. This development and others in conjunction with it will effectively pressure the infrastructure of the village into something way out of character for an Oxfordshire village. These remarks are first of all general remarks regarding excessive developments in Adderbury village. Beyond these the specifics of this site raises the additional concern for the nature and extent of the Adderbury circular walk being harmed, as well as the potential for Croft Lane to become a much busier road (either through road or access road) which opens up the whole issue of increasing levels of pollution, noise, road safety problems, light pollution, all of which change the landscape irreversibly.
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Attention needs to be given to the rates etc charged for retail spaces - the number of empty units in Banbury suggests that these are too high. Support for local small businesses, community use of retail space etc.
LPR-B-837	Christopher	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-837	Christopher	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-837	Christopher	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-837	Christopher	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-837	Christopher	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	The document mentions the vision to 'Achieve our climate action targets' but Key Objective 2 is to 'support the growth of all sectors'. Supporting the growth of sectors should only be supported IF climate action targets can be met, and where climate targets can only be met where sectors SHRINK, then this should be accepted. This is not an easy truth, but the truth isn't always easy. I read somewhere recently that climate change mitigation will have a negative impact of 8% on the economy- and doing nothing will have a negative impact of 30%. So we may have to accept the continuous growth in all sectors is now a fiction, and careful management of a certain amount of degrowth may need to be necessary.

LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Option 12	Biodiversity compensatory measures are usually a myth - for example, if you destroy a 300 year old wood you won't get another one like it for 300 years.
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals;
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes. In rural areas, very cheap and reliable (and regular if possible) public transport would be wonderful.
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Question - Transport & Connectivity	I don't drive. Public transport is expensive. I am very blessed to be healthy enough to cycle a lot. Anything Cherwell can do to encourage and assist people to be healthy will help, and measures to keep cyclists and walkers safe are essential
LPR-B-837	Christopher	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Option 20	Cherwell District Councillors have taken an unwise risk with council taxpayers money in investing it all in the Castle Quay extension. The number of empty shops in Banbury testify to the level of risk. I know of family members both young and old who now make longer trips to other towns because 'Banbury is dying now'. Strenuous efforts need to be taken to reverse this, or a lot of local councillors should be hanging their heads in shame.
LPR-B-837	Christopher	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Question - Addressing Inequality in	Support community initiatives. Support national policies aimed at reducing inequality, in the unlikely event that there are any.
LPR-B-837	Christopher Manley	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	I don't make any. Safer cycling and walking would encourage more people out of their cars, and so to would very cheap public transport. Bridge Street is particularly difficult for cyclists
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	LPR-A-091	LPR-A-091 Bodicote, objection The proposed site is currently accessed via Austin way, and Church street, both of which are unable to support additional volume. Both Austin Way and Church Street have limited driveways and have no choice but to park on the road; Church Road is especially narrow being one of the original streets of the village. At present both roads already operate as single file with drivers having to give way to each other due to the inadequate infrastructure. The roads beyond the two mentioned above are busy supporting the local community and shop, and are also used as a cut through from the Bloxham to Oxford Road. Further traffic would completely exhaust the village. The two fields in question are currently pastureland with one providing access via its footpaths to beautiful walks through a local wood and onto the neighbouring village of Adderbury. These walks are used regularly by locals and visitors alike, green space is important to the village especially since the ever increasing developments of Longford Park east of the Oxford Road, plus White Post west of Bodicote. To conclude; I do not feel the area in question is unsustainable due to the poor infrastructure re access, also it will spoil the local countryside which is the one and only area around Bodicote left undeveloped.
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	Option 31	Use combination of the above
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	Option 32	Yes, more weight to availability of certain services and facilities and yes to accessibility by walking and cycling. Village hall and GP surgery are important. Settlement boundaries would stop the over development of villages, stopping the over expansion in areas that have already and continue to be built around. These villages will lose their identity and struggle to sustain such increases in population
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-838	Annie Turner	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	Green Belt should continue to be protected. The erosion of the Green Belt is harmful to the open Character of the countryside around Oxford. Unrestricted sprawl across the countryside nearby will destroy the rural character of many of the villages near to Oxford. We would like to see a policy within the plan to protect all remaining Green Belt and utilise brown field sites.
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Option 30	To meet local need on a small scale, not within Green Belt land. Any new housing in Rural Areas needs to be agreed at a community level through meaningful consultation. Green Belt should be protected and areas of Brown Field should be prioritized
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Option 31	Use a combination of the above

LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Option 32	Yes more weight to accessibility of settlement using walking/cycling.
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Neighbourhood plans rely on huge amounts of volunteers time and energy to put together, which is hard in small villages. Helping Parish Councils to better understand the system and where help can be obtained would be helpful. As Islip is washed over by The Green Belt it is hard to put a Neighbourhood Plan together that will pass the tests and go to referendum. Any development other than infilling would be against current policy
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Islip	Islip Parish Council strongly objects to the sites put forward as part of the 'Call For Sites'. Potentially adding 3,000 new houses to a small village of approximately 270 households would destroy the rural nature of Islip and put huge pressure on the existing facilities, the natural environment and road systems. The Church Commissioners and their agents, who own most of the land put forward, show no respect for the village community, the environment and the character of the village, pursuing profitable development at all costs. There has been no consultation with the village prior to these proposals. All of these sites are within The Green Belt and should be protected, especially as there are other sites in the District able to be developed, which are outside of the Green Belt.
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	LPR-A-223	The Church Commissioners and their agents, who own most of the land put forward, show no respect for the village community, the environment and the character of the village. All of these sites are within The Green Belt and should be protected, especially as there are other sites in the District able to be developed, which are outside of the Green Belt. The Parish Council strongly object to this site.
LPR-B-839	Islip Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	We must ensure that the level of development in Oxfordshire, stays within our environmental constraints and does not harm Oxfordshire's rural character. The main focus of growth should be in urban centres, not eroding the already pressured Green Belt and countryside. The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries, once set, should be permanent beyond the end of the Plan period so there should be no need to re-visit the boundaries again so quickly. Development such as that being proposed by the Church Commissioners at Islip should be completely ruled out as being entirely inappropriate. These developments would swamp Islip as developers seek to gain profit from Green Belt land. Proposals such as the Church Commissioners' plan to engulf the village of Islip and multiply its size by a factor of ten must be robustly resisted.
LPR-B-840	Archstone Ambrosden	Option 30	Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. Some of the larger villages in the District are particularly sustainable, both in terms of their range of facilities and also accessibility to the District's main centres. Additional housing can also help to provide new facilities or enhance existing services, improving the sustainability of the settlement overall. An example is Ambrosden, which has a good range of existing local services, but is also in close proximity to Graven Hill, employment areas on the south eastern edge of Bicester and the centre of the Town. It is realistic cycling distance from Bicester (there is an existing dedicated cycle route) and could benefit from an improved regular bus service. New housing could provide further public facilities for the village, such as asports pitch which is not currently available, and would relate well to the employment opportunities in Bicester.
LPR-B-840	Archstone Ambrosden	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. The solution for each community could vary depending on the Parish's willingness to undertake a Neighbourhood Plan or similar exercise to allocate sites. Some communities may prefer to consult with the District and allocate the preferred site/s through the Local Plan
LPR-B-840	Archstone Ambrosden	Option 32	Yes give more weight to availability of certain services and facilities and to accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport. The following are most important: Primary School Village Hall Local Shop Regular Bus services As well as the existing situation, there should also be consideration of the potential for the settlement to become significantly more sustainable through some planned growth and additional facility/ies. Accessibility to a main urban centre is a relevant factor to determine the sustainability of a village. The communities will rarely rely on the services in the villages alone and will need to travel to the urban centres. The urban centres provide the various facilities, public transport hubs and employment opportunities to support the needs of the variety of age groups that comprise a vibrant community. Being able to travel to an urban centre conveniently and by modes other than the car is therefore fundamental to the sustainability of the rural settlement.
LPR-B-840	Archstone Ambrosden	Option 33	Use a combination of the above. There is an opportunity to provide for businesses and employment in the rural areas to help create more sustainable settlements. There has been a shift in work patterns where people are now more able to work from home and remotely from their main place of work. Rural areas could benefit from home working hubs with small offices and meeting rooms with some associated facilities for those communities. More people living in the villages during the day should also help to sustain new and existing local services. Such flexible business/retail uses to serve the community could be provided as part of allocated sites for new homes

LPR-B-840	Archstone Ambrosden	LPR-A-010	Land North of Ploughley Road, Ambrosden (LPR-A-010) Ambrosden is a large village with a good range of local services, including a primary school. A Costcutter convenience store is located very near the site on the opposite side of Ploughley Road. Five acres primary school and other facilities are within easy walking distance. Being on the northern edge of the village, the site is also very well located in relation to Bicester and the mixed use growth proposed on the south eastern edge of the Town (Graven Hill, Wretchwick Green and Symmetry Park). Particularly with the close proximity to Bicester and the new strategic development, there is the opportunity for additional growth at Ambrosden, which would improve the sustainability of the village and complement the aspirations for Bicester. Specifically, the site at Ploughley Road, Ambrosden could: • Strengthen the community and support existing local services; • Provide for further improvements at Five Acres Primary School; • Contribute towards improvements to the public realm within the village. • Enhance bus routes and cycleways to Bicester (the site is very near to the routes from Graven Hill); • Create a new high-quality green edge and entrance to the village; • Provide for new recreation/community facilities. We believe there is the opportunity for growth at Ambrosden to improve the village and make it a highly sustainable settlement. Ambrosden can have strong connectivity with Bicester, complementing the strategic objectives for the town, while maintaining its separate identity and benefiting from that relationship (access to jobs etc). Since the submission for the call for sites, following a meeting with the Parish Council, the proposed development for the site at Ploughley Road has been reduced. Please refer to the Concept Plan provided. The reduced development area more closely relates to the existing edge of the village, which could accommodate around 140 dwellings, with land for a flexible community building/home working hub and a large area available for recreation, including for older children (a football pitch and skate park).
LPR-B-841	Dr Paul Harffrey	LPR-A-107	In Sibford Gower, two parcels of land (LPR-A-107) have been identified as potential areas for residential development. Based on recognized calculations the 30 acres of land could be developed with up to 360 houses. The village population is 533 today meaning that incorporation of these areas into the local plan could more than double the size of the village. Practically, the sites are unsuitable for development as access to the sites listed would lead directly onto a narrow road (Pound Lane) and feed traffic into roads such as Main Street and The Colony / Temple Mill which are also very narrow, and in parts single lane. Development of these sites would also remove agricultural land from use and create additional infrastructure challenges for water supply / drainage. Also, in relation to the existing local plan, such a scale of development would be at odds with the existing policy to limit growth in rural areas and direct it towards larger and more sustainable villages. Furthermore, it would contradict principles to protect natural assets that store carbon, reduce dependency on private cars as a mode of travel given the very limited public transport links available. Sibford Gower is, and should remain, a 'darksky' village, however such a scale of development is likely to include street lighting. I support villages like Sibford Gower taking incremental developments appropriate to the existing size and aesthetic of the village. Any such development should use sustainable materials, mitigate climate change through appropriate energy sources and add to the attractiveness of the village and area bordering an AONB. In principle, however, I believe the local plan should primarily focus on largescale development of brownfield sites in and around towns where infrastructure is in place and already scalable.
LPR-B-841	Dr Paul Harffrey	General	I fully support the much more comprehensive response submitted by Mrs Kirsty Buttle on behalf of Sibford Gower Parish Council which touches on many wider aspects of the local plan beyond the specific sites I have commented on here. Thank you for the consideration my response.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 1	There needs to be an obligation for renewable energy sources to be included in all future developments.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). There should be more emphasis on a skilled labour force and less retail and warehousing
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Supporting	More high tech companies that can offer skilled apprenticeships leading to nationally recognised qualifications e.g. like the old scheme at Harwell.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. There needs to be more free parking to encourage people into the centre of the towns. Future town centre will need plenty of car charging points. Smaller shops for local business use, rather than high street chains to promote and support local enterprise. No further expansion of Bicester Village. No more national distribution centres.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent. We need more affordable shared ownership properties with CDC, to enable young people or key workers, ex-military etc. to get onto the housing ladder.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Housing Policies	New homes should include the infrastructure required for future car charging, be A rated energy efficient and include a minimum percentage of renewable technologies.



LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Separation Distances	All house should be able to put their bins somewhere where they do not detract from the local environment e.g. a back garden or closed individual bin stores
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Use locally sourced, recycled or sustainable materials wherever possible and be transparent about this so it can be proved. Encourage a degree of modular housing or other types which is more affordable.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Use modern, especially recycled materials wherever possible that do not detract from the overall look or ambience of the buildings
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 11	Use it wherever possible e.g. solar farms in discreet locations amongst grazing animals. Solar arrays on reservoirs. Use locally produced renewable energy to supply the power to its local community as a priority. COP 26 has illustrated the need to take immediate action to save the planet
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Some percentage of renewable energy production should be inherent in all new builds e.g. brown water for toilets or rain capture and reuse.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Green Belt	There should be an overarching principle that brown field sites must always be used before any consideration is given to building on the Green Belt or any other green fields. There should be no building on any sites of special scientific interest e.g. where there are great crested newts, rare orchids, etc. Woodland, wild flower meadows, native hedgerows and fresh water courses must be preserved
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. Provision for older children must be considered e.g. facilities and building suitable for use by youth groups. If there is nothing for them, those living in rural situations can become disenfranchised resulting in ant-social behaviour.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. The current policies are not working. We are in urgent need of more, appropriate and timely, sports facilities that will be used by the up and coming youngsters e.g. skate parks, BMX tracks and more high standard, public swimming pools available. Any sports provision provided as part of a development should be built when staged trigger points are reached rather than as an afterthought at the end. Some exercise groups do not need pitches as such but good facilities to enable them to thrive e.g. walking groups, outdoor gyms, boot camps etc
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Local Green Spaces	Heyford Park Village Green. This is an important amenity in an expanding area of housing development. It is in the centre of the community and the only outside space where large community events can be held. The veterans tranquil garden should be preserved as it is a well used and important facility. This is especially important due to the heritage of Heyford Park as a key strategic air base.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Talking from the point of view of Heyford Park residents there is no provision for anyone travelling west of the village e.g. to Lower Heyford Station, Banbury, Deddington Health Centre or library, etc. or any links between the local villages e.g. off road cycle paths, bridle ways etc. There is a limit to how far you can reduce the need to travel in rural villages therefore need more sustainable methods and also better public transport to and from areas other than Bicester and Oxford. offroad cycle routes - cycling friendly design of roads - more pavements - partially enclosed bus shelters with seating and real time displays - traffic calming and reduced speed limits - better public transport at the times when it is needed e.g. the Village Link, and include later in the evening - electric vehicle charge infrastructure - safe well-lit environments at night e.g. path lighting, CCTV etc to make people feel safe
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). There is still very poor mobile and WiFi coverage in many rural villages e.g. in areas of Heyford Park, Steeple Aston etc. This is needed to enable more home working and to keep children safe when they are out and about
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Transport Policies	No strategic freight rail or road transport hubs due to pressure on local roads, the A34, the A43, the M40 etc.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are. If Ardley station is to reopen it must be passengers as well as freight in order to be of any benefit to the local community. This means that it will require, parking, other facilities for passengers, and a safe, well lit, walking route linking Ardley to other villages.

LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	More electric vehicle charging points and secure bike storage for commuters
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Option 29	Limit further development beyond that already planned for. Before any further development is considered there must be a community cemetery in place owned and operated by the Parish Council for the benefit of residents. There is also a need for more community facilities, including a Parish owned Village Hall, a Youth Club, allotments, a community orchard, community garden, more open spaces, Parish Council managed play areas (NB the current privately owned and operated ones have been shut to children for almost 2 years, with no adequate explanation), health centre, more shops of a wider selection of retail, fewer large businesses, limits on additional freight transport to the site, more hi-tech companies including the much spoken about film industry to secure well paid employment for local people. Preserve and maintain the current rented bungalows, and build additional low cost private rental options, suitable for a wide variety of residents that don't necessary fall into social housing needs categories, so that local people can afford to live in their community e.g. the elderly, less abled, those on minimum wage etc. There is a history of there being a mobile home park at Heyford Park that is full integrated into the local community, and which the residents take great pride in. This should be maintained and considered in any future plans.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	Question - Development Management Policies	S106 and CIL should always go to the relevant parish councils for use in their own community. This should be passed over within one year of the planning application being approved and be non-refundable.
LPR-B-842	Heyford Park Parish Council	General	Some developers have too much power within local communities e.g. residents have no say about the service charges they are made to pay and there is often a lack of transparency about how these are calculated, or what you are paying for. Many residents feel as if they are paying a premium price for a sometimes poor or inadequate service. There should be a requirement that all management companies have to publish their accounts. They should be more accountable and there should be a price cap. The developers are often subcontracting to other companies within their own groups and thereby making profits from this with little if any accountability.
LPR-B-843	Moira Bowden	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-843	Moira Bowden	Option 32	Yes, give more wight to the availability of certain services and facilities. The following are most important: Primary School Secondary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services
LPR-B-844	Eleanor Sampson	LPR-A-091	I want to object to the inclusion is sites LPR-A-091. Access issues, unsustainable, recent over development are just to name a few.
LPR-B-844	Eleanor Sampson	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-845	Wayne Slater	Option 1	Bodicote does not need or require more homes/houses. Bodicote is a village that is loved by the people that all ready live here and enjoy and relish its beautiful surroundings. With the increasing number of new homes being built it is slowly losing its identity of a lovely quiet village and at the current rate of expansion will soon be classed as a town. Not only that but with previous expansion and the proposed expansion more and more of out countryside is being swallowed up. Families wanting to take there children out for walks and exploring the great British countryside will have yet more of that taken away. People who have and enjoy walking their dogs and meeting like minded friends are slowly losing that option by unnesecary development.
LPR-B-845	Wayne Slater	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-845	Wayne Slater	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-845	Wayne Slater	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-845	Wayne Slater	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 2	Stop all expansion of Bodicote
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 19	to the north of the town
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Question - Important views of Banbury	Too much land is being developed

LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 21	Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes. Make it safer to walk along the canal side
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Question - Banbury's open spaces	More facilities are needed with the ever increasing number of houses being built.
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Question - Reducing Car dependency in Banbury	Cheaper bus fares
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 32	Yes more weight to availability of certain services and facilities and yes to accessibility of settlement to urban centres by walking/cycling. Following are important: Primary School Secondary School Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Yes to settlement boundaries to stop over expansion of rural areas
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Make the process and forms much more user friendly
LPR-B-846	Bishop Loveday School	Banbury	Banbury, does not have enough schools, doctor surgeries, dentists or leisure facilities to accommodate the people currently living here. Invest in more facilities before building more homes.
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. More buildings adapted for public use/entertainment. Subsidise business rents to encourage small business/shops to return
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 8	Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Stop building on Greenfield sites , increase tree planting
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Green Belt	Stop building on Greenfield sites and maintain separations between villages to prevent current building in areas between them
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain

LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Plant more trees to increase woodland , forests and open land
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Prioritise protecting and renovating historic buildings
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	improve designs of new buildings to reflect area's heritage instead of building unattractive boxes e.g. at Banbury canal site or the endless warehouses now along the M40
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 19	None is appropriate considering the great amount of recent building around the town in all directions
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Important views of Banbury	Limit views to control height of new buildings , to retain town character
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 21	Allocate the site as a regeneration are to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes. Aesthetically not attractive , overshadows the canal walkways
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Banbury's open spaces	Protect by voluntary or council monitoring and improving
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Question - Reducing Car dependency in Banbury	Regular , more frequent buses
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 26	Maintain green belt strictly
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 32	Yes, weight to both availability of certain services and facilities and to accessibility of settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling. Maintain character of villages by not building large developments. Yes to settlement boundaries to maintain rural character and reduce traffic
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-847	L Connolley	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-848	John Purchase	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Additional housing in rural areas should be limited to the needs of the area. Additional housing in areas of low or no employment or in areas of limited public transport options results in a higher volume of private traffic. A higher volume of private traffic is negative for the climate and increases dangerous traffic congestion on narrow rural roads.
LPR-B-848	John Purchase	Option 31	Use of combination above
LPR-B-848	John Purchase	Option 32	Yes, more weight to availability of certain services and facilities and yes to accessibility by walking and cycling. The following are most important: Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services Play facilities for children, suitably lit roads and pavements.

LPR-B-848	John Purchase	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-848	John Purchase	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-848	John Purchase	Sibford Gower	Sibford Gower - the village is noted as having an equipped play area. This is not the case - there is no equipped play area in the village. Sibford Gower - constraints - some primary roads in the village are extremely narrow with large numbers of cars parked at the roadside, in particular Main Road, between the School and crossroads with Pound Land. This section of road can be dangerous at peak times with coaches, cars and lorries all competing for space. Increasing the number of cars in the village can only make this situation more dangerous and create more risk to pedestrians and road users.
LPR-B-848	John Purchase	LPR-A-107	LPR-A-107 The submitted sites would potentially double the footprint of the village. The village has no need for such a significant number of houses. There is no employment in the village or surrounding area and village facilities are not sufficient. Access to employment and the needed facilities will require additional road journeys and an increase in traffic volumes. An increase in traffic volume will result in both a negative climate impact on the village and an increase in traffic congestion. Additional traffic congestion will be particularly unwelcome on Main Road in the area of the primary school. This road is currently extremely congested during peak times with buses, cars and lorries competing for space.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 1	Item 1: Tackling climate change. Clearly this must be a key theme and one that I support of course. However, most of the newly proposed sites are now open countryside and farmland. We cannot allow this destruction of the natural habitat to happen. It is in clear conflict with point 1. Even if we have exhausted all options, we must still push back on this until there is clear evidence that ALL other options have been discounted for genuine practical reasons (ie not just economics). Killing our countryside for reasons of financial gain cannot be permitted. Item 10: Our distinctive natural landscape and rich historic heritage is to be preserved and enhanced. Absolutely spot on. On this point, the new plan shows that Hanwell village is at risk of being coalesced with Banbury, turning fields into housing estates and destroying an 800 year old village, it's rural setting and its community. This must be rejected.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 2	Overall I think the Key Objectives are well written however there are some important points to raise: Firstly KO1: Allocate sufficient land to meet our housing and employment needs. Why are you straight in with "allocate land"? And where does the information on expected housing needs come from? Section 4.2.2 states that in the last 20 years the population has grown 16%, DRIVEN BY housing growth. So why are we stating that our Key Objective 1 is to allocate land? Surely our Key Objective 1 should be to develop ONLY at a level to KEEP UP WITH demand (NOT DRIVE IT) and to focus our development in town centres to reduce levels of travel in support of our climate change mitigation policies? This KO makes it clear the real objective is to take the easy option, filling the pockets of large development firms at the expense of our countryside, rather than promoting the development of brownfield sites! KO23: Focus developments in sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and setting of its towns and villages. Totally agree with the objective. However, most of the new development sites in the plan are in open fields and farmland, while large numbers of properties in the town centre are empty, most with potential for apartments above them. I see no signs that this has been looked into, while at the same time, Hanwell, a conservation area and historic village, is potentially being coalesced into Banbury- it's setting being anything but protected but in fact destroyed. This is direct conflict with this Key Objective. Proposed sites LPR-A-152, LPR-A-214 and LPR-A-205 in particular must be rejected for that reason (as should LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154) KO25: Protect and enhance the historic and natural landscape. I totally support this but again- destroying fields, farmland and wildlife north of Banbury is NOT aligned but in direct conflict with this Key Objective. The sites listed above should all be rejected on these grounds.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-152	KO23: Focus developments in sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and setting of its towns and villages. Totally agree with the objective. However, most of the new development sites in the plan are in open fields and farmland, while large numbers of properties in the town centre are empty, most with potential for apartments above them. I see no signs that this has been looked into, while at the same time, Hanwell, a conservation area and historic village, is potentially being coalesced into Banbury it's setting being anything but protected but in fact destroyed. This is direct conflict with this Key Objective. Proposed sites LPR-A-152, LPR-A-214 and LPR-A-205 in particular must be rejected for that reason (as should LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154) KO25: Protect and enhance the historic and natural landscape. I totally support this but again - destroying fields, farmland and wildlife north of Banbury is NOT aligned but in direct conflict with this Key Objective. The sites listed above should all be rejected on these grounds. LPR-A-152, LPR-A-214 (Drayton PC) and LPR-A-214 (Hanwell PC). These sites coalesce Hanwell, a historic village and conservation area with Banbury. This plan breaches previous commitments from CDC to maintain Dukes Meadow Drive as a defensible boundary, made during the Design Brief for Hanwell fields which has been renegeed on several times already. Development of these sites goes directly against several of this local plans Key Objectives including enhancing the natural landscape and the maintaining the rural setting of villages. It also is in direct conflict with CDC's commitments to the northern boundary of Banbury AND the commitments to maintain the surrounding field systems made in the Conservation Area Appraisal 2007. Developing these sites would destroy this village and its rural community and permitting this/renegeing on these commitments would make a mockery of this system of Consultation, of Conservation Areas and in fact the Planning Council itself. If CDC wants its residents to have any respect for this process and trust in the Planning Council, these sites MUST be rejected. Sites LPR-A-205, LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154 are also in clear breach of prior commitments given by CDC's planning council and should also be rejected for the same reasons.

LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-214	<p>KO23: Focus developments in sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and setting of its towns and villages. Totally agree with the objective. However, most of the new development sites in the plan are in open fields and farmland, while large numbers of properties in the town centre are empty, most with potential for apartments above them. I see no signs that this has been looked into, while at the same time, Hanwell, a conservation area and historic village, is potentially being coalesced into Banbury it's setting being anything but protected but in fact destroyed. This is direct conflict with this Key Objective. Proposed sites LPRA-152, LPR-A-214 and LPR-A-205 in particular must be rejected for that reason (as should LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154) KO25: Protect and enhance the historic and natural landscape. I totally support this but again - destroying fields, farmland and wildlife north of Banbury is NOT aligned but in direct conflict with this Key Objective. The sites listed above should all be rejected on these grounds. LPRA-152, LPR-A-214 (Drayton PC) and LPR-A-214 (Hanwell PC). These sites coalesce Hanwell, a historic village and conservation area with Banbury. This plan breaches previous commitments from CDC to maintain Dukes Meadow Drive as a defensible boundary, made during the Design Brief for Hanwell fields which has been reneged on several times already.</p> <p>Development of these sites goes directly against several of this local plans Key Objectives including enhancing the natural landscape and the maintaining the rural setting of villages. It also is in direct conflict with CDC's commitments to the northern boundary of Banbury AND the commitments to maintain the surrounding field systems made in the Conservation Area Appraisal 2007. Developing these sites would destroy this village and its rural community and permitting this/reneging on these commitments would make a mockery of this system of Consultation, of Conservation Areas and in fact the Planning Council itself. If CDC wants its residents to have any respect for this process and trust in the Planning Council, these sites MUST be rejected. Sites LPRA-205, LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154 are also in clear breach of prior commitments given by CDC's planning council and should also be rejected for the same reasons.</p>
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-205	<p>KO23: Focus developments in sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and setting of its towns and villages. Totally agree with the objective. However, most of the new development sites in the plan are in open fields and farmland, while large numbers of properties in the town centre are empty, most with potential for apartments above them. I see no signs that this has been looked into, while at the same time, Hanwell, a conservation area and historic village, is potentially being coalesced into Banbury - it's setting being anything but protected but in fact destroyed. This is direct conflict with this Key Objective. Proposed sites LPR-A-152, LPR-A-214 and LPR-A-205 in particular must be rejected for that reason (as should LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154) KO25: Protect and enhance the historic and natural landscape. I totally support this but again - destroying fields, farmland and wildlife north of Banbury is NOT aligned but in direct conflict with this Key Objective. The sites listed above should all be rejected on these grounds. LPRA-152, LPR-A-214 (Drayton PC) and LPR-A-214 (Hanwell PC). These sites coalesce Hanwell, a historic village and conservation area with Banbury. This plan breaches previous commitments from CDC to maintain Dukes Meadow Drive as a defensible boundary, made during the Design Brief for Hanwell fields which has been reneged on several times already. Development of these sites goes directly against several of this local plans Key Objectives including enhancing the natural landscape and the maintaining the rural setting of villages. It also is in direct conflict with CDC's commitments to the northern boundary of Banbury AND the commitments to maintain the surrounding field systems made in the Conservation Area Appraisal 2007. Developing these sites would destroy this village and its rural community and permitting this / reneging on these commitments would make a mockery of this system of Consultation, of Conservation Areas and in fact the Planning Council itself. If CDC wants its residents to have any respect for this process and trust in the Planning Council, these sites MUST be rejected. Sites LPR-A-205, LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154 are also in clear breach of prior commitments given by CDC's planning council and should also be rejected for the same reasons.</p>
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-047	<p>KO23: Focus developments in sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and setting of its towns and villages. Totally agree with the objective. However, most of the new development sites in the plan are in open fields and farmland, while large numbers of properties in the town centre are empty, most with potential for apartments above them. I see no signs that this has been looked into, while at the same time, Hanwell, a conservation area and historic village, is potentially being coalesced into Banbury it's setting being anything but protected but in fact destroyed. This is direct conflict with this Key Objective. Proposed sites LPRA-152, LPR-A-214 and LPR-A-205 in particular must be rejected for that reason (as should LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154) KO25: Protect and enhance the historic and natural landscape. I totally support this but again - destroying fields, farmland and wildlife north of Banbury is NOT aligned but in direct conflict with this Key Objective. The sites listed above should all be rejected on these grounds. LPRA-152, LPR-A-214 (Drayton PC) and LPR-A-214 (Hanwell PC). These sites coalesce Hanwell, a historic village and conservation area with Banbury. This plan breaches previous commitments from CDC to maintain Dukes Meadow Drive as a defensible boundary, made during the Design Brief for Hanwell fields which has been reneged on several times already.</p> <p>Development of these sites goes directly against several of this local plans Key Objectives including enhancing the natural landscape and the maintaining the rural setting of villages. It also is in direct conflict with CDC's commitments to the northern boundary of Banbury AND the commitments to maintain the surrounding field systems made in the Conservation Area Appraisal 2007. Developing these sites would destroy this village and its rural community and permitting this / reneging on these commitments would make a mockery of this system of Consultation, of Conservation Areas and in fact the Planning Council itself. If CDC wants its residents to have any respect for this process and trust in the Planning Council, these sites MUST be rejected. Sites LPRA-205, LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154 are also in clear breach of prior commitments given by CDC's planning council and should also be rejected for the same reasons.</p>

LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-154	<p>KO23: Focus developments in sustainable locations, making efficient and effective use of land, conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape and setting of its towns and villages. Totally agree with the objective. However, most of the new development sites in the plan are in open fields and farmland, while large numbers of properties in the town centre are empty, most with potential for apartments above them. I see no signs that this has been looked into, while at the same time, Hanwell, a conservation area and historic village, is potentially being coalesced into Banbury it's setting being anything but protected but in fact destroyed. This is direct conflict with this Key Objective. Proposed sites LPRA-152, LPR-A-214 and LPR-A-205 in particular must be rejected for that reason (as should LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154) KO25: Protect and enhance the historic and natural landscape. I totally support this but again - destroying fields, farmland and wildlife north of Banbury is NOT aligned but in direct conflict with this Key Objective. The sites listed above should all be rejected on these grounds. LPRA-152, LPR-A-214 (Drayton PC) and LPR-A-214 (Hanwell PC). These sites coalesce Hanwell, a historic village and conservation area with Banbury. This plan breaches previous commitments from CDC to maintain Dukes Meadow Drive as a defensible boundary, made during the Design Brief for Hanwell fields which has been reneged on several times already.</p> <p>Development of these sites goes directly against several of this local plans Key Objectives including enhancing the natural landscape and the maintaining the rural setting of villages. It also is in direct conflict with CDC's commitments to the northern boundary of Banbury AND the commitments to maintain the surrounding field systems made in the Conservation Area Appraisal 2007. Developing these sites would destroy this village and its rural community and permitting this / reneging on these commitments would make a mockery of this system of Consultation, of Conservation Areas and in fact the Planning Council itself. If CDC wants its residents to have any respect for this process and trust in the Planning Council, these sites MUST be rejected. Sites LPRA-205, LPR-A-047 and LPR-A-154 are also in clear breach of prior commitments given by CDC's planning council and should also be rejected for the same reasons.</p>
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington; At significant transport interchanges; Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. Allowing some of the long term empty properties within the town centre to be developed to residential HAS to be considered, to try and protect our rural environment, limit the destruction of fields and farmland and achieve our climate change targets. Increasing the population within the town will in turn support the economy of the town centre with more people having direct access to it without the need for significantly increased parking facilities. Many towns and cities show evidence of this, having vibrant central communities. This of course has to be supported with green spaces, but Banbury is well equipped already with many parks within short walking distance of the centre.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 12	We should not develop areas where biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures cannot be achieved.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	All of the points raised are valid - the ecological emergency, the need to preserve flora and fauna are all of paramount importance. Added to that, buffer zones between villages and towns are key to preserving the historic natural landscape of Cherwell. Regarding Dark Skies - Hanwell Village has a community funded observatory... the proposed coalescence of Hanwell into Banbury will render this useless as light pollution is already been increased as CDC have reneged on every promise made regarding the "defensible boundary" of Dukes Meadow Drive.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	"To protect, preserve and enhance clear green spaces around the rural villages of Cherwell with the planting of trees and protection from development, to ensure that the setting of and views from these key historic villages remain intact." This is critical to the historic environment of Cherwell and of particular importance when considering Conservation Areas. The latest proposals for development go against everything this section stands for considering Hanwell village and its status as a Conservation Area. It must be protected from coalescence- it has stood separate from Banbury for 800 years and is home to a historic church (parts of which are 12th century) and a castle with a whole series of archaeological digs ongoing. The setting of this historic village must be maintained and this policy would help ensure Hanwell's future.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Question - Important views of Banbury	Like Cherwell Council's duty to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of town conservation areas, there is an equal duty to protect the conservation area for the historic heritage of neighbouring settlements. As with the existing Local Plan policy (ref. Policy C34) to protect the views of St Mary's Church (built in the 18th Century to replace an earlier medieval church), there should be a policy to protect views of other significant Places of Worship. The view from fields north of Banbury towards the village of Hanwell include the view of the historic St Peter's Church (dating from the 12th century), which is within the Hanwell Conservation Area. An update of Policy C34 should apply to ancient Places of Worship such as St Peter's Church in Hanwell. This church can still be viewed from open countryside in the south, which is a vista that has been protected for many centuries. This is especially important now as it is under threat from the latest proposals for more housing development north of Banbury.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 20	Consider a balanced approach that allows a mixture of residential and retail use in many of the buildings. Many buildings in Banbury town centre have the opportunity for residential use above retail ground floor spaces, but the vast majority are empty. Developing these is more costly, but finance cannot be a strong factor when compared to the ecological impact of developing on farmland and fields. In addition, a local population within town centres can help to revitalise it- those residents have no barriers to access and the town flourishes as a result of a larger population that is already on-site. Banbury is blessed with large green spaces within a short walk of the town centre and so this can be easily achieved without concerns over the lack of green space / residents well being.

LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. I totally support the development already done to the canal side area. I would further reinforce the point that an increased local population within the town centre itself by developing existing vacant properties would further invigorate this area adding life and "buzz" to our precious town, while providing people with access to homes within walking distance to the train station.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	The green spaces between Banbury and nearby villages MUST be protected from development and potentially enhanced by planting. To not do so destroys the villages and their communities, a key part of our rural district.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 32	Yes, give more weight to the availability of certain services and facilities. No more weight due to accessibility of urban centres. Following are important: Local Shop, GP Surgery and Regular Bus services.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Yes to settlement boundaries, however it also needs to be respected in the future. There was an agreed boundary at Dukes Meadow Drive to the north of Banbury, but this has since been ignored in recent planning. It has been repeatedly stated within this Consultation Document how important our rural villages and landscape are. Clear boundaries to both towns and villages are necessary to ensure that villages remain just that and do not get swallowed up by an ever expanding town. It also ensures that villages do not expand beyond the capabilities of their infrastructure. Instead it forces us to look for more imaginative solutions and re-purposing of existing sites.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Option 34	Hanwell Conservation Area, home to a 12th century church and a castle, is under threat. The threat of development from the south is made very clear within the Conservation Area Appraisal 2007 and Cherwell District Council commits to protect it from this threat. It also commits to protect the field systems that surround the village Conservation Area and the setting of the village. Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-152	LPR-A-152. This site breaches commitments made by CDC that Dukes Meadow Drive is a defensible boundary and the northern most limit of Banbury development. It also erodes Hanwell's status as a village (even more than it has been) and breaches commitments to protect the setting of Hanwell and the field systems surrounding it clearly described in the Hanwell Conservation Appraisal. Development of this site is also in conflict with CDC's own Key Objectives of protecting the identity of rural villages and the rural landscape. It will lead to even more traffic flow through Hanwell, using the (in place single-track) road as a "rat-run". Traffic levels are already dangerously high in the village of Hanwell due to other recent nearby developments, with regular near misses and the corresponding noise increase from this increased traffic is seriously impacting village life. This and the increased safety risks are all to the detriment of the character of the village and the mental well-being of its residents. This site MUST be rejected.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-214	LPR-A-214. This site breaches commitments made by CDC that Dukes Meadow Drive is a defensible boundary and the northern most limit of Banbury development. It also totally destroys Hanwell's status as a village by coalescing Hanwell to Banbury and totally breaches commitments by CDC to protect the setting of Hanwell and the field systems surrounding it, as is clearly described in the Hanwell Conservation Appraisal. Development of this site is also in conflict with CDC's own Key Objectives of protecting the identity of rural villages, historic sites and the rural landscape. It will lead to even more traffic flow through Hanwell, using the (in place single-track) road as a "rat-run". Traffic levels are already dangerously high in the village of Hanwell due to other recent nearby developments, with regular near misses and the corresponding noise increase from this increased traffic is seriously impacting village life. This and the increased safety risks are all to the detriment of the character of the village and the mental well-being of its residents. Finally, Hanwell residents have been ignored and their trust abused too many times already with the recent sites already developed north of Dukes Meadow Drive. Combine this with the naming of these which further erodes the village identity (Hanwell Fields, Hanwell View, Hanwell Chase etc) and you have insult added to the injury of CDC renegeing on their commitments. This site MUST be rejected. Hanwell must be allowed to remain a village and must be protected from future development as per CDC's promises.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-205	LPR-A-205. This site breaches commitments made by CDC that Dukes Meadow Drive is a defensible boundary and the northern most limit of Banbury development. It also erodes Hanwell's status as a village (even more than it has been) and breaches commitments to protect the setting of Hanwell and the field systems surrounding it clearly described in the Hanwell Conservation Appraisal. Development of this site is also in conflict with CDC's own Key Objectives of protecting the identity of rural villages and the rural landscape. This site MUST be rejected.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-047	LPR-A-047. This site breaches commitments made by CDC that Dukes Meadow Drive is a defensible boundary and the northern most limit of Banbury development. It is also potentially in conflict with CDC's commitment within the Hanwell Conservation Appraisal to protect views from the village towards the South East. Finally it is in conflict with CDC's own Key Objectives of protecting the identity of rural villages and the rural landscape. This site should be rejected.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-154	LPR-A-154. This site breaches commitments made by CDC that Dukes Meadow Drive is a defensible boundary and the northern most limit of Banbury development. It is also potentially in conflict with CDC's commitment within the Hanwell Conservation Appraisal to protect views from the village towards the South East. Finally it is in conflict with CDC's own Key Objectives of protecting the identity of rural villages and the rural landscape. This site should be rejected.



LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	Question - Local Green Spaces	The Village Playing Field, off Muddy Lane, Hanwell and Field between Park Farm and the Castle Grounds, Hanwell are proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-849	Kenton Bromby	LPR-A-214	Object. Hanwell Village is a rural village that Cherwell has promised to protect on numerous occasions yet so far, the Council has shown no intention of honouring those commitments, renege in fact at every opportunity. I am not against new development – it is necessary in fact, however I am very “pro-Hanwell” and firmly believe and insist that it should remain a village, separate from Banbury – this does not mean by a line of trees, but by a clear, natural green space. The newest proposed sites for development will eliminate the last elements of space between Hanwell and Banbury, with the proposed sites extending up to the border of the Conservation Area. Hanwell is an 800year-old village. It’s a place of historic value, with rural community spirit, friendship, character and beauty. It is surrounded by greenfields, nature and wildlife, something none of us have the right to destroy. This must not be taken from them. The community has incredible warmth and strength. A village community really is something to be cherished. It is where I want to raise my children, safe in the knowledge that they will grow in this precious environment, its village community, and the surrounding nature. Over recent years, the new developments north of Dukes Meadow Drive have already had a significant impact. These new developments have destroyed what was once farmland and have meant that traffic through the village is at an all-time high – the road, in places single-track, is clearly not capable of sustaining the existing traffic increases, with near-misses already a regular occurrence. Drivers mount the pavements to pass on an hourly basis with little regard for the safety of pedestrians. Further increases to the traffic volume will surely lead to serious accidents and destroys the village character, increasing noise levels. Our community benefits from reduced ambient light because of its rural setting – we have a community funded observatory that will be rendered useless by further development on its doorstep increasing ambient light levels. Coalescence with Banbury will force those who wish to live in a rural village to move. Hanwell Fields, Hanwell View, Hanwell Chase... the identity of Hanwell has been stolen and its value and historic importance diminished by lazy branding of new estates. Additional development in the area will only compound these issues, making Hanwell part of a town, completely destroying its community and way of life. CDC committed to Dukes Meadow Drive being the urban limit on the north side of Banbury. That urban limit was carefully set by the Council’s adopted 1996 Local Plan policies, and the Hanwell Fields Development Brief and Design Brief in 1997 as a “defensible boundary”. This has already been reneged on. The developments already completed to the north of Dukes Meadow Drive, in breach of the prior commitment, were planned with a new commitment that the tree line up to which they extend would be the new boundary to the north (with Dukes Meadow Drive forming the rest). Again, the newly proposed sites would be another example of CDC choosing to renege on their promises. Hanwell is a Conservation Area which should be maintained and preserved. Development in the proposed locations south of Hanwell / north of Dukes Meadow Drive would be a total failure of Cherwell to honour these commitments and in doing so makes the very concept of Conservation Areas null and void. Cherwell District Council’s core strategy is to maintain rural villages and farmland. Planning development in these areas clearly is in direct conflict with this Core Strategy. We are in the middle of COP26. We have a climate emergency on a global scale. Cherwell District Council has not only a commitment but also a moral responsibility to plant trees, preserve/improve the environment and Cherwell as a rural area. There has been no evidence that CDC has pushed to secure brownfield sites instead of farmland for development. Brownfield sites may be more expensive/less lucrative in Banbury than other areas and developers will always choose the easy (most financially rewarding) option. This will reduce Developers options and force them to be more creative in developing brownfield sites. Developers may even need to be offered incentives to develop brownfield sites to ensure we protect our environment and our future. The finances of Development companies cannot be the deciding factor in whether we destroy our natural habitat. Once green farmland and fields are gone, they are gone forever!
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 1	This Vision does not support the phrase "Our distinctive natural and built environment and our rich historic heritage is cherished, protected and enhanced" (p23) but threatens it. There should be no more erosion of the countryside with housing schemes that destroy the very habit the vision seeks to protect. Smarter development within Banbury could supply homes for the 14,000 expected growth in population, whilst at the same time rejuvenating the town, reducing car journeys and helping towards net zero carbon emissions. The sites identified for potential development on the edge of Banbury could instead become native woodland, thereby further assisting the journey to carbon neutrality and providing cleaner air and amenity value for the residents of Banbury. I have been impressed with the towns that China has been building in which houses, water courses and plants merge into a single collage of beauty and desirable living space. We need creative thinking, not more of the same - it is time to end the salami slicing of countryside that leads to urban sprawl that eventually engulfs and destroys the uniqueness of an area, as has already happened over much of England.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 2	They are mostly sound objectives but there is conflict between them. The focus should be on K05 and K07, supporting urban and rural communities. K01 should be abandoned as new development conflict with objectives K06 and K09 and is harmful to the climate
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Retrofitting should be approached with caution. The true costs could outweigh the benefits or be so marginal that they are not worth carrying out. Given the pace of change of technology, it may be wiser to wait for new technologies to arrive.

LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Climate change is multifaceted. The notion that we can keep on developing land for housing and balance climate change is flawed. We need to stop development of undeveloped land. Agricultural land is needed for safeguarding food supplies (and reducing transport costs and emissions expended in international travel of imported food), agricultural land needs to be rested to halt soil depletion and promote wildlife, hedgerows need to be reinstated to stop soil erosion and if there is spare land, it needs to be planted to remove carbon from the atmosphere.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 12	Construction should not take place under such circumstances
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Protection of biodiversity and the natural environment is key to combatting climate change. The current vision of balancing development and protection is flawed. This approach has led to massive wildlife habitat destruction, destruction of biodiversity, increased air pollution and the destruction of local unique communities over a number of decades.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Historic buildings and their hinterland should be absolutely protected against nearby development. Where development has already taken place any new development or changes to existing development should be structured to be sympathetic to the historic environment.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	This is too idealistic and would lead to urban sprawl. It does not work for rural areas. People choose to live in rural areas because it is not built up.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 16	Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	LPR-A-214	In order to protect rural communities, no development should take place within a mile of villages designated as a conservation area. LPR-A-214 and fields immediately to the West in Drayton, for example threaten Hanwell, whose residents have had to endure ever increasing encroachment in recent years. Where development has already occurred, woodland could be planted to define the boundaries and limit of development. Secondly, in order to take advantage of the M40 and reduce congestion from Banbury, if any further development of Banbury is considered, it should be to the East of the M40.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Question - Addressing Inequality in	By sympathetically redeveloping the older run down areas of the town for the residents that live there, providing them with more green space and restoring a sense of community
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. In order for the conservation villages to the north and west of Banbury to retain their uniqueness and identity, any proposed nearby developments should only take place with the agreement of the villages
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 32	No, no more weight to availability of certain services and facilities and no more weight to accessibility to urban centres. Yes to settlement boundaries, In order for settlements to remain unique and maintain residents' sense of community boundaries should be set. The northern and western villages with conservation status should be protected from encroaching development.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district

LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	LPR-A-214	Hanwell - this stone built village is unique in its sense of community and lack of development, making it a desirable place to visit (especially dog walkers) and to enjoy a meal. It is full of history. It has superb views over the local countryside, a C11th medieval church with bats, and an Astronomical Observatory, which has suffered increasing light pollution from the encroachment of Banbury to the south. The local private woods support a large variety of wildlife and the birdlife is particularly impressive. Already, the development of Hanwell Fields to the immediate south has encroached to a point where this uniqueness and biodiversity is under threat. Any further development (LPRA-214 and LPR-A-152) would destroy this jewel of a village that is in walking distance of Banbury. The villagers have seen encroachment salami fashion over recent years, and with each field that has gone under bricks and mortar, they have become increasingly dismayed and distrustful. Their strong sense of community that results in them looking after this picturesque village and in welcoming strangers should be encouraged and not betrayed with further development. On the contrary, biodiversity should be extended. The land offered by local landowners could be acquired for amenity and carbon offsetting purposes and planted with native woodland. Landowners could be required to reduce field sizes around Hanwell by reinstating hedgerows. Sheep grazing could be introduced and a network of trails from Banbury established to provide all residents in the region with a local venue that oozes history, beauty and tranquility. The Castle has a hidden C17th water garden that is slowly being excavated and is a rare if not unique example of its kind in England. This would benefit from funding. The features that make Hanwell special and unique should be conserved. I have only lived here for a few months and already I realise what a remarkable place it is. Please do not allow any further developments here.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	LPR-A-152	Hanwell - this stone built village is unique in its sense of community and lack of development, making it a desirable place to visit (especially dog walkers) and to enjoy a meal. It is full of history. It has superb views over the local countryside, a C11th medieval church with bats, and an Astronomical Observatory, which has suffered increasing light pollution from the encroachment of Banbury to the south. The local private woods support a large variety of wildlife and the birdlife is particularly impressive. Already, the development of Hanwell Fields to the immediate south has encroached to a point where this uniqueness and biodiversity is under threat. Any further development (LPRA-214 and LPR-A-152) would destroy this jewel of a village that is in walking distance of Banbury. The villagers have seen encroachment salami fashion over recent years, and with each field that has gone under bricks and mortar, they have become increasingly dismayed and distrustful. Their strong sense of community that results in them looking after this picturesque village and in welcoming strangers should be encouraged and not betrayed with further development. On the contrary, biodiversity should be extended. The land offered by local landowners could be acquired for amenity and carbon offsetting purposes and planted with native woodland. Landowners could be required to reduce field sizes around Hanwell by reinstating hedgerows. Sheep grazing could be introduced and a network of trails from Banbury established to provide all residents in the region with a local venue that oozes history, beauty and tranquility. The Castle has a hidden C17th water garden that is slowly being excavated and is a rare if not unique example of its kind in England. This would benefit from funding. The features that make Hanwell special and unique should be conserved. I have only lived here for a few months and already I realise what a remarkable place it is. Please do not allow any further developments here.
LPR-B-850	David Collingwood-Turner	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	By dialogue with the village parish councils
LPR-B-851	Michael Weston	LPR-A-091	Object. It is not sustainable and offers no benefit and is disproportionately in conflict with the village. The village has already had significant development. There are major access issues to the sight from narrow single track bridal paths.
LPR-B-852	Adam Brother	LPR-A-091	Object. Adding yet more housing to Bodicote, specifically in this area, would simply be unsustainable and would very much add access issues for Bodicote locals on a daily basis
LPR-B-853	Nicole Croft	LPR-A-091	Object. Unsustainable, disproportionate and add access issues and recent over development that we have had to already put up with in Bodicote very close to this suggested new site. Most of the village are up in arms about all the building work here as you are taking away so much of our green space, making traffic and access impossible and adding houses in what should be a nice quiet village where housing isn't needed. We are very against it, as are many many villagers.
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 1	The vision glosses over its approach to transport. The regeneration of our high streets will require better transport to the three hubs (Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington) and is required to underpin the sustainability of the vision. any development plan must be underpinned by a full transport strategy. The allocation of land for development must be controlled and prioritised. Later you say "Any options that would result in the need to release land from the Green Belt will need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in accordance with national policy. This commitment should be recognised in the vision.
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 2	None of this will work without a transport strategy."Prioritise active travel and increase the attraction of and opportunities for public transport, ensuring high standards of connectivity and accessibility to services for all. Reduce dependency on the private car as a mode of travel, facilitating the creation of a zerocarbon transport network." is simply an inadequate commitment. More detailed and specific objectives must be set e.g. accessibility to hubs (Kidlington, Bicester, Banbury) from outlying villages to support the regeneration of their High Streets
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges. really is not realistic to ask respondents to make a choice without an outline transport plan/objectives. If we can't get to work on public transport, the whole plan will not meet its objectives on sustainability
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Without a transport plan, comments and opinions have no practical context

LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	A plan which includes transport hubs is essential
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Supporting our Town	How will people get in and out of town centres?
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	Old (and historic) housing stock should be encouraged to move to heat pump-based systems. To support a rapid transition to renewable energy, Cherwell should encourage the use of hybrid heating systems in which heat pumps are supported by a secondary heat source (gas, oil, electricity) in extreme weather. The installation of a heat pump does not require an expensive and timeconsuming complete overhaul of pipes and radiators. This approach has allowed e.g. France to install ten times as many heat pumps as the UK, supporting a move to renewable energy even in places where winter temperatures can fall to -15 deg C
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Green Belt	Prioritise the development of brown field land, protecting the green belt in line with the vision and objectives. For Kidlington, ensure that any options that would result in the need to release land from the Green Belt will need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in accordance with national policy
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Local Green Spaces	Islip, Noke, Beckley, Otmoor surrounds and sites connected by the Oxfordshire Way, keeping any development centred within a short distance of the A34
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Good in principle, but clearer definition of what is available in a 20 minute neighbourhood is needed. The value of the neighbourhood and its amenities is inextricably bound up with the transport arrangements to get to another one and the document is silent on this:
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The approach is far too vague and needs specific objectives related to specific activities e.g. access to shops, entertainment, green space. Development plans should not be considered sustainable without this. Rural areas need access to low carbon technology and to reliable, tailored public transport to support access to facilities and services that are not part of the 20 minute neighbourhood. Reliable on-demand public transport would encourage me to drive less.
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Transport Policies	They are grossly insufficient in the context of this document
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Bicester is a town split in two physically by the East West railway development and rail connections to London/Birmingham. Tr
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 23	No opinion. I am against further incursion into the Green belt surrounding Bicester. The development of Bicester has encouraged major retailers to move away from the historic centre of Bicester and has promoted car-based "out of town" shopping, encouraged by Bicester Village (e.g. Marks and Spencer). If the High Street is to be preserved and we are to move towards sustainability, this trend must be stopped. Again, these development decisions must be taken in the context of a vision for transport. Developments have simply served to promote the use of cars.
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 24	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Reliable on-demand public transport
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Availability of public transport to reach the centre of Kidlington and other local amenities
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. Development should be concentrated in specific areas with good transport links for local residents.
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre

LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Reliable on-demand public transport from Otmoor to Kidlington
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. We need to avoid Kidlington developing into an "urban sprawl" as is happening with the plans for development at Watereator
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. The character of Otmoor and surrounding villages must be protected for a whole host of reasons. The character of a village must not change. In Islip brownfield land only should be used for development and the existing stock of ca 250 houses should be increased by no more than 20% over the next 30 years with any new development close to existing transport infrastructure so that traffic from new development does not need to pass through the village centre to reach arterial road and rail routes. Priority should be given to affordable housing. These considerations should also apply to the rest of Otmoor and surrounding villages
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 32	Yes- Both
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Settlement	Rural settlements must not become part of an urban sprawl so boundaries must be set
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 33	Use a combination of the above. We must make sure that developments are underpinned by a transport policy based on robust principles, sustainable delivery with specific measurable objectives
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Parish Profile	I don't believe that realistic and sustainable plans can be developed without a transport plan for Cherwell
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Question - Development Management Policies	Transport. We need to start thinking more carefully about what we want our transport system to achieve for our communities.
LPR-B-854	Richard Henshaw	Islip	The Islip sites must be limited to those with good access to the A34 and to Oxford Parkway. The village should be developed carefully so that its character is preserved and its role as a local hub for sport, access to green space and for children's play is not damaged. Anything likely to generate more motor traffic through the village must be ruled out. Priority should be given to the development of the brownfield site on the edge of the village. Plans by local land holders to add 3,000 homes to a village of around 250 homes are a disgrace and founded, as they are in part, on the presence of the Expressway (which is now unlikely to go ahead and), must be rejected. The village will become part of an urban sprawl, which is not what the Local Options paper is intending. If Islip is to be seen as part of a development plan centred round Kidlington, transport must be developed to support that properly and avoid increasing reliance on cars. I support the development of the village but not in the uncontrolled manner envisaged by the Church Commissioners
LPR-B-855	Tim Coombs	LPR-A-204	Infrastructure insufficient, this area is being used increasingly more and more for walkers, the road will be unusable for pedestrians and unsafe, the views for walkers will be ruined
LPR-B-856	Christopher Birch	Option 18	Consider further urban extensions limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-856	Christopher Birch	Option 19	To the north of the town. To the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-856	Christopher Birch	LPR-A-091	Object. These greenfields have only ever been and still are used for agriculture. Any development here would have an extreme detrimental affect on the flora and fauna. This area is an amenity to the community helping health and wellbeing especially during the pandemic. The number of people walking over these fields has never been so great. The noise and pollution generated by development would be terrible and the lost of visual amenity in this area of outstanding Oxfordshire countryside would be tragic. Concern of local residents at being overlooked by new houses and losing their privacy. Hhigh density and closeness of the new properties in areas such as Blackwood Place nothing but negative comments have been heard from people living in Bodicote. The risk of flooding in this area is real as the southern boundary of the site is right upto the flood plain of Sor Brook. I have lived in this area of Bodicote for nearly 39 years and the area of flood has, each winter, gradually grown. And I know that the effect has increased downstream in Adderbury. Developers would promise to attenuate the flow by various methods but this is not viable in this case as it is far too close to the existing floodplain and there would be a real threat to some of the new properties.
LPR-B-856	Christopher Birch	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes. Its one the most important historical and visual assets of Banbury.
LPR-B-856	Christopher Birch	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-856	Christopher Birch	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area

LPR-B-857	Susan Murray	LPR-A-091	Object. There are significant access issues from two narrow single track bridal paths. There has already been significant development extending the footprint of the rural village of Bodicote. This development is significant on its impact on the community and rural views and not required
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Question - Housing Policies	Policy should allow more flexibility for alternative construction methods, materials and architecture to enable more cost effective homes to be built. Standards should be maintained regards insulation, eco etc.
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 19	to the west of the town
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 32	Yes. Primary School, Secondary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. More weight to accessibility
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Question - Settlement	Yes. Our historic villages are being subsumed into the larger towns and history is being eroded.
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-858	Robert Ravie	LPR-A-091	Object. Change the landscape in a negative way, move the natural village boundary further South, spoil the habitat for birds and animals, site access would be a major issue. There can be no justification for building housing in the village given Longford park is over the main road and can provide many more homes with less impact on the rural surroundings. Services are already a problem in the village and the Primary school and nearby secondary school are over subscribed.
LPR-B-859	Nicholas Gillham	Option 1	Expanding the population in Banbury will inevitably increase pressures in the Horton. Over the last 20 years many services have been moved to Oxford of which maternity and general surgery are the most controversial. Oxford fails to cope on a regular basis. There needs to be a real commitment to restoring the Horton General Hospital to what it was and should be. I.e a district general hospital. This must include a full maternity, womens and childrens service and acute general surgery as well as expansion of a nationally recognised high quality trauma service. Too many patients need to go to Oxford for simple minor procedures and this is not good for patients or the community or efficient. Oxford has promised long and delivered short over 20 years. The hospital needs to be replaced before not after the housing expansion. Promises are not enough. There needs to be actual restoration of services before any expansion of housing and the inevitable increase in patients.
LPR-B-859	Nicholas Gillham	Option 2	Too complex for a clear understanding
LPR-B-859	Nicholas Gillham	Hempton	The level of traffic through Hempton and the Barfords is already too much for the roads, see the problems with the bridge in the Barfords. The pinch points in Hempton and Barford make expansion of traffic exceptionally problematic with no clear solution. The road to Duns Tew from Hempton is equally rural and narrow. Hempton is not a suitable site for expansion because of the traffic and lack of any infrastructure, no shops, school etc. It is too far for many to walk to Deddington and this will result in an inevitable increase in car usage for shopping and commuting as the only viable option.
LPR-B-860	Susina Beck	Parish Profile - Bodicote	Parish Profile of Bodicote which states on Page 3 that the 'open nature of the south and west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting. The inclusion of sites LPR-A-091 in the plan review would constitute a breach of the statement that the boundaries should be preserved.

LPR-B-860	Susina Beck	LPR-A-091	Object. The grounds for my objection centre around the preservation of the rural nature of the village of Bodicote. Many people use the area and public rights of way immediately adjacent to the proposed site for leisure and exercise and development of this site would, in my opinion, impact on the enjoyment of the area surrounding Bodicote village. Increase in traffic to the narrow roads not only of the Conservation Area of Bodicote, which should, by definition be conserved, but the roads which would lead in to the proposed new development would be unacceptably and, for their size and current use, be made too busy and unsafe. 'Bodicote Parish Profile' states that "The open nature of the south and west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting'. Permitting the development of the site in question would be, in my view, contradictory to what is stated in this document and I would question the reason for <u>saving one thing and then permitting this development.</u>
LPR-B-861	Tristan Spaargaren	LPR-A-004	Object. Village does not have the infrastructure. Our village is very small in size with only a minor road at each end as access, that passes through the centre of the village with very narrow passing points due to the on-street parking. This road is already used to access other villages and as a cut through from the Broughton main road to Stratford main road. We constantly have traffic backing up because of residents parking, as cars are not able to pass each other at the narrowest parts of the village. This narrowest part of the road is towards the end of the village where developments are proposed. On this stretch of road there is a particular issue on the blind corner where the main street turns into Shutford Road. It is very difficult, and potentially dangerous, to manoeuvre through this section. If we were to add the additional housing with an average of 2 cars per property (minimum), this would exacerbate the problem. The same concerns would be extremely relevant in the case of increased traffic through North Newington as a result of proposed developments in neighbouring villages, which would be accessed via the road through our village as it is currently used as a cut- through to other villages, and this would seem unlikely to change. Another factor is that due to climate change we are experiencing increasingly heavy rainfall. We experience overflowing surface water due to poor drainage at the end of the village where new development is proposed, to add additional housing to this would mean less natural drainage into the developed fields, and, as a result increased levels of water fed into the current already over-stretched drainage system. We were advised that our water pressure is already at the very minimum legal level required by water companies in the UK. Seems unlikely that the current water supply system will support further housing and if it is not significantly improved, the additional demand would potentially reduce water pressure in the existing houses to below the legal minimum required levels. Unless our reliance on gas/oil is 100% resolved by the time any development was to take place, fuel tankers would need improved access through the village - on a road infrastructure that is already overloaded.
Page 2084	Tristan Spaargaren	LPR-A-135	Object. Village does not have the infrastructure. Our village is very small in size with only a minor road at each end as access, that passes through the centre of the village with very narrow passing points due to the on-street parking. This road is already used to access other villages and as a cut through from the Broughton main road to Stratford main road. We constantly have traffic backing up because of residents parking, as cars are not able to pass each other at the narrowest parts of the village. This narrowest part of the road is towards the end of the village where developments are proposed. On this stretch of road there is a particular issue on the blind corner where the main street turns into Shutford Road. It is very difficult, and potentially dangerous, to manoeuvre through this section. If we were to add the additional housing with an average of 2 cars per property (minimum), this would exacerbate the problem. The same concerns would be extremely relevant in the case of increased traffic through North Newington as a result of proposed developments in neighbouring villages, which would be accessed via the road through our village as it is currently used as a cut- through to other villages, and this would seem unlikely to change. Another factor is that due to climate change we are experiencing increasingly heavy rainfall. We experience overflowing surface water due to poor drainage at the end of the village where new development is proposed, to add additional housing to this would mean less natural drainage into the developed fields, and, as a result increased levels of water fed into the current already over-stretched drainage system. We were advised that our water pressure is already at the very minimum legal level required by water companies in the UK. Seems unlikely that the current water supply system will support further housing and if it is not significantly improved, the additional demand would potentially reduce water pressure in the existing houses to below the legal minimum required levels. Unless our reliance on gas/oil is 100% resolved by the time any development was to take place, fuel tankers would need improved access through the village - on a road infrastructure that is already overloaded.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 1	Ecological resilience will not be achieved by building on the green belt and increasing flood risk by building large numbers of houses on sites like the Church Commissioners are proposing around Islip.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 2	K06, KO9, KO12, KO13, KO14, KO15, KO18, KO23 & KO25. Need to recognise the economic benefits of the character and beauty of Cherwell's natural heritage, landscape, and the wider benefits from its natural capital and ecosystem services. How can we be wringing our hands over climate change and cheering COP 26 in one breath and then suggesting that building large numbers of houses on green belt land around Islip and Oxford is in any way 'sustainable'. Why are we suggesting that making an already crowded SouthEast, including Cherwell, 'better' by building on green belt, increasing flood risk and reducing biodiversity is viable, in the context of climate change? Surely we would be better to promote economic development in deprived areas, build on brownfield sites and redevelop urban areas? Are we setting out to line the pockets of developers and landowners, or are we serious about protecting our environment and combatting climate change? We do need more housing. We need less greenwashing and more sober and responsible consideration of the legacy of unbridled inappropriate and unsustainable development in rural areas.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land. We need to regenerate our urban and semi urban areas and use brownfield sites in both urban and rural areas, not build on greenfield sites in the greenbelt. An example of sustainable development would be building on the old MOD oil dump in Islip. This is a brownfield site in the greenbelt but its development is being actively promoted by the PC and residents of Islip. Ignoring this, the Church Commissioners have put forward proposals to concrete over productive farmland around Islip and build thousands of houses, something that would lead to a huge loss in biodiversity and an increase in flood risk. It is not that the residents of Islip are 'nimbys'- the community recognises the need for development but wishes it to be appropriate and in line with our drive towards net zero. The oil dump is an excellent site (next to the railway station, good road access, currently abandoned and of an appropriate size in relation to the existing village for services and community cohesion), and could cater for employment and residential purposes.

LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 6	Increase in the urban areas, decrease in rural areas
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. We must add to our natural capital. Must not build on farmland, and only on brownfield. Consider what is genuinely sustainable, stop the greenwash, minimise offsetting and build residential and commercial spaces whose siting, in terms of ecological impact/carbon footprint, has been considered as a priority.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Do not need to control. The market will drive the requirement- if more flats are needed (for young people for example) then let's allow larger buildings to be converted.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 26	Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 27	Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Question - Settlement	Yes. We must stop drives for large scale development around existing villages/communities such as that proposed on viable and productive farmland around Islip by The Church Commissioners.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Consult locally - at village level. Do not impose area targets indiscriminately. Take the plan seriously and protect communities against the imposition of schemes promoted by developers and landowners (particularly The Church Commissioners) who are unconcerned by community or climate change and driven only by profit.
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	LPR-A-223	Object. Need to regenerate our urban and semi urban areas and use brownfield sites in both urban and rural areas. Example of sustainable development would be building on the old MOD oil dump in Islip. This is a brownfield site in the greenbelt but its development is actively promoted. Church Commissioners have put forward proposals to concrete over productive farmland around Islip and build thousands of houses, something that would lead to a huge loss in biodiversity and an increase in flood risk. It is not that the residents of Islip are 'nimby's'- the community recognises the need for development but wishes it to be appropriate and in line with our drive towards net zero. The oil dump is an excellent site (next to the railway station, good road access, currently abandoned and of an appropriate size in relation to the existing village for services and community cohesion), and could cater for employment and residential. Need to develop rationally and responsibly we cannot be wringing our hands at COP26 and then allowing this sort of development. Nationally, agricultural incentivisation schemes (subsidies) are being reworked to focus on ecosystem services and natural capital and get us away from heavy input/high impact farming. We can achieve sustainable food production and achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Increase carbon sequestration and storage in soils through sound agricultural management and conservation (tree planting, rewetting, rewilding).
LPR-B-862	James de Jonge	LPR-A-221	Support. Development is sensible and proportionate and supported by the local community. It contrasts starkly with the plans the Church Commissioners have submitted for covering viable agricultural land around Islip with thousands of houses dramatically reducing biodiversity, pushing us in the wrong direction in terms of climate change and dwarfing the existing village- that anyone could be proposing something like this is risible given the imperative to address climate change in a meaningful way. How could something like that be acceptable after COP26- the environment is not something that just happens in rainforests or on peatland in the uplands.



LPR-B-863	Veronica Warner	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-863	Veronica Warner	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-863	Veronica Warner	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. Give more weight to accessibility.
LPR-B-863	Veronica Warner	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-863	Veronica Warner	LPR-A-091	Object. This site brings no benefit in terms of meeting the district's housing targets. Bodicote has done more than its share in having large new housing developments. There is inadequate access to the proposed site - both directly and via the nearby roads which are not wide enough for construction vehicles and equipment.
LPR-B-864	William Croft	LPR-A-091	Object. Unsustainable, disproportionate and add access issues and recent over development that we have had to already put up with in Bodicote very close to this suggested new site. Most of the village are up in arms about all the building work here as you are taking away so much of our green space, making traffic and access impossible and adding houses in what should be a nice quiet village where housing isn't needed.
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 1	The vision for so many houses should be scrapped and recalculated. And the vision should be much greener in consideration- more buses and consideration of how people travel and where they work.
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 2	Building more houses on the edge of towns is not the answer! Where is the infrastructure to support this? Where are the jobs for people to move to, in Banbury?
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Question - Green Belt	Maybe the wildlife that lives there. In Bodicote, we have Barn owls, toads and frogs, heron, swans, mallards, finches and endangered farm birds such as linnet and yellowhammer, hedgehogs, deer, foxes - all of which enrich our lives in our so called 'village' location. All appreciated and enjoyed by the village.
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 19	None
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Option 30	No more building.
LPR-B-865	Wig Sayell	Bodicote	No more housing. Roland Bratt has proposed giving up two more fields to the South of the village in Bodicote. We have already lost nesting sites from Cala Homes for skylarks we have endangered hedgehogs that get run run over on Molyneux drive. We have had enough! None of these houses are for local people. They have in the majority moved here from London and Essex
LPR-B-866	Jonathan Stanley	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-866	Jonathan Stanley	LPR-A-091	Object. I feel it would add no benefit to the village and prove a detriment to the area as a whole.
LPR-B-867	Olga Rashkovan	Question - Green Belt	Local Green Belt around villages in Banbury is being destroyed as lots of land has been sold for development. Our community has lost a substantial number of fields and local green spaces to housing. Bodicote is one of the worst affected villages in the area
LPR-B-867	Olga Rashkovan	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-867	Olga Rashkovan	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-867	Olga Rashkovan	LPR-A-091	Object.
LPR-B-868	Sarah Jarvis	LPR-A-091	Object. Totally inappropriate setting due to access problem, overdevelopment and loss of much needed green space so necessary for mental well being
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Question - Green Belt	LPR-A-091 impacts green belt, local views and is underwater for several weeks per year
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Option 12	Don't build on this land
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain

LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	LPR-A-091 impacts green belt, local views and is underwater for several weeks per year
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Option 30	LPR-A-091 impacts green belt, local views and is underwater for several weeks per year
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	Question - Settlement	If you don't there will be no villages just a joined up metropolis
LPR-B-869	David McDonald	LPR-A-091	Object. Impacts green belt, local views and is underwater for several weeks per year. It will increase traffic in rural village
LPR-B-870	ICOMOS-UK	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	The Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site lies just outside but close to the boundary of Cherwell district. The setting of the WHS supports its Outstanding Universal Value as set out in para 112 of the 'Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2019' to which the UK Government is a signatory. The Local Plan Review should ensure that the need to protect the setting of the Blenheim Palace WHS is explicitly covered in the policies for heritage and protecting the historic environment
LPR-B-870	ICOMOS-UK	LPR-A-063	Object. This site forms part of the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site. Opposed an application to develop it in 2015 which was refused and raised concerns in 2017 about its allocation as PR10 during the Partial Review. The site was subsequently omitted from the Partial Review at Examination stage partly because its development would cause some harm to the setting of the WHS. The site is now the only part of the historic open setting of Blenheim Park to survive on its southeastern side. It sits at the entrance to Woodstock for those approaching on the main route from Oxford, allowing them to appreciate the contrast between enclosed park and open country which is important to an understanding of the social and cultural significance of the WHS.
LPR-B-871	Svetlana Ardonova	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-871	Svetlana Ardonova	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-871	Svetlana Ardonova	LPR-A-091	Object. This land to subject to flood, destroy local habitats.
LPR-B-872	Richard Lodge	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. Employers should be made to consider housing needs of their employees
LPR-B-872	Richard Lodge	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-872	Richard Lodge	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Busses to the John Radcliffe hospital, Bicester Village and Oxford town center
LPR-B-872	Richard Lodge	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way. Why are you only exploring the potential? I would expect you to commit to creating linked green spaces around Kidlington
LPR-B-872	Richard Lodge	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	You plan to build 4400 new houses you need to plan for increased sport, recreation and community needs not
LPR-B-872	Richard Lodge	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance Why can't you do both?
LPR-B-873	Kevin Boneham	LPR-A-091	Object. There are 4 ongoing sites building houses in this village with an adequate amount of houses being built & I believe it is being raped of its beautiful surrounding countryside. I'm afraid it is being destroyed by more development that is not required. Development of this site would also be a conflict with the National planning policy.
LPR-B-874	Chris Woodward	LPR-A-091	Object. Development is absolutely shameful. No more houses are needed within this small village with existing poor infrastructure and it happens to be a rural, well used open green space. More houses means more cars on the ever increasingly dangerous roads of Bodicote! More houses means less green space to exercise. As there are no advantages in this site, what could be the true motivation for putting it forward
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land. At the larger villages. A combination of all the above
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?

LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Question - Local Green Spaces	The Village Playing Field, off Muddy Lane, Hanwell and Field between Park Farm and the Castle Grounds, Hanwell are proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 19	Further development to the north of the town will threaten the fragile open "strategic gaps" between the current urban boundary and the adjacent conservation villages of Hanwell and Drayton. The individual rural setting and character of the village of Hanwell and its Conservation Area would be permanently destroyed if further housing sites were accepted. CDC should not be considering development of further housing sites to the north of Banbury. The following sites would have the most adverse impacts on Hanwell village: LPRA-214 and LPR-A-152.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Important landmark.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Much improved and cheaper bus services. Car parking charges are fair. Strengthen the town centre offer, which has suffered with closure of key retailers.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Villages must be kept "alive" and thriving as far as possible but are the least sustainable locations for new development.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. More weight to accessibility of the settlement.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Question - Settlement	Yes. Or have robust rural planning policies which have the same effect.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance Hanwell Conservation Area: the existing Conservation Area boundary (2007) should now be extended by the inclusion of the field on its southern boundary between Park Farm and the Castle grounds, which forms important part of the setting of the Church and Castle.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Parish Profile - Hanwell and Drayton	Hanwell and Drayton. The character and setting of both villages are threatened by the expansion of Banbury to the north and new housing sites. Effective policies are needed to protect the strategic gaps and open land between Banbury and these villages and prevent further coalescence
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	Question - Development Management Policies	In practice previous Local Plans have been weak in protecting open land from development despite CDC's efforts. This has allowed continued- and piecemeal - development on agricultural land to the north of Banbury which is now encroaching on the surrounding small villages. This should be addressed urgently.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	LPR-A-214	Object. Unsuitable site. Will have serious impacts on the setting and character of Hanwell village.
LPR-B-875	Karen Jones	LPR-A-152	Object. Unsuitable site. Will have serious impacts on the setting and character of Hanwell village and Drayton.
LPR-B-876	Planning Issues Ltd.	Option 2	McCarthy Stone and Churchill Retirement Living are independent and competing housebuilders specialising in sheltered housing for older people. We are responsible for delivering approximately 90% of England's specialist owneroccupied retirement housing. The ONS 2018 population projections for the Cherwell show that the population aged 65 and over is expected to increase by 59% between 2018 and 2043 from 26,959 persons to 43,012. This will have significant implications on several matters, including housing need. The population aged 80 and over, the demographic most likely to be frail and suffer long term illness, will increase from 7,396 to 15,193 over the same period – 105%. Paragraph 1 of the PPG Housing for Older and Disabled people states: "The need to provide housing for older people is critical. People are living longer lives and the proportion of older people in the population is increasing. Offering older people, a better choice of accommodation to suit their changing needs can help them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to the social care and health systems. An understanding of how the ageing population affects housing needs is something to be considered from the early stages of plan-making through to decision-taking". McCarthy Stone and Churchill Retirement Living have been concerned by the limited consideration given to the future requirements for specialist older persons housing, particularly in some Housing Needs Assessments. We stress the importance of properly determining the housing needs of older people and planning for them appropriately in the emerging Local Plan

LPR-B-876	Planning Issues Ltd.	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. The role of town centres is changing and that many traditional uses, in particular retail. Specialist older persons' housing is typically located circa 0.5miles from a town or local centre placing residents within close proximity of the shops, services and community facilities located therein. This helps facilitate the continued independence of older people as they can access goods and services more easily and continue to play an active role in their local community, without the need for a car. Specialist older persons' housing has a corresponding role in supporting the vitality and viability of town and local centres. A recent paper entitled 'Silver Saviours of the High Street' by WPI Strategy concluded that: • 63% of residents of specialist older persons' housing's annual expenditure is in local shops. This is much higher than the average local spend by 80+ year olds in the general population. • A typical 45-unit retirement development generates £550,000 of spending per year, £347,000 of which goes to local shops, supporting retail jobs and keeping shops open. • Assuming a shop has an owner and two full time equivalent employees, a specialist older persons' housing development would support one shop on the high street. The incorporation of specialist older persons' housing either within or in close proximity to town and local centres can enhance their vitality and viability.
LPR-B-876	Planning Issues Ltd.	Option 6	Affordable Housing, s106 and CIL contributions should be robustly tested through the Plan making process and evidence based. Without the preparation of a Local Plan Viability Study, we are of the view that questions over the policy approach towards planning obligations are premature. Increased importance has been placed on Local Plan viability testing in the NPPF and the PPG, with the latter stating The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan. It is crucial that the evidence base underpinning the Council's planning obligations framework is both robust and credible, and to that end it is important that developers are given the opportunity to meaningfully inform and provide feedback on this process. We would like to stress the importance of undertaking viability appraisals for specialist older persons' housing typologies – namely Sheltered Housing and Extra Care accommodation. This is both best practice and in step with the typology approach detailed in Paragraph: 004 of the PPG which states that. "A typology approach is a process plan makers can follow to ensure that they are creating realistic, deliverable policies based on the type of sites that are likely to come forward for development over the plan period." While a significant number of viability consultants preparing Local Plan Viability Assessments do test specialist older persons' housing typologies, a small number do not. The viability of these forms of development should robustly tested during the Plan making process in a manner commensurate with that of other forms of housing.
LPR-B-876	Planning Issues Ltd.	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government. There is clear focus and momentum from Government in preparing and enhancing sustainability standards. For example, Government has recently finished consulting on interim changes in both Part F and Part L of the Building Standards through the second consultation on The Future Buildings Standards and it is clear the energy efficiency requirements for domestic and nondomestic buildings will increase sharply in the coming years.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land. At the larger villages. A combination of all the above
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Question - Local Green Spaces	The Village Playing Field, off Muddy Lane, Hanwell and Field between Park Farm and the Castle Grounds, Hanwell are proposed for designation as a Local Green Space. A site location plan has been supplied.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 19	Banbury has delivered a substantial proportion of the District's housing provision for over 30 years and given its clear "natural limits" the future emphasis for greenfield sites should be on the southern parts of Cherwell. Areas such as the town of Bicester form key parts of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine where employment growth is likely to take place. There should be renewed efforts to regenerate sustainable brownfield sites in Banbury and its centre for housing and commercial uses, with the transport connectivity needed for the future. Further development to the north of the town will threaten the fragile open "strategic gaps" between the current urban boundary and the adjacent conservation villages of Hanwell and Drayton. The individual rural setting and character of the village of Hanwell and its Conservation Area would be permanently destroyed if further housing sites were accepted. CDC should not be considering development of further housing sites to the north of Banbury. The following sites would have the most adverse impacts on Hanwell village: LPRA-214 and LPR-A-152. Other housing sites submitted north of Banbury would cumulatively erode the rural character of the area.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Important landmark for the town.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area

LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Much improved and cheaper bus services. Car parking charges in Banbury are reasonable, so you need greater carrots to encourage more bus usage. Strengthen the town centre offer, which has suffered with closure of key retailers and created more trips to out of town shopping (M&S etc).
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Villages must be kept "alive" and thriving as far as possible, but are the least sustainable locations for new development if we are to tackle climate change
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. More weight to accessibility of the settlement.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Question - Settlement	Yes. Or have robust rural planning policies which have the same effect.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance Hanwell Conservation Area: the existing Conservation Area boundary (2007) should now be extended by the inclusion of the field on its southern boundary between Park Farm and the Castle grounds, which forms important part of the setting of the Church and Castle. See figure uploaded below. This is vital if urban development is allowed over time to encroach further on the southern boundary of the village.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Parish Profile - Hanwell and Drayton	Hanwell and Drayton. The character and setting of both villages are threatened by the expansion of Banbury to the north and new housing sites. <b>Effective and robust policies are needed to protect the strategic gaps and open land between Banbury and these villages and prevent further coalescence</b>
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	Question - Development Management Policies	It seems that in practice previous Local Plans have been weak in protecting open land from development despite CDC's efforts. This has allowed continued - and piecemeal - development on agricultural land to the north of Banbury which is now encroaching on the surrounding small villages. This should be addressed urgently.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	LPR-A-214	Object. Unsuitable site. Will have serious impacts on the setting and character of Hanwell village.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	LPR-A-152	Object. Unsuitable site. Will have serious impacts on the setting and character of Hanwell village and Drayton.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	LPR-A-047	Object. The other three housing sites submitted north of Banbury between Southam Rd and Warwick Rd would also cumulatively erode the rural character of the area and should resisted.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	LPR-A-154	Object. The other three housing sites submitted north of Banbury between Southam Rd and Warwick Rd would also cumulatively erode the rural character of the area and should resisted.
LPR-B-877	Alan Jones	LPR-A-205	Object. The other three housing sites submitted north of Banbury between Southam Rd and Warwick Rd would also cumulatively erode the rural character of the area and should resisted.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land. Employment Land must be accessible at all hours by sustainable transport options. Out of town employment land has poor accessibility by public transport in North Cherwell
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. High quality residential conversions of existing buildings can help to keep those buildings in use and allow low carbon "transport free" lifestyles
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - Housing Policies	Housing Policy must be evidence-led and not influenced by those who have a vested interest in increasing house building.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government? Future Homes standards must be rigorously enforced to ensure developers do not cut corners in design or construction.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Exemptions should be allowed to protect the external appearance of historic buildings thus respecting and enhancing our existing built heritage.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 12	Biodiversity "net gain" is a fallacy. Simply creating a new "green space" somewhere else is no replacement for a historic habitat and should not be permitted.

LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Attempting to replace distant "big-sky" views and historic landscapes with pseudo "open spaces" such as play areas and parks will never restore the damage done to natural habitats
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	The policies for protecting the historic environment must be robust enough to prevent them being overridden or bypassed by vested interests.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	No. Certainly not applicable in rural areas
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree and the approach shouldn't be different for rural areas. The focus should be on keeping rural villages small so that walking/cycling is encouraged.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 18	consider further urban extensions
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 19	to the south of the town
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Investigate further the viability of a southern link road
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Free long stay car parking which would allow all errands to be completed in one journey.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 22	focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Bicester
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 23	to the south of the town. Use of redundant MOD land with existing infrastructure would enable sustainable growth.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 27	Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for). Since most of the employment associated with Heyford Park is likely to be to the south, additional development should be to the south
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. It is obvious from the list of completions that the existing rural requirements are close to being met. This would suggest that these sites are more lucrative for developers and focus should now be on development on urban centres, particularly brown field sites and where planning permission has already been granted.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 32	
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 33	
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	Question - Development Management Policies	If a proposed development site has been refused planning permission in the past, the Council should be able to refuse to allow that same site to be resubmitted in a Call for Sites, unless there has been a considerable change in planning policy.
LPR-B-878	Stephen Moffatt	LPR-A-155	Object. The Council will be well aware that the site to the "West of Station Road" already has extensive planning history with planning permission being denied at appeal in 2017. The appeal was turned down on Heritage grounds and those grounds remain applicable to this day. Furthermore, since that time a Climate Change Emergency has been declared and it should be noted that this site is subject to considerable flooding despite being in Flood Zone 1. The Council's own Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update states that Cropredy is "At significant risk of surface water flooding" and the cost of clearing up after any flooding would fall to the Council and existing residents. The high cost of mitigating the flood risk by the use of SuDS would make delivery of affordable housing extremely unlikely. Additionally, noise and air quality issues caused by the proximity of the adjacent main railway line would further increase the costs required to build to "Future Homes Standard". The UK government has committed to giving money to smaller countries to protect their green spaces. The green field sites around Cherwell's rural villages are equally as important to provide green spaces for the existing inhabitants of those villages and help to encourage tourism. They should also be protected. Any inclusion of this site, or indeed any site in Cropredy which would contribute to the flood risk or destroy green spaces, would not meet the Council's Climate Change Mitigation criteria and should be refused early on in the assessment process.
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land. A lot of the business parks for example historically may have technically been placed at urban locations but are on the outskirts with poor transport links reliant on cars to get there. This needs to change as it pulls retail business from the centre and they are also often very ecologically awful

LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Supporting	If building new sites, some incentives for public transport, cycle scheme or car sharing, i.e. make sure any company looking to build there has to enact these policies. And also making it more ecologically sound and pleasant, i.e. green spaces and trees
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units? Raise the percentage significantly as well as making sure these homes are nice to live in, i.e. transport links etc.
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes? Ensure the accessibility of the surrounding areas so that they can be enjoyed by those who need this accessible housing. Seen some issues with poorly planned and unaccessible pavement routes in Cherwell that need to be fixed
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Not sure and not a housing expert but there is no point having a home if it is not liveable and so in many cases it will be necessary to retro fit regardless of age.
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Look into the suitability of that generation in the long term. I.e. no point in rushing in to build new wind and solar as there already a lot that is proposed and will go live in the next few years. So consider other environmental uses of the land too
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Green Belt	Quality of life detrimental effect on building on moving the green belt and building on green spaces near public footpaths (and if nearby how then the ecological deadzone will effect the areas around). Would rather have a nice field with a river to walk round than a housing estate or business park
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. And just because a net gain is not achievable the project should still be made to be as biodiverse as possible i.e. not just give up on biodiversity
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. "pocket play areas" if successful will help rejuvenate the town centres and their businesses
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Transport & Connectivity	I think reducing need to travel should not be the first priority as it encourages isolation. I think safe routes for non car travel are a priority in rural areas. Many of the country roads in Cherwell are dangerous for driving, let alone cycling. Possibly a better bus service too but I understand it is hard to wean people off the concept of cars. For me, better bus services to the opposite end of Oxford (from Kidlington). A 20-30min drive takes 1.25hrs by bus. Going around the country, cheaper trains, recently got a car but before used the trains, how people can part with that much money with no railcard I don't know.
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy?
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Delivering Infrastructure	No sure if it belongs here but no point building homes if there already aren't enough NHS dentists!
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 22	Consider further urban extensions. Limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 23	A combination of the above
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Bicester's Open Spaces	Made more friendly, don't live in Bicester but have visited most of the benches were broken
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Ways to walk and get to retail areas that aren't alongside an A road
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Need to understand that in some cases making more homes from one house is a good thing. But ensure certain meter squared and access to green space if there is one. And ensure that family homes still exist
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. There should be no need to get rid of the green belt. Especially as a majority of it round Kidlington is run off to nearby rivers or flood land (very prone to flooding)

LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. There are enough retail locations within Kidlington and plenty of empty ones so no need to use Exeter close/hall which is servicing the community in other ways
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Shuttle buses to business parks. More reliable service and better weekend service
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Option 28	Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way. Where there are not already green spaces there is housing so focus should be done on enhancing what we have (work that is already happening with various community projects that could be supported even further)
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	More community activities/sports teams. Especially for women and girls as when I lived here I could not find a sports team to take part in
LPR-B-879	Rachel Exact	Question - Local Green Spaces	We need to prioritise maintaining the green spaces and houses that we have and focus on building on unused or non biodiverse sites (like golf courses, old airfields etc).
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 17	Retain the current methodology. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 22	limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding village
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 23	A combination of the above
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Reinstate the S5 bus service to Launton
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy
LPR-B-880	Michael Jennion	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance



LPR-B-881	Andrew Stanley	LPR-A-091	Object. Development is not required for the village in that area and would detract from the surrounding countryside. Road and infrastructure is not suitable for further development.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 1	The success of this Cherwell Local Plan Review will be measured in the the delivery of the right quantity of housing for the right people, in appropriate places at the right time. Decisions must be achieved through following an approach which adheres to an evidential base and is not based upon the speculation of developers.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 2	Seeking to organise the Cherwell Local Plan Review into themes and objectives can add clarity to the process and begins to make it more understandable to non professionals. The options and objectives are however closely linked and giving one priority over an other is difficult. The important goal is one of sensitivity in the manner in which decisions are made.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 3	A combination of all the above. All are relevant and will address differing employment needs. The main transport centres should remain core employment areas though rural villages will also benefit from additional workplace space. The latter can help to support live/work within the same locality and by doing so reduce the need to commute longer distances to work.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Town centres have been particularly badly hit by changes in shopping patterns. Locations such as Banbury retain an attractive core and one which could support a range of residential accommodation. If a critical mass of mixed tenure residential accommodation can be achieved this will have the befit of increasing demand for more local food based retail and for cafes and restaurants. Banbury still has much to offer and a process of imaginative regeneration could succeed.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 6	Given the high average cost of housing in the district it will be important to strive for the highest percentage achievable. It will however be important to ensure that the percentage/numbers of units agreed during the planning process is strictly adhered to during development/ construction process and measures taken against developers if the agreed figures are not achieved.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 7	Essential to identify the need and then prioritising that need rather than simply applying an arbitrary formula.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility? Accessibility must be applied across all new development, whatever its nature/use.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Housing Policies	It will be important to consider all new forms of construction. Elements of modular construction can be part of all new development. The quality of factory constructed elements can be more rigorously monitored and they can lead to quicker construction which could/should be more cost effective leading to slightly lower costs.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Separation Distances	Separation distances are a vital element of the masterplanning/urban design process. It is important not to create development where individual buildings affect the 'personal space' of their neighbours, a more sophisticated mix of housing types, eg terraces and linked properties can lead to more appealing outcomes and help create safer, stronger local communities.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Travelling Communities	Travelling communities are part of our heritage and it remains important to provide suitable locations with access to good amenities.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government? CDC should be aspirational, wherever improving on national standards. There is great demand for residential property in the district which should enable the Council to persuade developers to enhance their standards
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	The district is very fortunate in having a large and varied stock of historic buildings. Whilst it is vital to retain the integrity of their elements, new technology will enable refurbishment work to ensure they are much more energy efficient.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation? As the Council has highlighted through identifying an Climate Crisis, it will be important to undertake a broad range of measures in many differing locations. This can and must be achieved whilst respecting the special landscape character of the district.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district. It really is a combination of all of the questions raised. Biodiversity can be achieved in all sorts of ways (eg green roofs) and no new development should ever be allowed create 'dead spots' within either a rural, urban or suburban environment. Where a biodiversity gain is required, existing conservation bodies are probably most suitably placed to ensure any monies arising are used to create maximum benefit
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. It is heartening to learn that much work is already underway in mapping the natural capital of the County. The use of this evidence at a local level to demonstrate the impact of development proposals and possible environmental net gain will generate a greater understanding for all parties and provided the basis for bold initiatives to interrupt the presumption in favour of economic growth and ensure that any new development is ecologically sustainable.

LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	The Cherwell draft Local Plan and the Oxfordshire Vision refer to the quality of the landscape and countryside within the District and County. This resource whilst attractive is delicate and easily damaged or destroyed. Recent inappropriate on the edge of many small rural settlements have shown little respect of the natural environment and much stronger measures are required to ensure that future damage is not incurred.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Local heritage assets do make an important contribution to the nature and character of their environs. The creation and delivery of policies to formally protect such assets is strongly supported.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Development design guides have been shown to help improve the quality of development. However it is important that these reflect the many differing characters which can be found within one district council. Well composed design guides can influence density, general arrangement, materiality and landscape. Good site planning lies at the core of new development and those undertaking such need to have the appropriate 'tools' or access to specialists to achieve such.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Low quality roads results in access to and movement around the many rural villages of the district to be difficult. To a degree this has the effect of restraining vehicle speeds and volumes and wholesale road improvements would be detrimental. Large scale, speculative development in such locations would add undue pressure to this highway network and should not be considered. Additional local bus services connecting the remoter villages would be beneficial. The provision of community based vehicle charging points should also be considered. For example, many of the Parishes within the District have village halls and car parks where such infrastructure could be located
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 16	Whilst it will be vital for any new development to have digital infrastructure provision which meets current needs, eg working from home, it will also be important that such is future proofed to ensure that changes in technology can easily be accommodated. Equally it will be important to ensure that all residents are able to take advantage of similar levels of digital infrastructure.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Continue to prepare the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) by place. The reference to grouping infrastructure by its catchment area could offer an interesting perspective on on connectivity though the lack of scale identified for such catchment areas, as potentially applied to rural areas is a significant omission.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes - It's an important building within the town and visual corridors to it should be protected.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. With Net Zero by 2050 a major goal for both the Oxfordshire and Cherwell Plans the environmental arguments are powerful. Low carbon living will be paramount it does not make any sense to direct the construction of new houses to greenfield sites in and around villages with poor transport, limited drainage/primary infrastructure and little employment.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 31	Developing a collaborative approach with local communities is likely to achieve the most positive outcomes by enabling all parties to express their wishes and concerns within a positive dialogue.
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 32	More weight to available facilities. Local perspective The Sibford Gower Parish Profile offers a concise and informative picture of the village, identifying a range of characteristics which are particularly relevant to any future development considerations. A recent planning appeal draws attention to the historically challenging nature of local highway provision. 'Given the spread of services across each settlement it is unlikely that the development of any site around the Sibfords would readily enable access by sustainable transport modes'
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 33	Use a combination of the above

LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Option 34	<p>Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance. While the two options identified are not mutually exclusive, the current approach would appear to generate a broader perspective which is beneficial to the wider community. The suggestion of devising a non-statutory designation protection for 'valued landscapes' offers a level of protection similar to non-designated assets within conservation and is to be supported. The draft plans of the County and District Councils both make reference to the overall quality of Oxfordshire's landscape and to specific landscape and countryside features. Some of these areas are afforded protection through measures such as AONBs, others have almost identical characteristics but do not have this recognition and the protection it brings. The countryside immediately north of the village centre forms part of the Ironstone Downlands, a term promoted by the two Councils. The topography is in the form a long ridge. It is similar in height to other nearby hills which include: Long Hill, Yarn Hill, Epwell Hill, Gallow Hill and Brailes Hill. These combine to form part of the distinctive landscape referred to as the Ironstone Downs. Whilst the Ironstone Downlands have natural features of a similar character to those of the adjacent Cotswolds AONB, the area does not have the same status. The ridge to the north of the village of Sibford Gower makes a major contribution to character of the whole of the north Cotswolds. The ridge in question provides extensive views west which are terminated by the ridge on which Broadway Tower is located. In reverse, when viewed from Broadway Tower the ridge to the north of Sibford Gower provides an equally imposing topographical feature and provides a strong green skyline. These two north south running ridge lines are important pieces of the wider landscape, working together to subtly contain and frame the northern area of the Cotswolds AONB. There is a strong case that the Cotswolds AONB be extended eastwards to include the high ground immediately to the north of the village of Sibford Gower. The two inappropriate development sites proposed on land to the north of Sibford Gower are located on this important piece of landscape. Protecting this landscape through an extension of the Cotswolds AONB or by defining it as Special Landscape Area would prevent this.</p>
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	<p>Neighbourhood Planning is a time consuming process but if adopted is a way of helping to ensure that the needs and aspirations of a specific community are achieved. As such it should be encouraged.</p>
LPR-B-882	Andrew Tindsley	LPR-A-107	<p>Object. The proposals are inappropriate. The two sites are not contiguous with the heart of the village and its conservation area. Currently agriculture land. The fields are enclosed with mature tree lined hedgerows. The land, which forms an elevated ridge forms one of the hills in the area referred to as the Ironstone Downlands. It is part of a wider composition of hills. Whilst lying outside the Cotswolds AONB the ridge along which the suggested development sites are located works in parallel with the distant ridge to the west. These two areas of high ground help to cradle the gently undulating landscape of the AONB and its environs with only occasional buildings interrupting the scene. Whilst no numbers are given, it is possible using industry recognised norms, to consider broad development strategies and calculate outline numbers of proposed development. 30 residential units/hectare is a possibility and simple arithmetic indicates that this could generate over 350 dwellings with a related population potentially in excess of 700. Recent (2019) figures from the ONS indicate that Sibford Gower has a population of 533. Using these calculation would increase the village by 131% and significantly out of scale with the current settlement and contravene DCC's current planning strategy 'limiting growth in rural areas and directing it towards larger and more sustainable villages'. Development is totally inconsistent with the planning/development strategies currently being promoted by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council. The development cannot be considered 'sustainable' and will increase the need to travel. The proposed sites are likely to generate some of the least sustainable traffic movements of any rural development in the area. If development is planned around providing for private car use then less sustainable travel choices are locked in from the outset. Given the contribution of transport to carbon emissions, this would make it very difficult for new development to achieve carbon reduction and wider objectives in particular on health and wellbeing. Any development would fail the strategic criteria to be applied and the proposed sites must be removed as designated sites for future development. No sustainability assessment has been undertaken and any such analysis would show the proposed sites to be unsuitable. Whilst Pound Lane connects to the B4035 Shipston- Banbury road this is only a low speed, low volume route and already has issues of capacity. Pound Lane is rural in nature, restricted in width and with only 60m of footpath in the location of its single bus halt. The nature of the road however helps to reduce its impact as a transport corridor and allows it to contribute to the overall character of the village. The poor nature of the road is recognised by the highway authority. The only public transport is provided by an occasional and recently reduced bus service. The nearest railway station is Banbury, 8 miles away. Walking and cycling is challenging due to topography. Pound Lane forms part of the Oxfordshire Cycleway. This is a route of regional significance and selected because of its rural character and low traffic volumes. An increase in vehicular movement would be detrimental. A highlevel section of the d'Arcy Dalton Way is located close to the eastern boundary of the proposed sites. This section of the nationally recognised longdistance footpath was established to mark the Oxfordshire Fieldpaths Society Diamond Jubilee and takes a meandering route across the Ironstone Downlands from Epwell to Hook Norton before heading to the eastern Cotswolds. There is limited access to primary infrastructure. Potable water is provided from the reservoir at Epwell. This is located at the highest point in the district and requires all water for the village to be pumped to this location before supplying the residences. Water pressure and quantity is already an issue with comments from local water supply engineers that the currently reservoir should already have significantly greater capacity than currently exists. The main length of Pound Lane has no main foul sewer making access to drainage difficult. The village is served by a small sewage treatment plant (STP) located in a steep valley to the south of the main settlement. The STP has limited capacity and is unlikely to be able to accommodate significant increase in foul sewage. Its location makes any increase in size very difficult. Any poor quality outfall from the STP would have a negative impact on this important network. Any development containing roads/footpaths/drives and roofs means that water quickly flows off these surfaces and is not absorbed into the ground. Any surface water directed off the site will head south and eventually run into the network of brooks which eventually form the River Stour. The river creates flooding issues within downstream settlements such as Shipston on Stour and any substantial built development in the upstream catchment areas will only exacerbate an already difficult situation. There is an absence of street lighting retaining the 'dark skies'. Any new development would destroy the 'dark skies' nature of the village. The height of</p>

LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 2	It is important that implementation of KO1 takes into account KO9, KO15, and especially KO23. KO18 is misleading introduced: it sounds as if it will be about protecting the historic built environment when in fact it is about altering it. It's thus potentially dangerous. KO19 is important to mitigate the danger
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land. It's important to develop as little new land as possible and always to use brownfield sites over greenfield sites. I don't support allocating new land in urban centres, but using land that is already built on and un-used - and there's a lot of that, certainly in Banbury. It's important that as many people as possible should be able to reach the sites with as little travel as possible. And it's important too that larger villages shouldn't be subject to sprawl on the edges and shouldn't lose their village character, which happens instantly when a retail park or warehousing facility is introduced
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes). E use classes are preferable to B2 and (especially) B8
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Question - Supporting	Try to avoid sites of endless uniform nondescript prefabs distinguishable only by signage set round endless roundabouts. Try to make any sites in urban centres ones that people can walk or cycle to and round. Try to give them a human scale.
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. It's an excellent idea to use accommodation over shops and possibly some buildings that are currently standing empty for housing, but if there is no protection for retail & restaurant space, the centre will stop being a centre and only those who live there will go there, as if it were a housing estate.
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Market)	Ban any new out of town shopping centres and provide incentives for appropriate companies (e.g. M&S, Next, FatFace in Banbury) to return to the town centres. Support businesses by reducing town centre business rates. Develop a pop-up support scheme. Reduce the stall-holder fees for Banbury market (and others too, if applicable), so that it goes back to being the thriving market it once was
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Question - Retrofitting of Historic Buildings	It's important to build new houses to more energy-efficient standards, and to encourage people to do the kind of retrofitting of historic houses that can reasonably be done (such as adding roof insulation and doubleglazing), the idea that all solid walls should be internally or externally insulated is a horrifying one: it would entirely change the character of the houses inside and/or out, at phenomenal expense, and for relatively little gain.
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 12	You should not develop the site
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	By reflecting the difference of places and not over-designing according to a set of predetermined principles
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	In principle, yes. They can work in town centres and larger villages; they probably shouldn't be expected to work in very rural areas. They don't always work in suburban areas, and ideally that would be remedied.
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Support the approach but should be different for rural areas. I particularly support what is said about the importance of rail connections and the recognition that rural areas are different. The alternative would be to alter the character of those areas entirely. More frequent trains to Oxford; also much better bus service between Banbury and Chipping Norton, with buses in the evenings and on Sundays:
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 19	Do not develop greenfield sites: there's no excuse. There are huge areas of Banbury that are semi-derelict ex-industrial. Under no circumstances go to the south or west, where the transition from town to landscape setting is currently cleanest. The north and east have already been damaged, so if you must, build there. But the key principle is that no building on greenfield sites should be allowed under any circumstances.
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes. It is a key aspect of the town's heritage and gives a sense of focus from wherever it is seen. Horsefair, South and North Bar, Crouch Street all contain multiple significant buildings. So too does the town centre.
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 20	Planning permission should be needed to convert from shops and restaurants to housing, but applications should be considered on their merits. Castle Quay is a disaster: it's so unattractive that I don't use its shops, even the ones I would use frequently if they were on the High Street or surrounding streets. My blue sky solution would be to move its shops back to the High Street and turn it into a world-class ice rink! Failing that, demolish it so that it's possible to get at Lock 29 without having to go through it.
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-883	Dr Jane Griffiths	Banbury	Please consider building a bridge over the ring road to re-connect Banbury town centre with the station, and make the approach to the station more pedestrian-friendly. And ideally rebuild the station to make it less depressing to approach by any means
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Option 19	to the south of the town and to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)

1899  
 2097

LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	LPR-A-152	Object. Hanwell is a conservation area that CDC have committed to protect by preserving the fields around it, its setting and its rural nature. These sites are in complete breach of that, joining Hanwell to Banbury. For both of these options CDC are proposing to destroy important greenfields, nature and wildlife. Globally we are in an ecological and environmental crisis. CDC have a duty to protect our local natural habitat and biodiversity, supporting the overall Global impact. CDC must protect the welfare of our current and future generations
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	LPR-A-214	Object. Hanwell is a conservation area that CDC have committed to protect by preserving the fields around it, its setting and its rural nature. These sites are in complete breach of that, joining Hanwell to Banbury. For both of these options CDC are proposing to destroy important greenfields, nature and wildlife. Globally we are in an ecological and environmental crisis. CDC have a duty to protect our local natural habitat and biodiversity, supporting the overall Global impact. CDC must protect the welfare of our current and future generations
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	LPR-A-205	Object. These sites are north of the agreed defensible boundary of Dukes Meadow Drive in breach of CDC's commitments. For both of these options CDC are proposing to destroy important greenfields, nature and wildlife. We are in an ecological and environmental crisis. CDC have a duty to protect our local natural habitat and biodiversity, supporting the overall Global impact. CDC must protect the welfare of our current and future generations.
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	LPR-A-154	Object. These sites are north of the agreed defensible boundary of Dukes Meadow Drive in breach of CDC's commitments. For both of these options CDC are proposing to destroy important greenfields, nature and wildlife. We are in an ecological and environmental crisis. CDC have a duty to protect our local natural habitat and biodiversity, supporting the overall Global impact. CDC must protect the welfare of our current and future generations.
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	LPR-A-047	Object. These sites are north of the agreed defensible boundary of Dukes Meadow Drive in breach of CDC's commitments. For both of these options CDC are proposing to destroy important greenfields, nature and wildlife. We are in an ecological and environmental crisis. CDC have a duty to protect our local natural habitat and biodiversity, supporting the overall Global impact. CDC must protect the welfare of our current and future generations.
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Question - Important Views of Banbury	This should be amended to include other landmarks of historical value in the local area not only within the town. The 12th century church of St Peters in Hanwell, needs to be included.
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Must consider town centre developments to bring life, energy and money to the town centre - this could encourage growth
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	More homes needed in the town centre within walking distance of shops, trains etc
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Development should be limited so as not to destroy nature, wildlife, fields, and must protect the conservation of the area. Green buffers should be created and enforced to protect villages from coalescence
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy, Regular Bus services, Post office
LPR-B-884	Nicola Bromby	Question - Settlement	Yes - We need a strong and clear, well defined policy for green buffers to prevent coalescence and the destruction of rural villages and our communities and heritage
LPR-B-885	Faith Hammond	Option 1	It's obstructive
LPR-B-885	Faith Hammond	Option 2	Ruins the village environment
LPR-B-886	Dave Quinney	LPR-A-091	Object. This is meant to be the countryside and it's becoming less and less so. If this goes ahead Bodicote will have a full 360 of housing estates around it. We don't have any fields to walk other than these so why take that away too? The fields peaceful and picturesque area with fields and the sound of the stream down the bottom of the hill. Since lockdown I know lots of people who have suffered from mental health issues, we need the countryside to help these people. We don't need greedy people lining there pockets.
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 26	Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Bus links to Islip and Otmoor villages
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington

LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. There are 9 core objections to prevent mass housing around Islip. Roads through and around Islip are single flow with current plans to install traffic lights on the river bridge next year. The A34 is overcrowded and plans to scrap the A34 link to Cambridge means that the existing infrastructure could not cope with more traffic without endangering life. Flooding that regularly occurs up to the edge of the village to the East, South, South West and West of the village will have a major impact on any property development. Transport and Rail Infrastructure is inadequate for additional housing. Water, Electricity and Sewerage systems are so poor for existing inhabitants that supplies are often intermittent. Sewers flood the village roads. Water is delivered through Victorian pipes and regularly leak with limited supplies from a water tank above Noke which is stretched. School not big enough. Infrastructure limited. Medical services stretched. It would <b>spoil the countryside. Not an eco option. Use brownfield sites first.</b>
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy, Regular Bus services. More weight to accessibility - public transport
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Question - Settlement	No. Existing boundaries are sufficient. Money spent on this is a waste
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-887	John Guest	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Take on local residents views and resist the imposition of organisations such as Church Commissionets
LPR-B-888	Ashley Taylor	LPR-A-004	Object. Previous Cherwell Plans have discounted sites for housing due to the small size of the village. Any sizeable development would significantly change the scope and feel of the village. Residents have chosen to live in a small village for the village life. Any sizeable increase in village life would substantially change this. Shutford is a quiet rural village with the last major development of 40 homes being over 30years ago. Only small infill development has been permitted since then. One key aspect of the village is its quietness that will be negatively impacted by and substantial increase in village size. Transport links to the village are poor. The road network is small and is generally served by unclassified roads which are not capable of handling increased traffic. There is no school, doctors or shop in the village so residents have to drive for these services, again increasing traffic volumes. Site LPR-A-004 is partially on steeply sloping ground. With climate change that we are seeing leading to increased rainfall and increased severity of rainfall, this has the risk of increasing the risk of landslip type issues and the rainfall run off would have reduced area to go in the surrounding areas, potentially affecting and impacting existing houses below on Ivy Lane. The site has been turned down for various good reasons based on site suitability and planning frameworks in place which considered the sites unsuitable for development. The views and vistas of the village would be substantially altered with large scale developments. The views and vistas of the village would be substantially altered with large scale developments. Whilst I appreciate that views are not a legal right, once again they make up part of what makes the village, gives it its character and make it a desirable place to live. Residents choose to live in the village because of its views. Further development should be avoided to avoid disturbing the natural habitat of many wild animals in the area. In terms of services, there is no mains gas in the village, the road network is poor as mentioned, there are no current plans to bring FTTP fibre broadband to the village and the small sewage works is already unable to cope with existing current demand as has been proven by the number of times and amount of direct raw sewage discharge into the Sor Brook over the past year.
LPR-B-888	Ashley Taylor	LPR-A-171	Object. Previous Cherwell Plans have discounted sites for housing due to the small size of the village. Any sizeable development would significantly change the scope and feel of the village. Residents have chosen to live in a small village for the village life. Any sizeable increase in village life would substantially change this. Shutford is a quiet rural village with the last major development of 40 homes being over 30years ago. Only small infill development has been permitted since then. One key aspect of the village is its quietness that will be negatively impacted by and substantial increase in village size. Transport links to the village are poor. The road network is small and is generally served by unclassified roads which are not capable of handling increased traffic. There is no school, doctors or shop in the village so residents have to drive for these services, again increasing traffic volumes. The site has been turned down for various good reasons based on site suitability and planning frameworks in place which considered the sites unsuitable for development. The views and vistas of the village would be substantially altered with large scale developments. Whilst I appreciate that views are not a legal right, once again they make up part of what makes the village, gives it its character and make it a desirable place to live. Residents choose to live in the village because of its views. Further development should be avoided to avoid disturbing the natural habitat of many wild animals in the area. In terms of services, there is no mains gas in the village, the road network is poor as mentioned, there are no current plans to bring FTTP fibre broadband to the village and the small sewage works is already unable to cope with existing current demand as has been proven by the number of times and amount of direct raw sewage discharge into the Sor Brook over the past year.
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Supporting	Local employment Ability to use public transport, cycle routes. walking
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 6	30% everywhere
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015. Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?

LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Settlement	Make new developments less crowded. Give the appropriate number parking spaces in useful places so cars are not littering the roads
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	We need to ensure historic buildings are preserved rather than left to go to ruin
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Green Belt	Use brownfield sites. Consider environmental impact of using greenfield sites. Consider extra pollution due to transport for residents. Irreversible damage to local wildlife/habitats
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. They should be suitable for a wide range of children. Pocket parks seem to focus on younger years; what about children aged 7 plus and also teenagers?
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree with the approach and it should be different for rural areas. We need safer cycle routes to link villages to each other and to towns Public transport is insufficient for the majority commuters. More people can now WFH but others will have to commute due to the nature of their employment plus social activities. Public transport cannot meet this need- too costly and time-consuming and not to/from the right locations in rural areas. Electric cars or hybrid cars? Bus service would require less driving.
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 19	To the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11). A combination of the above
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes - All the churches Bodicote windmill Town Hall
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. It should be a vibrant place to socialise with a waterfront setting- look at Birmingham's use of the waterfront for instance
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Of course! The bigger the population, the more of these we need
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Better public transport Not sure how to overcome the supermarket shop though
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 32	No more weight due to accessibility to urban centres. New transport infrastructure should be built for new developments so they don't have to be existing developments. Inc public transport, roads, cycle tracks, pathways etc
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Settlement	Yes to ensure villages retain their identity
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Support the neighbourhood planning with your own experience and that gained from other communities
LPR-B-889	Julia Jackman	LPR-A-056	Object. This site is too big. The number of properties would dwarf the village plus the impact on medical services, schooling, transport/road users

LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Rural housing development needs to be supported by creating rural employment opportunities along with the infrastructure and facilities that support this. by simply adding more housing in rural areas villages become dormitories as everyone leaves for work each day (or week), invariably in a private car, which further adds to road congestion, degrades air quality and contributes to Cherwell's carbon footprint.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. Plans are based on the needs of the community as well as the wider need for housing capacity. Planning cannot be left to speculative applications from land owners and developers, but instead needs to be discussed, planned and agreed with the parish.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Option 32	Agree with approach - GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. Should give more weight to accessibility of a settlement. Employment opportunities - how many businesses are based (registered?) in the village and immediate area? for example there have been some small business parks established in some areas such as the Sugerswell Business Park near Shennington. Consideration needs to be given to the capacity of the local services and facilities to expand/cope with the additional housing. For example does the local shop already have the capacity to adequately service the existing community and could it cope with additional footfall? does it have the space, should the proprietor wish, to grow and develop as the village grows and develops? Similarly GP surgeries, could they cope with the additional number of patients? Is located on a hill and connected to the village by roads without pavements. Compared to surgeries in urban areas which enjoy good pedestrian and cycle access and are easily reached by bus, some rural surgeries would struggle to cope with more patients who's only choice is to drive there in a car.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Question - Settlement Boundaries	Yes we should consider settlement boundaries because we need to stem the loss of our quality agricultural land which is all to easily sold off to developers. the drive to reduce the carbon footprint of the farm to fork journey will be all the more difficult if we aren't able to produce our food locally.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. We must protect our natural environment. We continue to lose agricultural land where wildlife flourishes and we replace it with housing developments, drainage ponds and allotments which go untended. We push deer, badgers, hares and the like in to ever closer contact with humans as we build on 'their' land and even the resultant light pollution impacts owls and bats and others. Developers need to be directed to use the brownfield sites ahead of choosing greenfield sites, which they see as easier, faster and more profitable to develop.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Parish Profile - Sibford Ferris	Sibford Ferris - The Parish Profile is generally accurate and the comments from the parish council paint a more complete picture. Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower should not be considered as one category A village. They are separate parishes entirely and even together do not come close to true category A villages such as Bloxham, Adderbury, or Deddington. Sibford Ferris is an old village and does not easily lend itself to expansion. The roads are narrow and without pavements, meaning cars cannot easily pass each other, let alone buses or the many light goods vehicles making deliveries. The lack of pavements and pedestrian refuges seriously hamper pedestrian safety, especially children trying to walk to the primary school. There is no space to widen the roads or add pavements. There is a private school in the village catering for primary to secondary pupils. In the past, a large percentage of the pupils were termly or weekly boarders, however in relatively recent years this profile has changed, with many more day pupils now, which has significantly increased daily school run traffic during morning drop off and afternoon pick up. I don't believe Sibford Ferris could sustain any further development, given the permission granted to develop 25 houses on the Hook Norton Road. This development will seriously strain the existing facilities and infrastructure, and as highlighted elsewhere in this survey the new occupants of these dwellings are likely to be travelling outside of Sibford Ferris to get to work thus increasing the traffic loading on the local roads and further impacting air quality. It should be noted that when it comes to planning Oxfordshire County Council put a strong emphasis on sustainability and the environment; putting more houses in remote rural areas where people have no choice but to use their car to just to get to their GP surgery or local shop do not support these key objectives. The transition to EVs, will indeed help reduce CO2 but it will not reduce congestion on country roads and consideration should be given to the fact the EV take up in rural areas will be lower and slower than that of urban areas due to range anxiety and the higher percentage of working and towing vehicles.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Best support neighbourhood planning through guidance, support and consultation with the local Parish Council and residents, providing examples of best practices and by facilitating the exchange of ideas, information and draft plans between Parishes.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	LPR-A-045	Object. The site is located in a rural village away from employment centres and due to the lack of availability of public transport it would necessitate the use of private cars for the residents to get to and from work every day. Contrary to Oxfordshire and Cherwell plans for a low carbon future and would have a negative impact on air quality. The site is on good agricultural land which should not only be preserved for future agricultural use, but also preserved to protect the environment, biodiversity and wildlife. The Cherwell plan aims to protect farming and agriculture and to protect, conserve natural assets such as soil, woodlands and hedges. inclusion of this site would contradict policy. Further significant development in Sibford Ferris would seriously effect the unique historical character of the village. The site can be seen from several directions when approaching the village and so after dark the impact on the nightscape would be significant. Oxfordshire policy to try and protect our dark skies. Due to the age and topology of the village, Sibford Ferris cannot sustain further housing. The roads are inadequate and cannot be widened, they are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as there are very few pavements and no cycle paths. Village facilities are limited to a very small local shop which has little or no room for expansion. The GP surgery, pub, and primary school are located in another Parish and could only be safely accessed from the site by car.



LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	LPR-A-068	Object. The site is located in a rural village away from employment centres and due to the lack of availability of public transport it would necessitate the use of private cars for the residents to get to and from work every day. Contrary to Oxfordshire and Cherwell plans for a low carbon future and would have a negative impact on air quality. The site is on good agricultural land which should not only be preserved for future agricultural use, but also preserved to protect the environment, biodiversity and wildlife. The Cherwell plan aims to protect farming and agriculture and to protect, conserve natural assets such as soil, woodlands and hedges. inclusion of this site would contradict policy. Further significant development in Sibford Ferris would seriously effect the unique historical character of the village. The site can be seen from several directions when approaching the village and so after dark the impact on the nightscape would be significant. Oxfordshire policy to try and protect our dark skies. Due to the age and topology of the village, Sibford Ferris cannot sustain further housing. The roads are inadequate and cannot be widened, they are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as there are very few pavements and no cycle paths. Village facilities are limited to a very small local shop which has little or no room for expansion. The GP surgery, pub, and primary school are located in another Parish and could only be safely accessed from the site by car.
LPR-B-890	Andrew Evans	LPR-A-139	Object. The site is located in a rural village away from employment centres and due to the lack of availability of public transport it would necessitate the use of private cars for the residents to get to and from work every day. Contrary to Oxfordshire and Cherwell plans for a low carbon future and would have a negative impact on air quality. The site is on good agricultural land which should not only be preserved for future agricultural use, but also preserved to protect the environment, biodiversity and wildlife. The Cherwell plan aims to protect farming and agriculture and to protect, conserve natural assets such as soil, woodlands and hedges. inclusion of this site would contradict policy. Further significant development in Sibford Ferris would seriously effect the unique historical character of the village. The site can be seen from several directions when approaching the village and so after dark the impact on the nightscape would be significant. Oxfordshire policy to try and protect our dark skies. Due to the age and topology of the village, Sibford Ferris cannot sustain further housing. The roads are inadequate and cannot be widened, they are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as there are very few pavements and no cycle paths. Village facilities are limited to a very small local shop which has little or no room for expansion. The GP surgery, pub, and primary school are located in another Parish and could only be safely accessed from the site by car. This site is unsuitable for development as it only accessible by single track road. It sits at a level below the sewage main, meaning any property or properties on the site would have to pump their waste water up to the Seven Trent main in the village using electric power to do what gravity would do at more suitable sites. Designing in un-necessary use of electricity most certainly does not fall in line with a low carbon eco friendly planning policy.
LPR-B-891	Thomas Robbins	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-891	Thomas Robbins	Option 12	Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-891	Thomas Robbins	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals.
LPR-B-891	Thomas Robbins	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach. Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.
LPR-B-891	Thomas Robbins	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-891	Thomas Robbins	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-891	Thomas Robbins	LPR-A-091	Object. With the addition of other new estates locally, the village already suffers with increased traffic, the shops and schools can't cope. Moving the village border even further south would severely limit the outdoor space available to lifelong residents, and those who have enjoyed it for so long
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 2	I note the objectives but wonder if they should be priorities rather than objectives, which would give context and direction to planners. I would then query that your first objective/priority is to allocate land as opposed to conserving/enhancing/sustaining the environment. I believe this is wrong and not the peoples will.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land. We need to protect the countryside from further development and support agricultural use of the district and county
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - Supporting	Integrate transport plans to sites of employment. If there isn't a robust link from residence to place of work, it's not viable or will generate more traffic
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015. Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 8	Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - Housing Policies	It should be favourably viewed, but not a requirement. Architectural merit is probably more important

PS 9 21 02

LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Buildings evolve. Whilst protecting the intrinsic nature of our buildings, we need to allow development and use of historic buildings, not their decay in their original state.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	No. This ignores that many of these communities have insufficient organic infrastructure to support such growth, nor are transport links adequate to support the expansion currently envisioned
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree with approach. It should be different from rural areas. A single irregular bus does not constitute adequate public transport link to justify wide expansion of small villages, such as Milcombe. Connecting a bus time to attain time is completely impractical. The transport and development policies are manifestly developed in isolation. I would drive less if village EV charging points; increased frequency of buses.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Modern society is wholly reliant on digital connectivity-it is fast becoming a basic necessity and should be treated as such.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. We seem to be eroding agriculture and rural spaces that provide sustainability benefits for the environment. Better use of brownfield sites that are closer to centres of employment would seem to better meet development and housing needs as opposed to paving over more and more of the countryside, removing biodiversity, carbon sinks and flood absorption.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. In Milcombe, we notice a cunning plan to double the size of the village mostly with affordable housing by developing green fields. No school, no community centre, no doctor, no dentist, just one small shop. Whilst meeting central Government targets you will certainly not "be the first generation to leave the environment in a better state", let alone "target larger and more sustainable villages".
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery. Digital connectivity and proximity to employment are important to develop. Yes - walking/cycling.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - Settlement	Yes, this would protect agriculture and the countryside
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Parish Profile	A bus route with one bus an hour during working hours constitutes a "larger and more sustainable village". This too narrow and ignores the actual basis of village life.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Green belt should be inviolable, not susceptible to government, county, district or local planning. Local planning should have greater weight within the confines of a county and district plan.
LPR-B-892	Philip Crick	Question - Development Management Policies	This consultation mechanism is very difficult to wade through. It is comprehensive and will allow better data analysis by local officials, but I fear it will dissuade the majority from contributing. The general tone of the policy consultation document is good, but it does not reach out to the community at large. It will thus only ever be the plan of officials and the minority
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 1	I fail to see how this is environmentally sustainable or of benefit to the existing local communities.
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	LPR-A-091	Object. This site will have no positivity on the local village or info structure, it will also bring more damage to our ever dwindling countryside.
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 19	To the north of the town and to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes. The area is short of other pleasant landmarks

LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. Consider the current set up of residential space a waste of what could be a pleasant attractive retail area. The backs of retail areas fail to capitalise on what could be an attractive waterside space.
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Big fences, More CCTV and policing
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	A more rundown and less attractive town centre, more expensive parking, Less shops!! More out of town retail developments. A viable affordable public transport system. Cycle lanes.
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 32	Yes - Local Shop, GP Surgery. Yes - both
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Question - Settlement	Yes. To prevent sprawl and screw speculators who have bought land for future housing
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-893	Leigh Smith	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	By supporting them and fighting to enforce them
LPR-B-894	Daniel Warr	LPR-A-091	Object. This site will have no positivity on the local village or into structure, it will also bring more damage to our ever dwindling countryside.
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Housing Policies	Brownfield site regeneration
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals. Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Total awareness of not building on greenfield sites.
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. Children need open green fields to play and the natural environment not just adult designed structures.
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites.
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Conservation areas and areas with historic farming usage. Protect all CPRE areas
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree with approach. Not realistic provision planned. Approach should be different for rural areas. The ability to continue walking my dog around green fields and a quiet village environment, then no need to drive to do so
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 26	No development on green belt
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre

P 894 21 04

LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	A safe more direct cycle route from islip
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 28	Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Tennis courts in islip on recreation ground and no further bonfires on this site or near housing
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Maintain village of islip at the size in last village plan with only small scale development on the former oil dump area. Prevent church commissioners any future building or land developmen
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. There are 9 core objections to prevent mass housing around Islip. 1. Roads through and around Islip are single flow with current plans to install traffic lights on the river bridge next year. The A34 is overcrowded and plans to scrap the A34 link to Cambridge means that the existing infrastructure could not cope with more traffic without endangering life and amenity to residents 2. Flooding that regularly occurs up to the edge of the village to the East, South, South West and West of the village will have a major impact on any property development and current residents 3. Transport and Rail Infrastructure is inadequate for additional housing. 4. Water, Electricity and Sewerage systems are so poor for existing inhabitants. Sewers flood the village roads and rivers. Water is delivered through Poor pipes and regularly leak with limited supplies from a water tank above Noke. Even basic facilities are already stretched. 5. School not big enough to add to 7. Most housing needs are required very near to employment area. Ie not islip 6 Medical services stretched already 8. It would spoil the countryside and an important historic VILLAGE 9. NOT an eco option. Use brown field sites first!
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy, Regular Bus services. More trains as were promised but not delivered. Yes - walking/cycling.
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Green Belt	Yes Keep the green belt
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Islip should be afforded the same level of historic conservation as oxford.
LPR-B-895	Jane Guest	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Current local plan was agreed by local democratic process and should be adhered to... ie small development only. Green belt not encroached
LPR-B-896	Jason Farrington	LPR-A-107	Object. Scale of this development is inappropriate. It would damage Oxfordshire's countryside, increasing growth in a sensitive rural area and it is not a sustainable location for many reasons, including the fact that commuter traffic would be increased. The site is unsuitable because it is at the highest point in the village next to the Ironstone Downland, an area of outstanding natural beauty. The surrounding roads, cycleways and footpaths are totally inadequate to cope with such a development as is the infrastructure including water supply, foul and surface water drainage. The village is a 'dark sky' village which would be negatively impacted by the development's streetlighting. There would obviously be a loss of land with damage to ancient hedgerows, mature trees and the water table. It does not make sense to build on greenfield sites in villages with poor transport and drainage infrastructure and little employment, encouraging people to commute. It makes much more sense to develop brownfield sites in and around towns in a more sustainable way where amenities already exist. We have a rich, historical, rural heritage in The Sibfords and its unique character should be protected and preserved in a way to mitigate climate change for future generations. New housing development of any rural site in The Sibfords would most certainly not leave the natural environment in a better state than we found it.
LPR-B-897	Venetia Jennings	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-897	Venetia Jennings	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-897	Venetia Jennings	Question - Settlement	Yes - defining boundaries should help to avoid sprawl and erosion of the green areas. In the interests of conservation and biodiversity, encroaching on green areas should be restricted as far as possible.
LPR-B-897	Venetia Jennings	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-899	Haldey Dow	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-899	Haldey Dow	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-899	Haldey Dow	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services

LPR-B-899	Haldey Dow	LPR-A-091	Object. This site is unsuitable for development. This is the last undeveloped corner of the village. Development of this site would conflict with the National Planning Policy with reference to transport, access, sustainable development and enjoyment of the countryside. Access to this site would be difficult with the only option being a single carriageway and no option of 2 way traffic and any access would effect existing footpaths/bridleways. As this site is at the far end of the village all traffic would have to go through the village that is already congested. Bodicote has already had significant development over the last few years and there is currently planning permission for a further 78 dwellings. There have been other large developments that even though they do not come under Bodicote parish encroach on the villages boundaries.
LPR-B-900	Emma Roberts	LPR-A-091	Object. Not beneficial to the area. It will impact our countryside which is already disappearing due to recent building of new estates. There will be less areas to walk dogs meaning more estates will be fouled by dog faeces causing health and safety issues for our families
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 1	Some of the planned development towards Hanwell will impact on a number issues, in particular increased traffic to the village that is already too high for the size of the village and the environmental impact to the surrounding fields will be considerable. It's important that Hanwell retains it's historic setting and the plans basically merge Hanwell with Banbury.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 2	Whereas I understand the requirement for maintaining and developing a sustainable economy, just building more houses on vacant fields is just the easy option. Not only does this contradict the objective for supporting a sustainable rural economy or conserving and enhancing the countryside, it forgets about our climate change duties by removing trees and vegetation that help remove CO2 from the atmosphere. Every little helps and in the midst of COP26, this seems quite shortsighted when there are alternative options like developing brownfield sites in Banbury, converting old buildings into housing and looking at developing opportunities in the town centre.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11). LPR-A-154, LPR-A-047, LPR-A-205, LPR-A-214, LPR-A-152 All of these sites I have an issue with. They encroach on Hanwell, essentially merging the village with Banbury, which will cause further traffic through the village, destroying the identity of a village that is over 800 yrs old as well as damaging the surrounding countryside and wildlife. I also find it unfair that North Banbury is suggested for further housing development. Over the last 1015 yrs, we have taken our fair share of additional housing developments going towards the village, with Hanwell fields and Duke Meadow Fields, and yet again we are being asked to take more when its was promised it would never go beyond Duke's Meadow. There are plenty of other locations that have not been subjected to housing developments, so why destroy a historical village when there are other less damaging options.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	LPR-A-154	Site encroaches on Hanwell, essentially merging the village with Banbury, which will cause further traffic through the village, destroying the identity of a village that is over 800 yrs old as well as damaging the surrounding countryside and wildlife. I also find it unfair that North Banbury is suggested for further housing development. Over the last 1015 yrs, we have taken our fair share of additional housing developments going towards the village, with Hanwell fields and Duke Meadow Fields, and yet again we are being asked to take more when its was promised it would never go beyond Duke's Meadow. There are plenty of other locations that have not been subjected to housing developments, so why destroy a historical village when there are other less damaging options.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	LPR-A-047	Site encroaches on Hanwell, essentially merging the village with Banbury, which will cause further traffic through the village, destroying the identity of a village that is over 800 yrs old as well as damaging the surrounding countryside and wildlife. I also find it unfair that North Banbury is suggested for further housing development. Over the last 1015 yrs, we have taken our fair share of additional housing developments going towards the village, with Hanwell fields and Duke Meadow Fields, and yet again we are being asked to take more when its was promised it would never go beyond Duke's Meadow. There are plenty of other locations that have not been subjected to housing developments, so why destroy a historical village when there are other less damaging options.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	LPR-A-205	Site encroaches on Hanwell, essentially merging the village with Banbury, which will cause further traffic through the village, destroying the identity of a village that is over 800 yrs old as well as damaging the surrounding countryside and wildlife. I also find it unfair that North Banbury is suggested for further housing development. Over the last 1015 yrs, we have taken our fair share of additional housing developments going towards the village, with Hanwell fields and Duke Meadow Fields, and yet again we are being asked to take more when its was promised it would never go beyond Duke's Meadow. There are plenty of other locations that have not been subjected to housing developments, so why destroy a historical village when there are other less damaging options.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	LPR-A-214	Site encroaches on Hanwell, essentially merging the village with Banbury, which will cause further traffic through the village, destroying the identity of a village that is over 800 yrs old as well as damaging the surrounding countryside and wildlife. I also find it unfair that North Banbury is suggested for further housing development. Over the last 1015 yrs, we have taken our fair share of additional housing developments going towards the village, with Hanwell fields and Duke Meadow Fields, and yet again we are being asked to take more when its was promised it would never go beyond Duke's Meadow. There are plenty of other locations that have not been subjected to housing developments, so why destroy a historical village when there are other less damaging options.

LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	LPR-A-152	Site encroaches on Hanwell, essentially merging the village with Banbury, which will cause further traffic through the village, destroying the identity of a village that is over 800 yrs old as well as damaging the surrounding countryside and wildlife. I also find it unfair that North Banbury is suggested for further housing development. Over the last 1015 yrs, we have taken our fair share of additional housing developments going towards the village, with Hanwell fields and Duke Meadow Fields, and yet again we are being asked to take more when its was promised it would never go beyond Duke's Meadow. There are plenty of other locations that have not been subjected to housing developments, so why destroy a historical village when there are other less damaging options.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. It's a historic building and that encompasses it's views. The views over Edge Hill and towards Hanwell are extremely special for the local community and tourists who come to the area. Once this is destroyed, there is no going back. Please think about this when you could develop down near the M40 basin as an alternative.
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Secondary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services Other- Pubs. Yes - Walking/Cycling
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Question - Settlement	yes, to protect the historic identity of UK villages
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-901	Henry Cozon	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 1	Laudable overall aims. The devil will always be in the detail
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Question - Separation Distances	yes. Breathing space and some noise privacy important for mental health. Efficient use of available space should not override all other considerations
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Question - Housing Policies	Yes, Off-site, modular house building seems to be working well to provide fast and flexible, future-proofed buildings IF reputable companies are supported.
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Running out of time to provide comments in relation to option 10
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Make reliable advice readily available to owners/improvers of old properties, and use discretion in giving permissions.
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Much more easily available and well-promoted reliable advice. And promote local industries for green energy, eco-building, water conservation, waste management.
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district

LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 15	Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Far too much of historic Banbury has already been lost to mediocre development. NO MORE, PLEASE!
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Question - Transport & Connectivity	yes agree. Approach should be different for rural areas. Rural areas are never going to provide the range of services that residents need in daily life so there will always be a need to travel to the centres of provision, towns and larger villages. measures to drive less- Solutions to charging electric vehicles at on-street village houses.
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Yes - both. Be realistic about hilly terrain when assessing proximity to services!
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Question - Settlement	Yes, to protect the surrounding farmland and valued green spaces. and combat new legislation that development can be adjacent to existing settlement.
LPR-B-902	Sally Leszcynski	Option 33	Use a combination of the above. Facilitate more work opportunities within villages with Better broadband. and helpful business rates.
LPR-B-903	Sally Leszcynski	Option 34	Protect the spaces around the curtilage of our few historic houses and other buildings.
LPR-B-903	Corey Hobbs	Option 1	Ruining More natural beauty, wildlife, greenery for especially in such a beautiful village known for its walking routes, scenery etc. just outside of the town centre. We have so many new build estates around the area some even close at longford park and the new estate near salt way so we do not feel necessary only more damaging
LPR-B-903	Corey Hobbs	Option 2	Ruining More natural beauty, wildlife, greenery for especially in such a beautiful village known for its walking routes, scenery etc. just outside of the town centre. We have so many new build estates around the area some even close at longford park and the new estate near salt way so we do not feel necessary only more damaging
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Future medium- large scale development should be sited close to existing amenities and services, rather than creating isolated developments in rural areas
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Option 32	yes. Primary School Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services Other-utility services eg mains gas, decent water pressure, adequate road infrastructure. Yes-both. Future medium - large scale development should be sited close to existing amenities and services, rather than creating isolated developments in rural areas
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Question - Settlement	Yes, providing these boundaries are reasonably set and not too generously set. This should focus attention in infill development and sustainable locations where there is already infrastructure.
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Option 31	Significantly smaller satellite villages that form part of a wider Parish (such as Hempron & Clifton which sit in the Parish of Deddington) should not be covered by the same policies as those that cover the larger village within the Parish, as they do not have the same amenities, transport links etc. A Parish approach is not appropriate, instead a settlement by settlement basis should be adopted.

LPR-B-904	Henry White	LPR-A-065	not suitable for development. The key reasons being: - The village is not big enough to support such development and has no services or amenities (ie no shop, pub, school public transport etc.) - There is no public transport linking the village to either Deddington or larger towns of Banbury, Chipping Norton or Oxford.- The road infrastructure is not suitable for current traffic levels, let alone increased traffic flow from further development. Having a new development access onto B4031 on the western side of the village would be highly dangerous and cause further traffic issues, especially when combined with the current pinch point on the road meaning all traffic has to go down to single file. There are already frequent accidents and near misses at this spot.- The village has no mains gas; poor water pressure; electricity supply provisions are not sufficient / reliable and understand there to be need for further sewage plant provision too.- The local primary school at Deddington is already oversubscribed - The local GP surgery at Deddington is already over stretched and struggling to meet needs of the community - The local hospital provision is not sufficient to support further developments - The Horton at Banbury is lacking funding and does not provide several of the necessary wards.
LPR-B-904	Henry White	LPR-A-148	not suitable for development. The key reasons being: - The village is not big enough to support such development and has no services or amenities (ie no shop, pub, school public transport etc.) - There is no public transport linking the village to either Deddington or larger towns of Banbury, Chipping Norton or Oxford.- The road infrastructure is not suitable for current traffic levels, let alone increased traffic flow from further development. Having a new development access onto B4031 on the western side of the village would be highly dangerous and cause further traffic issues, especially when combined with the current pinch point on the road meaning all traffic has to go down to single file. There are already frequent accidents and near misses at this spot.- The village has no mains gas; poor water pressure; electricity supply provisions are not sufficient / reliable and understand there to be need for further sewage plant provision too.- The local primary school at Deddington is already oversubscribed - The local GP surgery at Deddington is already over stretched and struggling to meet needs of the community - The local hospital provision is not sufficient to support further developments - The Horton at Banbury is lacking funding and does not provide several of the necessary wards.
LPR-B-904	Henry White	Hempton	not suitable for development. The key reasons being: - The village is not big enough to support such development and has no services or amenities (ie no shop, pub, school public transport etc.) - There is no public transport linking the village to either Deddington or larger towns of Banbury, Chipping Norton or Oxford.- The road infrastructure is not suitable for current traffic levels, let alone increased traffic flow from further development. Having a new development access onto B4031 on the western side of the village would be highly dangerous and cause further traffic issues, especially when combined with the current pinch point on the road meaning all traffic has to go down to single file. There are already frequent accidents and near misses at this spot.- The village has no mains gas; poor water pressure; electricity supply provisions are not sufficient / reliable and understand there to be need for further sewage plant provision too.- The local primary school at Deddington is already oversubscribed - The local GP surgery at Deddington is already over stretched and struggling to meet needs of the community - The local hospital provision is not sufficient to support further developments - The Horton at Banbury is lacking funding and does not provide several of the necessary wards.
LPR-B-905	Joanne	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-905	Joanne Woodbridge	Adderbury	register significant concerns over the sites put forward by landowners and developers for potential housing developments within the parish of Adderbury. Rural Areas including Adderbury have provided on a disproportionate basis the bulk of new housing in Cherwell DC; with rural areas including Adderbury have provided 2,641 homes out of a planned amount of 3,031 homes equal to 87.1%. We would respectively ask that the locations for planned housing growth in Bicester, Upper Heyford and Banbury deliver the growth that has been identified and planned for BEFORE more housing is allowed in the Rural Areas such as Adderbury. Adderbury village has been substantially developed since the 2011 census; amounting to an increase of 21%. The large scale, generic style and rapidity of the expansion of the village in the past six years, particularly, has been overwhelming and upsetting to many residents, and the urbanisation imposed on the village has already begun to compromise its rural tranquillity. Additional substantial development would detract even more significantly from the village's character and place an even greater burden on both already struggling infrastructure and local amenities. Residents of St Mary's Road have had to accept developments immediately to the west and north, which, in a few short years have changed the setting and feel of their homes significantly; if the two fields to the west of Berry Hill Road are developed, St Mary's Road will have been utterly hemmed in by development. Several of the sites put forward for consideration contravene the policies set out in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan, by building outside of the accepted boundary of the village, and narrowing the amenity gap between Adderbury and both Bodicote and Bloxham/Milton. The preservation of these boundaries and gaps ought to be prioritised in consideration of future planning applications. several of the proposed sites, if developed in their entirety, would be vastly disproportionately large to the precedent set by previous developments in Adderbury (a maximum of 65 houses on one site), and vastly exceeding the limit of what is acceptable in a village setting. For example, three of the sites have capacity for over 400 homes, and one (the land east of Twyford) could fit 1800 houses, more than doubling the number of dwellings in the village by itself. Adderbury's infrastructure, in terms of both roads and many local services, is already at capacity. Congestion and parking in the village is a significant issue; the development will worsen the situation. An extra 100 homes would mean the school will be over capacity. Air pollution will increase; particularly affecting nearby residents and school children. Development will have a hugely destructive impact on regional ecology and wildlife habitats. Concerned about effects of water run off on existing floodplain. Although none of the sites proposed in Adderbury are within the existing floodplain, it stands to reason that if housebuilding takes place in areas adjacent to it, as several of the proposed sites are, the floodplain may not be able to cope. A number of the sites proposed contain what are presently rural public footpaths. These routes are all popular with walkers and local families, and surrounding these footpaths with housing estates is going to render them substantially less safe and pleasant to use. educational opportunities will be lost by developing the fields. Lack of light pollution in the existing village will be diminished with further development. If housebuilding within the village over the next decade mirrors or exceeds the rate and scale of development of the past ten years, the village will change beyond recognition in a permanent, completely undesirable and unsustainable way.
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. You shouldn't be building on green belt land and the building work will be disruptive to where we live



LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Option 5	Other - Protect the shops from being converted to housing. There are already too few shops, you should be looking to expand on the number of shops rather than converting what there is currently to housing. There's also a lack of cafes.
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Question - Green Belt	The map showing where you plan to build in Kidlington isn't clear but it looks like you are planning to build on the land by Roundham Lock. This is a popular area for walking and shouldn't be built on. Furthermore the noise will be disruptive as our house is nearby, particularly as we both work from home
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Question - Local green spaces	The land near Roundham Lock should be protected as a green space.
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Option 26	Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-906	Robin Lismore	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way. As stated earlier, you shouldn't build on the land near Roundham Lock
LPR-B-907	Jenny Haimes	LPR-A-077	I was dismayed to see the inclusion of sites around Adderbury that are being considered as suitable for development. In particular, the field off Croft Lane, LPR-A-077 and the field LPR-A-156. These fields form part of a popular and established circular walk around the village. Residents of Adderbury rely on access to open spaces and countryside (very important for mental as well as physical health) and for many of us it is why we choose to live in a rural village. Site LPR-A-077 is particularly unsuitable as any development would have a huge impact on neighbouring residential properties. I would also be very concerned about the access issues around any potential development.
LPR-B-908	Jenny Haimes	LPR-A-156	I was dismayed to see the inclusion of sites around Adderbury that are being considered as suitable for development. In particular, the field off Croft Lane, LPR-A-077 and the field LPR-A-156. These fields form part of a popular circular walk around the village. Residents of Adderbury rely on access to open spaces and countryside (very important for mental as well as physical health) and for many of us it is why we choose to live in a rural village.
LPR-B-908	Nicholas Hart	LPR-A-091	This ruins the southern boundary of Bodicote. The planted tree line has always indicated future proposed housing. I feel powerless to stop it. Fairholme House lane should not be accessible by car from this site and the hedgerow maintained
LPR-B-909	Mrs A Robey	LPR-A-077	Croft lane access: tight access and this road is used a key route for young children (often unaccompanied by an adult) to walk to the primary school. Even rerouting children to the main road during a build period would be problematic to make it a safe route. The path across the field is a key part of the circular walk in Adderbury and will take away the character and heritage of part of this walk. The water meadows flood (to about a foot deep in water) at times and are impassable. With a development even more water will run off into these areas making the circular walk inaccessible for longer periods.
LPR-B-909	Mrs A Robey	LPR-A-178	Any development to the north of the village is in danger of irreversibly damaging the village heritage as it becomes so close to Bodicote and Banbury that it will become impossible to maintain its village heritage
LPR-B-909	Mrs A Robey	LPR-A-081	Any development to the north of the village is in danger of irreversibly damaging the village heritage as it becomes so close to Bodicote and Banbury that it will become impossible to maintain its village heritage
LPR-B-909	Mrs A Robey	Adderbury	All Adderbury development. Whilst I recognise the need for more housing stock to help with the national shortage Adderbury has contributed hundreds of new houses in the last 10 years. This is already causing traffic congestion and parking issues at certain times of the day in the centre of the village and traffic pollution around the primary school. Any development will have a further impact on the heritage of the village. In consideration of further development in Adderbury, it is important to consider what development Adderbury has already had and try to give a fairer distribution amongst surrounding villages.
LPR-B-910	James Deegan	Option 1	Ruining countryside land, already over developed the entire village, spoiling views, property values, village life and attraction to the area
LPR-B-910	James Deegan	Option 2	Infrastructure issues, over development, spoiling the village, land over developed already with cala homes, longford park, david wilson, barrett, and greensquare
LPR-B-910	James Deegan	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-910	James Deegan	LPR-A-091	Village is already spoiled by over development, infrastructure not supported, views ruined, property prices affected, ruining beautiful and popular Countryside walks, one of the main draws to the area, therefore affecting the village again, housing development already taken place to a large degree, spoiling the Blackwood Place properties. No need for this level of housing in this area. New homes still being built on the north of the village, with already more to come.

LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Option 1	I note that in the Parish Profiles section of the report, that two fields in Bodicote have been proposed as potential sites for development. These are the two fields near Town Furlong. I would like to register the village's strong objection to any more of Bodicote fields and green space being used for development to help the district reach its housing targets. I would like to object to this area being considered for development. Bodicote has already had enough green space built on in the last few years. The village cannot sustain any more new residential housing and the associated traffic, refuse pollution, pressure on transport and school places. In addition, the green space that is left around the village is an important part of villagers' life, key to wellbeing and health. Bodicote has already done enough to help the district with its housing targets in recent years, please leave these fields alone and let the people (especially children and elderly) have access to these green spaces without any further development. These two fields are of particular concern, as they are directly alongside walkways / routes that allow people to walk from the village out into green open spaces. They border the route that villagers use to walk to Sor Brook, the windmill, and towards Bloxham Grove- and if this route becomes clogged up with more housing and it's associated infrastructure, it will materially impact many people's ability to get out and about into the open spaces, leaving some villagers feeling trapped and completely changing the rural / village life of Bodicote.
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Option 2	I note that in the Parish Profiles section of the report, that two fields in Bodicote have been proposed as potential sites for development. These are the two fields near Town Furlong. I would like to register the village's strong objection to any more of Bodicote fields and green space being used for development to help the district reach its housing targets. I would like to object to this area being considered for development. Bodicote has already had enough green space built on in the last few years. The village cannot sustain any more new residential housing and the associated traffic, refuse pollution, pressure on transport and school places. In addition, the green space that is left around the village is an important part of villagers' life, key to wellbeing and health. Bodicote has already done enough to help the district with its housing targets in recent years, please leave these fields alone and let the people (especially children and elderly) have access to these green spaces without any further development. These two fields are of particular concern, as they are directly alongside walkways / routes that allow people to walk from the village out into green open spaces. They border the route that villagers use to walk to Sor Brook, the windmill, and towards Bloxham Grove- and if this route becomes clogged up with more housing and it's associated infrastructure, it will materially impact many people's ability to get out and about into the open spaces, leaving some villagers feeling trapped and completely changing the rural / village life of Bodicote.
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Question - Housing Policies	I note that in the Parish Profiles section of the report, that two fields in Bodicote have been proposed as potential sites for development. These are the two fields near Town Furlong. I would like to register the village's strong objection to any more of Bodicote fields and green space being used for development to help the district reach its housing targets. I would like to object to this area being considered for development. Bodicote has already had enough green space built on in the last few years. The village cannot sustain any more new residential housing and the associated traffic, refuse pollution, pressure on transport and school places. In addition, the green space that is left around the village is an important part of villagers' life, key to wellbeing and health. Bodicote has already done enough to help the district with its housing targets in recent years, please leave these fields alone and let the people (especially children and elderly) have access to these green spaces without any further development. These two fields are of particular concern, as they are directly alongside walkways / routes that allow people to walk from the village out into green open spaces. They border the route that villagers use to walk to Sor Brook, the windmill, and towards Bloxham Grove- and if this route becomes clogged up with more housing and it's associated infrastructure, it will materially impact many people's ability to get out and about into the open spaces, leaving some villagers feeling trapped and completely changing the rural / village life of Bodicote.
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Question - Local green spaces	The remaining green spaces and fields around Bodicote village, which now need to be protected following the huge amount of new housing that the village has endured in recent years are requested to be designated a Local Green Space. A form and site location plan have been submitted
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Option 30	Other - Please do not permit any more housing development in Bodicote. Of all the local villages, it seems to have taken the biggest hit in terms of green spaces being used for new housing - please now give it a break!
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	Question - Settlement	Yes - boundaries need to be set around Bodicote to prevent more development.
LPR-B-911	Laura Gellately-Smith	LPR-A-091	I note that in the Parish Profiles section of the report, that two fields in Bodicote have been proposed as potential sites for development. These are the two fields near Town Furlong. I would like to register the village's strong objection to any more of Bodicote fields and green space being used for development to help the district reach its housing targets. I would like to object to this area being considered for development. Bodicote has already had enough green space built on in the last few years. The village cannot sustain any more new residential housing and the associated traffic, refuse pollution, pressure on transport and school places. In addition, the green space that is left around the village is an important part of villagers' life, key to wellbeing and health. Bodicote has already done enough to help the district with its housing targets in recent years, please leave these fields alone and let the people (especially children and elderly) have access to these green spaces without any further development. These two fields are of particular concern, as they are directly alongside walkways / routes that allow people to walk from the village out into green open spaces. They border the route that villagers use to walk to Sor Brook, the windmill, and towards Bloxham Grove- and if this route becomes clogged up with more housing and it's associated infrastructure, it will materially impact many people's ability to get out and about into the open spaces, leaving some villagers feeling trapped and completely changing the rural / village life of Bodicote. I would like to reiterate the strong objection to the application LP-R-A-91 in relation to proposed new sites for consideration for development in Bodicote. It would be unsustainable, bad for the environment and the overall health and well-being of villagers to have to suffer more green space being taken way. Bodicote has done its bit to help the district reach its housing targets, the village seems to have been disproportionately targeted for huge areas of development already. Please now give it a break and allow us to enjoy the green spaces we have left!

LPR-B-912	Susannah Peace	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-912	Susannah Peace	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-912	Susannah Peace	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-912	Susannah Peace	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-912	Susannah Peace	Option 30	Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs
LPR-B-912	Susannah Peace	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-912	Susannah Peace	LPR-A-223	Green belt and flooding area in one of the most beautiful areas of Islip with wild life significance importance i.e. badgers, otters, owls & wildlife that needs protecting not disturbing .
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Secondary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Yes - both
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	Question - Settlement	Settlement boundaries are important to prevent further encroachment in to rural land, and impact on landscape value and local ecology. This is also important for preservation of settlement character and prevention of coalescence
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	LPR-A-091	The map provided gives a distorted impression of development in the village, and the figures quoted to number of dwellings granted planning permission but not yet constructed appears inaccurate. Developments at Tappers Farm (former Bodicote Flyover Farm Shop) for 46 houses does not seem to have been included; the 280 houses West of the cricket club (ref 19/013037/REM & 19/00895/REM) to not appear to be represented, and there is no mention of the proposed further development at Longford Park, adjacent to the Rugby Club (or relocation of Banbury United, or the proposed new school). As far as I am aware, this proposal offers no benefit in reaching Cherwell's housing targets, but further degrades the local village environment and placed additional strain on the local infrastructure. It is also in direct conflict with the goal of CDC as stated "The open nature of the south and west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting".
LPR-B-913	Adam Hewins	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Having spent considerable time & effort reviewing the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan in the past, this type of document seems to have no legal standing and holds no weight with District Council and can be ignored or over-ruled when it suits the Districts' agenda. There is therefore no merit or benefit in devoting time & effort to its creation, but District seems happy to pedal the idea as it makes parishes feel 'empowered'.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 1	With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR-A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 2	With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR-A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR-A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.

LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8).With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it- lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses
LPR-B-914	Kathleen	Option 6	Other - We need to review what is actually affordable - given the house rises and impact of pandemic
LPR-B-914	Kathleen	Option 7	Other - We need to review what is actually affordable - given the house rises and impact of pandemic
LPR-B-914	Kathleen	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Question - Separation Distances	Yes
LPR-B-914	Kathleen	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Question - Travelling Communities	Building or expanding the sites already within the area- may be ask the communities already in the area where they would like to be and what services they need?
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Question - Green Belt	With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 12	Other - Don't just build on land that owners want to sell or develop for high profit. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR-A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it- lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA- 091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 14	Other - lets keep some country side and encourage children and young people to go outside, walk and run and play and not just be confined to play facilities
LPR-B-914	Kathleen	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites

LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it- lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it- lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 32	No more weight should not be given to availability of certain services and facilities. No no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR-A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it- lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Question - Settlement Boundaries	With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals. Growing food should be as valuable as development Land. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR-A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it- lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPR-A-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it- lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.

LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	Parish Profile - Bodicote	Bidcote. With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-914	Kathleen McDermid	LPR-A-091	With regards to the landowners interest in developing their land in Bodicote CP on LPRA-091 and LPR-A-091. My family objects. Following the planting of trees in collaboration with Woodland Trust to build houses or agricultural building and then houses on these fields would be detrimental to the wild life of the area. We have noticed an increase in Birds of prey above this area, as well as other British Birds. Furthermore given the recent large builds on the edges of the village we should preserve this part of the village as is. During, and now after the pandemic this part of the village and the surrounding areas has seen an increase in people walking, running and bike riding. This has meant an increase in a sense of community in the area. Lets not grant building development just for the sake of it - lets look at the bigger picture preserve green spaces and farming land and continue to think about peoples physical and mental health outside of the home in their local community.
LPR-B-915	Cherri Buxton	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. OBJECT to LPRA-091. This is one of the last green fields in Bodicote. Building on this site will bring more pollution harmful to the already fragile environment. To quote from Parish profile The open nature of the south & west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting. Plant TREES or solar panels NOT houses.
LPR-B-915	Cherri Buxton	LPR-A-091	OBJECT to LPR-A-091. This is one of the last green fields in Bodicote. Building on this site will bring more pollution harmful to the already fragile environment. To quote from Parish profile The open nature of the south & west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting. Plant TREES or solar panels NOT houses.
LPR-B-916	Robert Frost	Question - Transport & Connectivity	No. I do not agree with the planning proposals for ADDERBURY, in particular, the one for CROFT FARM REF LPR-A-077 and THE LAND OFF OXFORD ROAD REF LPR-A-081. I strongly think this will have a negative impact on the local habitat and reduce the open spaces for leisure and families/dogs. There will also be more pollution (noise, light, waste) and an irreversible loss of the natural environment that characterises the ADDERBURY village. There will be increased traffic, road safety issues, stress on local amenities and stress on other infrastructure. There will be destruction of the historical value of the parish, and it will be a BREACH of the former boundaries agreement and a BREACH of density agreements and a major disruption to peaceful community living.
LPR-B-916	Robert Frost	LPR-A-077	I do not agree with the planning proposals for ADDERBURY, in particular, the one for CROFT FARM REF LPR-A-077 and THE LAND OFF OXFORD ROAD REF LPR-A-081. I strongly think this will have a negative impact on the local habitat and reduce the open spaces for leisure and families/dogs. There will also be more pollution (noise, light, waste) and an irreversible loss of the natural environment that characterises the ADDERBURY village. There will be increased traffic, road safety issues, stress on local amenities and stress on other infrastructure. There will be destruction of the historical value of the parish, and it will be a BREACH of the former boundaries agreement and a BREACH of density agreements and a major disruption to peaceful community living.
LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments. identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	Option 18	focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Those people wanting to live in a rural area, wish it to remain as such. You call these areas villages and hamlets, but the proposed development areas would slowly strip our beautiful villages of their status and dilute the wonderful communities and rich history and traditions that we have all strived so hard to build. Please, stop adding more housing to our villages - especially those, as you have noted yourself, are large already and some (Adderbury in particular) do not have the infrastructure to support any more housing.
LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	Option 32	Yes.Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Yes - both
LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	Question - Settlement	Adderbury already has a defined area - it is also a conservation area and continued development at every edge will dilute its historic and natural beauty.

LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	Adderbury	Specifically developments Croft Farm LPR-A-077 and Land off Oxford road LPR-A-081. Continually have to fight to retain the local countryside which makes the village so appealing to live in. The fields in question provide vast open spaces for dog walking, getting fresh air on the Adderbury circular (which would be disrupted by these planned developments); valuable during lockdowns and Croft Road has become the popular site in winter for sledging. Development will result in the loss of the natural environment which characterises the village, bring increased traffic to areas of the village (specifically Croft Road) which are currently safe to walk. Adderbury is a wealth of wildlife. These developments are slowly stripping these beautiful creatures of their natural habitat. Adderbury is a peaceful village with a great community and it needs to stay that way to maintain its character and worth. It's rich history too. The sloping of the Croft Road site may also cause more problems for those of us living towards the bottom of that site from a flooding perspective; the tennis courts and surrounding fields already suffer badly from flooding, more development will only make things worse. The path at the beginning of the Adderbury circular at the end of Croft Lane floods terribly now as a result of the new development on the Oxford Road. Adderbury doesn't have the infrastructure to support further development - it doesn't have the infrastructure to support the size it is currently, let alone any future growth. Please - I implore you to reconsider and permanently prevent development on these areas and others around the village. The village is big enough. We love it as it is and want to keep it as it is.
LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	LPR-A-077	Object. Continually have to fight to retain the local countryside which makes the village so appealing to live in. The fields in question provide vast open spaces for dog walking, getting fresh air on the Adderbury circular (which would be disrupted by these planned developments); valuable during lockdowns and Croft Road has become the popular site in winter for sledging. Development will result in the loss of the natural environment which characterises the village, bring increased traffic to areas of the village (specifically Croft Road) which are currently safe to walk. Adderbury is a wealth of wildlife. These developments are slowly stripping these beautiful creatures of their natural habitat. Adderbury is a peaceful village with a great community and it needs to stay that way to maintain its character and worth. It's rich history too. The sloping of the Croft Road site may also cause more problems for those of us living towards the bottom of that site from a flooding perspective; the tennis courts and surrounding fields already suffer badly from flooding, more development will only make things worse. The path at the beginning of the Adderbury circular at the end of Croft Lane floods terribly now as a result of the new development on the Oxford Road. Adderbury doesn't have the infrastructure to support further development - it doesn't have the infrastructure to support the size it is currently, let alone any future growth. Please - I implore you to reconsider and permanently prevent development on these areas and others around the village. The village is big enough. We love it as it is and want to keep it as it is.
LPR-B-917	Maria Wareham	LPR-A-081	Object. Continually have to fight to retain the local countryside which makes the village so appealing to live in. The fields in question provide vast open spaces for dog walking, getting fresh air on the Adderbury circular (which would be disrupted by these planned developments); valuable during lockdowns and Croft Road has become the popular site in winter for sledging. Development will result in the loss of the natural environment which characterises the village, bring increased traffic to areas of the village (specifically Croft Road) which are currently safe to walk. Adderbury is a wealth of wildlife. These developments are slowly stripping these beautiful creatures of their natural habitat. Adderbury is a peaceful village with a great community and it needs to stay that way to maintain its character and worth. It's rich history too. The sloping of the Croft Road site may also cause more problems for those of us living towards the bottom of that site from a flooding perspective; the tennis courts and surrounding fields already suffer badly from flooding, more development will only make things worse. The path at the beginning of the Adderbury circular at the end of Croft Lane floods terribly now as a result of the new development on the Oxford Road. Adderbury doesn't have the infrastructure to support further development - it doesn't have the infrastructure to support the size it is currently, let alone any future growth. Please - I implore you to reconsider and permanently prevent development on these areas and others around the village. The village is big enough. We love it as it is and want to keep it as it is.
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Option 1	The proposed building in and around Adderbury is beyond ridiculous. We have already been subjected to way more new build estates than is proportionate in a village of our size, and further large scale building works would irreparably destroy wildlife habitats, cause pollution, create noise and generally be disastrous for the community at large
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Option 32	Yes. Secondary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Pharmacy Regular Bus services. Yes - both.
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Question - Settlement	Yes, because otherwise there is never going to be an end to it all
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	By involving whole communities. Not everyone is on FB or has access to website and effectively even for those with access to media, things are missed. If you want to ask the views of a community, every household should receive a letter and have a hard copy of a survey to complete - not rely on people wading through all of this confusing and complicated survey

LPR-B-918	Michelle Spilsbury	LPR-A-178	LPR-A-178 60 hectare site to the East of Adderbury proposing 800 houses is unacceptable. This would change the landscape, habitats and pollution irreparably
LPR-B-919	Gemma Davis	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-919	Gemma Davis	LPR-A-152	A proposal to double the size of an already large busy village is absurd. How many of Cherwell's local villages do you plan to develop until they simply become an extension of Banbury's main town? As a resident of Twyford with children attending school in Bodicote I am appauled at the level of existing developments within the 2 villages, let alone the extent of the proposed new ones. Bodicote is effectively now joined to Banbury town and you are now proposing to attached Twyford & Adderbury on to that, by building on the only land that separates to 2 villages. What about the identity of the individual villages? People that live in villages enjoy being part of a small community, with benefits such as less traffic, less pollution, areas of natural beauty, biodiversity, green belts? By building on the proposed site between Twyford and the Rugby club our village completely loses it's identity. The Oxford Road through Adderbury is busy enough, the Twyford Road towards Kings Sutton sees a huge amount of traffic, including the lorry depot, which flies past our house and regularly sees car wing mirrors knocked off. It is unsafe for residents and children already and adding to that by building the 2 proposed new sites, one opposite and one to the side would be very dangerous and completely unmanageable, we cannot cope with any more. It is difficult enough to pull out of the Twyford Road junction onto the Oxford Road each morning. development will result in more traffic being backed up and more accidents. The larger site is huge and would make the village completely unsustainable. There are not enough amenities, school places, community areas and we don't want more, we are a village not a town!!!! Plus it's next to flood land and that road becomes completely unusable at various times every year. Twyford and Adderbury has had it's fair share of building sites over the past few years, we want our own identity, we don't want to be joined to Bodicote and Banbury.
LPR-B-919	Gemma Davis	LPR-A-091	Building next to the school in Bodicote on the farm shop land, the large Cotefield site and the huge site opposite the school leading on to Wykham Lane has already caused enough problems for the village. Bodicote cannot cope with becoming any larger, it is not equipped for that, it is a village and it needs to remain one!! The increase in traffic is already creating safety problems for school children; recent accidents. There is a severe lack of parking and the school was oversubscribed last year, where are the children living in all these new houses going to go? A number of families and residents from Bodicote, Twyford and other local areas visit these fields accessible by public footpaths, to explore the local rural area, the nature, walk their dogs, ride their bikes, breathe fresh air. These sites are ruining the local aesthetics, increasing traffic to dangerous levels and turning small villages into huge built up areas, thus forcing them to lose their identity and community links / spirit. These are all the things which attracted the existing residents to them in the first place and you are destroying them.
LPR-B-919	Gemma Davis	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. LPR-A-152 A proposal to double the size of an already large busy village is absurd. How many of Cherwell's local villages do you plan to develop until they simply become an extension of Banbury's main town? As a resident of Twyford with children attending school in Bodicote I am appauled at the level of existing developments within the 2 villages, let alone the extent of the proposed new ones. Bodicote is effectively now joined to Banbury town and you are now proposing to attached Twyford & Adderbury on to that, by building on the only land that separates to 2 villages. What about the identity of the individual villages? People that live in villages enjoy being part of a small community, with benefits such as less traffic, less pollution, areas of natural beauty, biodiversity, green belts? By building on the proposed site between Twyford and the Rugby club our village completely loses it's identity. The Oxford Road through Adderbury is busy enough, the Twyford Road towards Kings Sutton sees a huge amount of traffic, including the lorry depot, which flies past our house and regularly sees car wing mirrors knocked off. It is unsafe for residents and children already and adding to that by building the 2 proposed new sites, one opposite and one to the side would be very dangerous and completely unmanageable, we cannot cope with any more. It is difficult enough to pull out of the Twyford Road junction onto the Oxford Road each morning. development will result in more traffic being backed up and more accidents. The larger site is huge and would make the village completely unsustainable. There are not enough amenities, school places, community areas and we don't want more, we are a village not a town!!!! Plus it's next to flood land and that road becomes completely unusable at various times every year. Twyford and Adderbury has had it's fair share of building sites over the past few years, we want our own identity, we don't want to be joined to Bodicote and Banbury. LPR-A-091 Building next to the school in Bodicote on the farm shop land, the large Cotefield site and the huge site opposite the school leading on to Wykham Lane has already caused enough problems for the village. Bodicote cannot cope with becoming any larger, it is not equipped for that, it is a village and it needs to remain one!! The increase in traffic is already creating safety problems for school children; recent accidents. There is a severe lack of parking and the school was oversubscribed last year, where are the children living in all these new houses going to go? A number of families and residents from Bodicote, Twyford and other local areas visit these fields accessible by public footpaths, to explore the local rural area, the nature, walk their dogs, ride their bikes, breathe fresh air. These sites are ruining the local aesthetics, increasing traffic to dangerous levels and turning small villages into huge built up areas, thus forcing them to lose their identity and community links / spirit. These are all the things which attracted the existing residents to them in the first place and you are destroying them.
LPR-B-919	Gemma Davis	Option 31	Use a combination of the above



LPR-B-919	Gemma Davis	Parish Profile - Twyford	LPR-A-152 A proposal to double the size of an already large busy village is absurd. How many of Cherwell's local villages do you plan to develop until they simply become an extension of Banbury's main town? As a resident of Twyford with children attending school in Bodicote I am appalled at the level of existing developments within the 2 villages, let alone the extent of the proposed new ones. Bodicote is effectively now joined to Banbury town and you are now proposing to attached Twyford & Adderbury on to that, by building on the only land that separates to 2 villages. What about the identity of the individual villages? People that live in villages enjoy being part of a small community, with benefits such as less traffic, less pollution, areas of natural beauty, biodiversity, green belts? By building on the proposed site between Twyford and the Rugby club our village completely loses its identity. The Oxford Road through Adderbury is busy enough, the Twyford Road towards Kings Sutton sees a huge amount of traffic, including the lorry depot, which flies past our house and regularly sees car wing mirrors knocked off. It is unsafe for residents and children already and adding to that by building the 2 proposed new sites, one opposite and one to the side would be very dangerous and completely unmanageable, we cannot cope with any more. It is difficult enough to pull out of the Twyford Road junction onto the Oxford Road each morning. development will result in more traffic being backed up and more accidents. The larger site is huge and would make the village completely unsustainable. There are not enough amenities, school places, community areas and we don't want more, we are a village not a town!!!! Plus it's next to flood land and that road becomes completely unusable at various times every year. Twyford and Adderbury has had its fair share of building sites over the past few years, we want our own identity, we don't want to be joined to Bodicote and Banbury. LPR-A-091 Building next to the school in Bodicote on the farm shop land, the large Cotefield site and the huge site opposite the school leading on to Wykham Lane has already caused enough problems for the village. Bodicote cannot cope with becoming any larger, it is not equipped for that, it is a village and it needs to remain one!! The increase in traffic is already creating safety problems for school children; recent accidents. There is a severe lack of parking and the school was oversubscribed last year, where are the children living in all these new houses going to go? A number of families and residents from Bodicote, Twyford and other local areas visit these fields accessible by public footpaths, to explore the local rural area, the nature, walk their dogs, ride their bikes, breathe fresh air. These sites are ruining the local aesthetics, increasing traffic to dangerous levels and turning small villages into huge built up areas, thus forcing them to lose their identity and community links / spirit. These are all the things which attracted the existing residents to them in the first place and you are destroying them.
LPR-B-920	BDL	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-920	BDL	Option 19	to the north of the town
LPR-B-920	BDL	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. Historical Importance
LPR-B-920	BDL	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rule
LPR-B-920	BDL	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-920	BDL	LPR-A-091	I object to these plans, as this area is regularly used for dog walking and general enjoyment of nature.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 1	In light of COP26 it is now morally reprehensible to build new houses on green land. It is widely documented that biodiversity in our country is on the brink of collapse. You cannot build a new house in a field and say that it is sustainable - That would be a lie. There are plenty of brown field options available - Use them. Development destroys our villages in so many ways.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 2	In light of COP26 it is now morally reprehensible to build new houses on green land. It is widely documented that biodiversity in our country is on the brink of collapse. You cannot build a new house in a field and say that it is sustainable - That would be a lie. There are plenty of brown field options available - Use them. Development destroys our villages in so many ways.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and at significant transport interchanges. In light of COP26 it is now morally reprehensible to build new houses on green land. It is widely documented that biodiversity in our country is on the brink of collapse. You cannot build a new house in a field and say that it is sustainable - That would be a lie. There are plenty of brown field options available - Use them. Development destroys our villages in so many ways.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 6	Other - You should define exactly what you mean by "affordable housing". There is no room for more houses in Banbury without a significant improvement in our roads. Developers' profit margins are so immense that they should take responsibility for expansion and improvement of our transport infrastructure to absorb the amount of new people settling in this area.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Separation Distances	yes.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Housing Policies	Do not develop any more housing on green field sites - You have a responsibility above everything else to protect our environment from the effects of climate change.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Building a new housing development on green fields is not "sustainable construction", no matter how carefully you word it.

LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Consider retrofitting unused shops and offices first - There is plenty of this stock available to retrofit.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	In light of COP26 it is now morally reprehensible to build new houses on green land. It is widely documented that biodiversity in our country is on the brink of collapse. You cannot build a new house in a field and say that it is sustainable - That would be a lie. There are plenty of brown field options available - Use them. Development destroys our villages in so many ways.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Green Belt	Green Belt land is sacred and should remain untouched- There should be nothing further for you to consider. I hope you are looking to expand the green belt land drastically to protect us as much as possible from disastrous climate change events.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 12	Other - Protecting our biodiversity protects the whole community and beyond. Why are you debating biodiversity when the default should be to protect it? Prioritise EVERY green field as a "Conservation Target Area" - Why are you just focusing on specific areas
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. It's impossible to develop a new housing estate in a green field area near a village whilst providing environmental net gain - You cannot understand this?
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	In light of COP26 it is now morally reprehensible to build new houses on green land. It is widely documented that biodiversity in our country is on the brink of collapse. You cannot build a new house in a field and say that it is sustainable - That would be a lie. There are plenty of brown field options available - Use them. Development destroys our villages in so many ways.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Local Green Spaces	This is an artificial concept. Also, if you now ignore the sanctity of the green belt then why should we take this idea seriously? The evidence is compelling - Just stop building on green field sites!
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Please define what you mean by sustainable. Please stop destroying our villages with executive housing estates.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 18	Other - I think you've failed Banbury - It is now one large ever increasing housing estate with choked up roads and a rapidly decaying town centre. Where have demonstrated any competence in town planning and environmental protection?
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 19	Other - No, you should not consider green field sites any more - Please use more imagination and be more responsible for the protection of our environment.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes. The reasons for protecting views of St Mary's Church really should be obvious. We want to live in a nice place which is protected from development.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 20	Other - Banbury's shopping area no longer exists - We don't go there any more, the shopping centre is empty and depressing. There is no vitality left in Banbury Town Centre, it has gradually decayed over the years.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 21	Other - All you seem to care about is building new homes. You keep saying "sustainable" like it's some magic wand - It doesn't anything. All you want to do is just build new homes. You built the shopping mall with no interest in the canal side. That was a major development error. All you want to do is just build new homes.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	By not selling everything off for new houses. All you want to do is build new homes.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 30	Other - Firstly, challenge your preconception that "additional development is required". You clearly have an agenda to destroy our villages. We do not trust you to protect our villages, you don't truly have any interest in rural ways of life. Look how you've recently discovered the Sibfords as the latest place to "develop" with no consideration for the inhabitants, the environment nor the traffic. Really, your lack of support for rural areas is a disgrace. There is no need for more housing in rural areas. Have you used every single brown field site before considering destroying the countryside? Did COP26 not prove that housing development is killing our environment and causing the disappearance of our biodiversity? And yet here you are again- More houses, more houses more houses. And you think that if you call every "sustainable" then that's ok. I guess "sustainable" is the new equivalent of "eco" that you used to say. You cannot build a house in a green field and say that it's sustainable, that would be a lie.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. All you want to do is build new homes. And you do that by calling them "sustainable".
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 32	Yes. Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services. You could start by maintaining the roads properly. Maybe stop thinking about new homes for a second and start providing some halfdecent roads. Yes - both. Maybe stop thinking about building new homes for half a second and start providing some half-decent roads.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Settlement	This is a meaningless concept - You will not respect any boundary if it means you can't build more homes.

LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 34	I don't see that you're interested in anything beyond building new homes. I have no belief whatsoever that you're interested in our "natural environment" when you're doing your best to build over it Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which <u>would be the subject of additional policy guidance</u>
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Parish Profile	Stop destroying our villages with new homes - We don't need "affordable homes", we don't need "sustainable homes", we don't need care homes, we don't need more executive homes. We need our villages to be preserved for the future. Please reserve future housing developments to the abundant amount of brown field sites we have in the area and stop kowtowing to developers who are purely driven by massive profit and have no interest in <u>local residents opinions and needs.</u>
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	All you want to do is build more new homes. Green belt boundaries need to be increased, not decreased. All you want to do is build more new homes
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Question - Development Management Policies	All you want to do is build more new homes. We need someone who will protect and care for the needs of local people rather than the profits for housing developers. All you want to do is build more new homes.
LPR-B-921	Lindon Locks	Option 30	You cannot go on building more and more houses in rural areas. It is destroying the region in terms of the environment and dwindling biodiversity. The impact is devastating to the local residents. I know two people who's mental health is suffering directly because of this issue. I find it amazing that we have to protect the environment from the very people who are responsible for the environment. The council need to protect their residents rather than attack them all the time with inappropriate developments pretending to be "sustainable" and "ecofriendly". My opinion is that Cherwell District Council are on a mission to build new homes, build new houses, build new estates. Everything else is window dressing as long as you can build more homes build more homes build more homes....
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Option 3	A combination of all the above
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Option 4	provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Question - Separation Distances	yes
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Question - Transport & Connectivity	No. I think you are missing the opportunity to influence the strategic transport plans at County and National level. E.g. a lot of new housing in Banbury and surrounding villages have been located the 'wrong' side of town for connection to the motorway which increases traffic and pollution in the centre as drivers try to join at junction 11. A solution would be for a new junction at Aynho. This would provide connectivity to houses that side of town, provide a Banbury 'Bypass' and reduce traffic/ pollution in the town. It would also reduce the current congestion at junction 11. Strategically, it would also reduce congestion at junction 10 and provide another diversion route for the regular accident congestion on that stretch of the motorway. Clearly, responsibility for such action lies at a national level but local plans should seek to influence national plans in my opinion. Yes approach should be different for rural areas. Measures to drive less- Make low carbon vehicles much more affordable.
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	Question - Travelling Communities	Influencing county and national plans to enable the local plan to be effective
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	LPR-A-004	Adverse impact on existing infrastructure water, drainage, roads etc. For full reasoning please refer to North Newington Parish Council submission which I fully support.
LPR-B-922	Nicholas Elton	LPR-A-135	As previous comments adverse impact on infrastructure fully explored in North Newington Parish Council response.
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington; At significant transport interchanges and Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility

LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Question - Green Belt	As an Islip resident I wish to preserve the green belt around the village, as Islip is a beautiful and historic village. However I also support increased housing provision and therefore fully support new housing being built on the former oil depot (a brownfield site) on the edge of the village
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree with approach. Should be different for rural areas. Measures to drive less- More bus services to Islip. Trains stopping more frequently at Islip station.
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	yes
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	yes
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 32	yes both - more weight to accessibility of the settlement to urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling.
LPR-B-923	Peter Desmond	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-924	Ellie-May Copping	LPR-A-091	object. It is some of the only rural parts of the village left, and it is busy enough with the new Longford park development and other new housing developments nearby with traffic any more traffic will cause chaos. The fields in question are on either side of a farm track that is great for dog walking and getting and if there are houses being built there it will not be as safe for dog walkers due to high traffic and not being able to let dogs off the lead due to lack of rural space.
LPR-B-925	Nina Jupp	Option 1	I bought the house because I wanted to live in a sleepy village (Islip), not a bustling town. How can the 'powers that be' have the right to change our village life into a bustling small town. We don't want to have a huge school, shops, 3000 new homes and hundreds more cars on the road. The pollution levels will go up not down and a great deal of the document is blah blah blah (thanks Greta) written by suited people in offices who have no clue of the life we wish to live. The vision of the 'future' fills me with horror and makes me want to leave Islip before the mayhem begins. We all know that this will probably go ahead and all the village comments will build a bonfire. I despair that a sleepy village can be changed so dramatically by pen pushers. Surely there should be a cap on how many houses can be added onto a village or town, so that some semblance of what we presently have now can be preserved. It is shock and horror to read this report. If every person in the village commented would it make any difference to the outcome. No, I presume I do not want to go through all the different categories, I see no advantage doing this as none of it looks reasonable, this is stuff made of nightmares. I hope that this will be at least read before it hits the 'burn' pile.
LPR-B-925	Nina Jupp	Option 2	Much of the land that is due to be built on is on a flood plane, or gets very waterlogged.
LPR-B-926	Rebecca Hammett	Question - Local Green Spaces in	Langford Orchard, Oxford Road and Gavray Meadows should be protected as green spaces, for the physical & mental wellbeing of humans & creatures. Also Gavray Meadows should connect to a wildlife area/corridor on the other side of the ring road before housing development starts there too
LPR-B-926	Rebecca Hammett	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Ensuring Bicester village level crossing will remain open in the future
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District). Other To make a house affordable there has to be surrounding infrastructure... transport links, local services etc...Affordable housing is best in town centres which have better infrastructures than in villages where transport is hard and rural schools and drs are under strain
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	This is a good way to save building on green spaces.. old housing and warehouses can be repurposed and upgraded- this helps with tackling the 'broken windows' strategy.
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation

LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Question - Green Belt	Protection of rural villages from being engulfed by town sprawl. Rural villages should be protected and not all categorised villages are equal. Even though a village maybe a Category A for example... it may not be suitable for further development as opposed to another Category A village... you can't compare apples with pears. For example Cropredy is a Cat A and so is Deddington and Bodicote which are far bigger - they are clearly not equal in terms of being Cat A.
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 14	Other - Fresh air and walking in the countryside are just as important for fitness and mental health as designated sports gyms, playgrounds extra... The countryside should be protected as much as possible
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Question - Local Green Spaces	The area in Cropredy up Spring Lane is widely used by the village to walk through, it should be protected as a Local Green Space.
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Historic buildings should be given special consideration to potential planning around them. Many historic buildings are interesting/beautiful because of the setting they currently occupy.
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Question - Transport & Connectivity	yes a different approach should be taken for rural areas.
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Writing personally as a villager in Cropredy... It is hard to understand that so many acres of land have been submitted (again and again) when they have been rejected from planning several times. Cropredy simply cannot cope with mass development. It is a mid size village built in a trough which has increasing flooding on all 3 roads out. Amongst many other difficulties the road is already totally congested and anymore traffic will be dangerous
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 32	No, more weight should not be given to availability of certain services and facilities. Yes- walking/cycling.
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Question - Settlement	Absolutely a village boundary is that... it protects a village becoming joined to a town.. if this is denied will all villages one day then become towns?
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Option 34	Protect the Historic and natural environment before it is too late. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-927	Amy Gault	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Supporting villages by understanding them... life in a village is a completely different choice to that of a town living and perhaps difficult to understand if someone has never led a rural life.. it is important to have people who understand both town and rural life and the affects of both that planning has on them to provide a balanced view.
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Question - Separation Distances	yes
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Question - Housing Policies	We should support modular homes
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Question - Green Belt	It is very important to maintain the existing green belts around villages such as Hanwell. Otherwise Hanwell and other villages will simply become part of Banbury, destroying their unique characteristics and destroying them as attractive places to live in
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites

LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Villages Should be kept as villages, rather than becoming part of a town. If the latter happens, our heritage will be destroyed.
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 30	Other - Keep villages as villages rather than allowing them to become part of a town by building on the green belt
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 32	No. Yes walking/cycling
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Question - Settlement	Yes, otherwise development will continue to encroach on land near villages until they effectively become part of the nearest town.
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Communities may come to be dominated by a few individuals who have an economic interest in developing on greenbelt land and that should not be allowed
LPR-B-928	Paul Beecroft	LPR-A-152	The two proposed sites at the Northern edge of Draycott, LPR-A-152 should not be approved. They are too near to Hanwell and will be the first step to turning Hanwell into a suburb of Banbury. This will destroy the Heritage of Hanwell and make it a far less desirable place to live in. If there is to be development near Hanwell this should be to the north of the village as there is a considerable distance to the next village to the north, Shotswell.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 1	I agree broadly with the vision, and believe planning should take sustainability into consideration in all aspects- the quality and design of new housing, the impact to the environment and the capacity of the area to service population growth. The individuality that we are so proud of should be maintained
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 2	When allocating sufficient land, in rural areas this should only be already developed rather than repurposed farmland.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington At significant transport interchanges Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Supporting	Supporting and developing sustainable industry should be a focus; developing innovative new industry with a renewable focus should take priority over becoming a factory town.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. Other- Promote diverse retail opportunities to make town centres attractive; limit big chains to retail parks and invite independent business to the town centre. See- Newcastle Australia revitalisation.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 6	Other - You need to tighten up the requirements for planning - people shouldn't be allowed to submit proposals for 10 affordable houses as a way to get around development.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above otheraffordable housing tenures
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Separation Distances	yes. If the pandemic has taught us anything it should be the importance of having space around you.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Housing Policies	Yes - housing should be sustainable and preference given to developments that are innovatively designed, are not exactly the same as the dedvelopment in the next down and should add to the aesthetics of the area rather than standing out like a sore thumb. Density should also complement the surrounding area- high density modern housing shouldn't be built in a small village.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Cherwell should try to do better than the government, use sustainably sourced materials, explore renewable energy in new estates, plan for longevity and quality rather than quantity, and ensure the environmental damage is mitigated.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Throw some money at the problem - engage innovative thinkers and actual experts who have more than immediate profit as a priority.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation

LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Environmental protection, reduction of traffic, preserving farmland.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Green Belt	My area is not officially recognised as Green Belt so I can't really comment, except to say that again, during the pandemic, the fields and farmland was a lifesaver for all people within the area, so the importance of this land shouldn't be disregarded
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 12	Other - find another site
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	We need to recognise that we are a small cog in the natural environment, that disproportionately affects the biodiversity around us.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. Children play best when thoughtfully stimulated rather than being allocated some bog standard play equipment on a rubber matted area. Developers should have to do better than this - a swing and a rocking horse does not constitute a playground and is an easy and cheap get out of jail free card. Do better.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites and Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Developers don't care about the incoming population and will contribute as little as possible to meet the requirement if left to their own devices. If you're not going to mandate what is required then you may as well give up and let your population get fat.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes agree with approach. Yes approach should be different for rural areas. Low carbon tech should be a focus, just because we know better. Why in 2021 would you focus on anything other than this? Do better. Measures to drive less - More charging infrastructure, lower loan interest rates for electric vehicles, new homes built with infrastructure in place.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 19	a combination of the above. Banbury has small villages that are poorly serviced by transport and infrastructure, but are somehow highly sought after by developers. They need to understand their impact on the area and be realistic in their planning- for example by not trying to develop high density housing on a one track road. Bloody stupid and shows a complete lack of understanding or care for the surrounding area or the population that they intend to house. (Foxden Way, Great Bourton)
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Melbourne, Australia CBD has been revitalised by building good quality apartments in the City which has resulted in an influx of population and business. Banbury is perfectly situated for this and would be great town centre with good development.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	By protecting and enhancing them!
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Understand that people buy in rural areas for a reason- it's to get away from high density housing.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services. Yes - both.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Settlement	Of course. Farmland on sale should not be an opportunity to build more houses.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district

LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Consult - and recognise when local neighbourhoods actually understand their area.
LPR-B-929	Julie Johnson	Option 30	Our villages are special, and should not be seen as prime targets for external developers who have no regard for the area and it's people. It's just blatant profiteering and to be honest, if you continue to build up the villages, they won't be villages anymore. It's too late to rue the loss of the countryside after it's gone
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 1	The identified areas for housing in Great Bourton and Cropredy are not suitable and are in danger of ruining historic picturesque villages. Great Bourton has already given more than it's fair share to developments in recent years and this seems very unfair to put more strain on the village. People living here have chosen to do so because it is a beautiful, enjoyable place to live in but more importantly in the countryside. If we continue to build more and more it will no longer be this way. At a time when we should be making the country and planet more sustainable this seems a million miles away from this objective. The only people gaining from these builds will be the greedy landowners who probably live in villages that will remain untouched.
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 2	We need to protect our countryside and wildlife, this should be a key objective!
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 19	Other - Carefully selected locations if totally necessary and infill is better than add on. have commented earlier on in regards to Great Bourton. Countryside and villages should be left alone to be enjoyed not ruined and lost forever
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes. Historic building that should be protected
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 21	Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. Make it less about money making and more about need. Protect rural locations , don't ruin them.
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 32	Yes. Local Shop Regular Bus services
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Question - Settlement	No. Boundaries should be respected not moved for convenience and financial gain.
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Simple...let's not ruin it!
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	Great Bourton	Great bourton sites are unsuitable as they are out of the village boundary
LPR-B-930	Rebecca Mitchell	General	This survey is clumsy and not user friendly. Many people will give up halfway though so will not represent the proper views of the local communities .
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 18	focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 19	a combination of the above. The proposed site at Bodicote has limited access that impacts adversely on existing homes and facilities
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Question - Important views of Banbury	no
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Question - Addressing Inequality in Banbury	Increase educational and health support facilities to provide sustainable and appropriate levels of support support to include the growth proposed in the Cherwell Plan. The current policy appears to provide home for enlarged population and adding on these facilities once shortfalls are being experienced by the enlarged family numbers
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Question - Banbury's open spaces	Extended to benefit the proposed growth of the local population
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Improving public transport availability
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs



LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 32	yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop GP Surgery Regular Bus services. Your plan is directed towards reducing the number of car journeys into Banbury Town. Yes- both.
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Question - Settlement	No as accurate prediction are difficult to assess
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 33	Use a combination of the above. In my view private and commercial planning should be kept separate in moving forward
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Improve the communication activities and transparency of the Local Plan before the formal development by Cherwell District Council staff start the process
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Question - Development Management Policies	Full communication of the Council's considered needs and offering local residents the opportunity to respond to these before the planning process is starts and moves forward
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	Bodicote	concerns regarding the access to the proposed sites in Bodicote extending the recently completed new build.
LPR-B-931	Bernard Goodchild	General	The Council gives the appearance of starting/drafting a plan before seeking general feedback from residents/local population. My belief is that democracy demands that the local people should have the opportunity to influence at the outset and before drafts are prepared that are rarely amended
LPR-B-932	Peter Dickins	LPR-A-077	Croft lane is a single track road building in excess of 40 houses off it will cause serious disruption. Building on green field sites adjacent to the conservation area should not be permitted.
LPR-B-932	Peter Dickins	Adderbury	Adderbury has already had significant new residential development. It has lost its character as an individual village, It is fast becoming a subsumed into Banbury.
LPR-B-933	Oxford Preservation Trust	Option 1	The Oxford Green Belt has been a key feature of planning in Oxfordshire for well over 50 years. It has been staunchly defended by your predecessors, both Conservative and Labour. For instance, in 1987 the Secretary of State stated that there was only very limited scope for further development around Oxford, and that once the Green Belt boundaries had been defined they should be strictly observed. The boundaries were subsequently defined through statutory local plans. The NPPF continues to stress the importance and permanence of Green Belts, and that only exceptional circumstances can justify changing their boundaries. As part of the Local Plan Review we hope that the Council will continue to support the importance and permanence of the Green Belt, and will not include any proposals within the emerging plan that will result in the development of large areas of land currently within the Green Belt. Central Government is currently considering a review of how housing numbers are calculated, and this may have a direct impact upon the District wide requirement to accommodate new homes. Added to this is the fact that, given the climate emergency that both central and local government now recognise, there is a stronger than ever case for conserving green space that can provide biodiversity and other benefits. Ref to Dieter Helm quote ["In defence of the Green Belt", April 2015 <a href="http://www.dieterhelm.co.uk/assets/secure/documents/Green-Belt- Paper-.pdf">http://www.dieterhelm.co.uk/assets/secure/documents/Green-Belt- Paper-.pdf</a> ]. Government statements indicate a continuing commitment to Green Belt protection. In the light of that and in the interests of the proper planning of the wider Oxford area we ask that protection of the Green Belt, and the wider green landscape are give the highest priority within the emerging plan.
LPR-B-933	Oxford Preservation Trust	Option 2	Key Objective 1 - this should not come at the expense of releasing Green Belt land, the text should confirm that allocating land will take a sequential approach - with brownfield and previously developed sites being preferable. There does not appear to be an Objective regarding preserving and enhancing the Green Belt and Green Infrastructure. OPT consider it would be prudent to include an objective which echoes the Governments <u>continuing commitment to Green Belt protection.</u>
LPR-B-933	Oxford Preservation Trust	Question - Green Belt	OPT was established in 1927 as a charity and local amenity society with the principal aim of conserving and enhancing Oxford and its setting. It takes a forward thinking and positive approach to development, looking to influence change rather than stopping it, preserving the best of the old and encouraging the best of the new. It is committed to ensuring that Oxford can continue to flourish and prosper, whilst protecting its historic character and setting. OPT owns and looks after 1000 acres of land in and around Oxford making green space available for local people to benefit from, and enjoy. OPT has detailed knowledge and expertise built up over a number of years so that it is legitimately recognised as a professional and experienced voice, able to speak with conviction on matters relating to landscape, views and the impact of development on the city of Oxford and its green setting and surrounds. While we are not a Green Belt organisation, OPT was instrumental in securing the establishment of the Oxford Green Belt, and in helping to protect Oxford's setting through its land ownership. It is imperative that 'the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; and the essential characteristics of Green Belts in their openness and their permanence' (NPPF Paragraph 137) continue to be achieved. OPT consider that the Local Plan should seek to resist any further releases of Green Belt land over the next plan period.

LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 1	In general lots of reference to green tech and sustainability, but not much detail on what that would involve. I would specifically challenge point 10. CDC has not cherished, protected or enhanced it's historic heritage or maintained its rural character when the partial review insisted on the destruction of large areas of green space and the decimation of ancient rural villages in Yarnton and Begbroke. The inclusion of such a claim doesn't suggest that the council really understand what those pledges mean. On point 11 I'd like to see more detail on exactly how biodiversity is being measured. And again the reference to flood risk, whilst timely, would seem to run contrary to the council's current behaviour in building on flood prone areas like Spring Hill in Begbroke. Point 12 is a gross misrepresentation of what has happened in Kidlington and Bicester. Both areas have had huge inappropriate development forced on them by the council.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 2	KO 1 - this will depend on where this land is. It should not be on green belt if the previous claims are to have any credibility. KO 2 - stimulating growth an already growing area like Cherwell is not compatible with climate change mitigation objectives. KO 3- Commuting didn't not seem to be a consideration when areas in south Cherwell were chosen for massive overdevelopment. How do we know that this claim will be any more honoured next time round? KO 5- Whilst I agree with this objective I wonder how this can be achieved when farming land is the target of development bids which are supported by the council.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington Mostly on previously developed land. By previously developed land I specifically refer to brownfield site:
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. There should be a greater focus on providing retail space for smaller independents, not just as start ups or 'popups' but as long term prospects with protected tenancies and sustainable rents. There should be areas like these designated in all new developments as well as being encouraged in existing areas.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester &	Rental guarantee schemes for smaller retailers. Local rates rebates (not necessarily government funded). Validated parking schemes. Local loyalty schemes. Regular events that support retailers (not things like Christmas markets which actually take trade away from established businesses).
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Supporting our Town	I don't see why these should be any different to the question above.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Separation Distances	yes
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Housing Policies	Encourage and develop purpose built housing co-ops
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. We should be aiming for carbon zero construction. Carbon negative should also be an aspiration
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	This needs to be done sensitively and proportionately. In the grand scheme of things this is probably not as high a priority as new builds and newer builds.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation. Whilst solar farms seem like a quick and easy solution they are poor use of land. We should focus more on ensuring that new builds all include an element of solar with appropriate national and preferably local grid connectivity. This is especially crucial for large distribution buildings with huge amounts of roof space.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We should be specifying Passivhaus in as many circumstances as possible. At least we should be using that as an exemplar and working towards similar standards.

LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Green Belt	Building on green belt should only ever be an absolutely last resort. The continued destruction of green belt as an easy and profitable option for developers should be discouraged. After the wholesale destruction of large areas of green belt in south Cherwell CDC has a long way to go to rebuild the trust of local people. As we've seen during the pandemic, green spaces are vital for physical and mental health and once they have been destroyed they are usually gone forever.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district. The term biodiversity net gain is a very slippery subject. We should include a tight definition in any future plan.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Again we need a comprehensive definition of Biodiversity gain and there should be an ongoing monitoring program to ensure that gain is not eroded as soon as a development is completed. We should be requiring a commitment from developers to monitor and report on at least a 30 year ongoing basis.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	I'd like to see the details of what is being proposed first. Any Biodiversity plan must be supported by recognised independent experts.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all age areas of play Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Local Green Spaces	Land between Honor Close and Alexander Close, Kidlington and Old tip site, Sandy Lane, Yarnton are proposed for LGS designation.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	All design should be in keeping with the local environment. This is especially important in rural areas
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes I do agree. Meeting areas, pubs, and niche/destination retail areas should be encouraged along with community action groups.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Transport & Connectivity	yes agree with approach. There should be a greater focus on active travel options, especially cycling and walking. We need to build in support for future transport technologies (not just BEVs) and encourage car free areas. Car clubs and car subscription schemes can help new developments become carbon negative and should be a requirement for all new estates. No, there should not be a different approach for rural areas - We should be focusing on low carbon travel everywhere. The main additional focus that is needed in rural areas is a decent bus service. measures to drive less - Better segregated and contiguous cycle lanes.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development. All new developments and infrastructure should include the ability to retrofit future technologies. At the moment this probably means good fibre connectivity, but in the future this may change. We need good advice from futurists who may be able to suggest ways forward that will be flexible enough to keep us moving forward on connectivity. Above all we must avoid anything that may provide a blockage in the future.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	That any green spaces left after the current LPPR developments should be protected, preferably via covenants. We need to guard against extensive infilling as this is likely knockon effect of the recent plan review. we are about to turn 2 small ancient villages into a major conurbation there needs to be attention paid to ensure that this does not become a free for all for developers looking to spot and easy buck.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. Not sure what 'outside existing green belt boundaries' means. If this means not on green belt land then I support this. There should not be any further economic or employment development on green belt land. Oxfordshire is an area of low unemployment and we do not need additional areas like these. What is required is genuinely affordable housing.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close

LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	The canal side would make a good area for a cycleway although we need to ensure we don't destroy the historic nature and culture of the canal in the process.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way. Other- I don't think the two above options are mutually exclusive so I have selected both. leave Kidlington green spaces alone; You've destroyed enough!
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 32	No; more weight should not be given to availability of services and facilities. Yes- walking/cycling
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Settlement	Yes. As long as this is defended beyond what are becoming increasingly porous green belt boundaries.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Provide a toolkit and free advice on how to proceed and ways to reduce the cost. Promote the benefits to local parishes. Set an example by ensuring that neighbourhood plans are given proper weight in planning decisions (otherwise they are seen by many parishes as pointless and a waste of time and money).
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Development Management Policies	Enforceable zero/low carbon development principles at the planning committee will properly apply. The current set of 'advisory' principles are just not fit for purpose.
LPR-B-934	Ian Middleton	Question - Green Belt	Many of these sites are again on green belt or unprotected green spaces. If the sustainability aims of this plan are to have any credibility we must not allow these sites to be prioritised just to suit the expediency of housing provision and the wishes of developers to make an easy gain
LPR-B-935	Wendy Eves-Dickins	Option 1	LPR-A-077 This planning proposal will be on greenfield sites adjacent to the conversation area (this is ancient meadow)! which will totally ruin the village and add to congestion,over-crowding and noise pollution as well as robbing the village of its rural and peaceful characteristics
LPR-B-935	Wendy Eves-Dickins	LPR-A-077	LPR-A-077 This planning proposal will be on greenfield sites adjacent to the conversation area (this is ancient meadow)! which will totally ruin the village and add to congestion,over-crowding and noise pollution as well as robbing the village of its rural and peaceful characteristics
LPR-B-935	Wendy Eves-Dickins	Question - Development Management Policies	Yes,it is very important that the local residents are informed about all your proposals and building plans.
LPR-B-935	Wendy Eves-Dickins	Adderbury	Adderbury is losing its rural aspects and charm and has far too much housing development already.Further building would spoil the conservation village which sadly is rapidly becoming suburban to Banbury.
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 18	focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 19	Other - Green field should be avoided.
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Development should be limited to local needs where those local needs are the ones identified by the people of the locality through mechanisms such as the local plan
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 32	No; more weight should not be given to availability of services and facilities. No- no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Question - Settlement	Yes. Village identities need protecting. The growth of Banbury is widely unpopular as it swallows up the surrounding villages. Village communities survive through an identity which dies when a place is swallowed before its character irreversibly changec
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district

LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Adderbury	The village has already taken far too much development. The village has an active neighbourhood plan which many of us worked hard to create and the Cherwell plan must protect that. Site LPR-A179 would completely change the character of the village as it is far too overpowering and puts growth away from the villages centre and amenities. The site would be at the opposite end of the village to the new sports field and community centre and more than walking distance from the pubs and shop. It's is wholly unsuitable. It is also good arable land delivering crops to feed people. More houses but less crops is a recipe for huge problems in the future. LPR-A286 and similarly would create urban sprawl and irreparable damage to the ability of Adderbury to function as a village. It is vital that you defend the villages neighbourhood plan where villagers have already told you what they want to see.
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	LPR-A-179	Site LPR-A179 would completely change the character of the village as it is far too overpowering and puts growth away from the villages centre and amenities. The site would be at the opposite end of the village to the new sports field and community centre and more than walking distance from the pubs and shop. It's is wholly unsuitable. It is also good arable land delivering crops to feed people. More houses but less crops is a recipe for huge problems in the future.
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	LPR-A-286	would create urban sprawl and irreparable damage to the ability of Adderbury to function as a village. It is completely out of proportion and would cause irreparable damage to the ability of Adderbury to function as a village
LPR-B-936	Andy Green	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Demonstrate that you will take notice of what they decide. We have completed one in Adderbury already and many of the suggestions here contradict our hard work.
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 1	The land offered up by the Church Commissoners, if all taken up for building would increase the size of Islip by about 500%. While I accept that development needs to happen in Cherwell. I feel that Islips share would be quite disproportionate
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 2	Too much in Islip; share it around the district particularly where there is supporting amenities.
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 22	consider further urban extensions
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 23	A combination of the above
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 24	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester Facilitate such developments through a criteria based policy
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plan:
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 23	Yes agree with approach. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop Regular Bus services. Yes - both.
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Question - Settlement	Yes, a litte is permissable, but keep it proportional the the existing size.
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-937	Andrew McKnight	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Take note of the local communities you plan to develop
LPR-B-938	Dr Anna Campbell	LPR-A-091	Objection to the inclusion of the land south of Wards Crescent. This is a significant area of natural beauty for the village and the last undeveloped corner of the village, which residents of Bodicote and other nearby villages, are keen to retain. It is used extensively for recreation, enjoyment of the countryside, farming of land and animal husbandry. There is poor vehicular access for cars, and the roads in the village are already overused and insufficient for the number of people. It is unrealistic to assume that a household will only have a single vehicle, given the poverty of transport provision. Also there are reasons why people live in a village- for community, for belonging, for the surrounding countryside. We didn't choose to live in a village in order to become part of Banbury town, or a dormitory for Oxford, Birmingham, London. There is very little space between Adderbury and Bodicote as it is, and the land between the two- and Bloxham - is used by hundreds of people to get out into the countryside for mental and physical well-being. I object strongly to the inclusion of this site. Also, I was under the impression that the land is prone to flooding, according to the land surveys I have seen.
LPR-B-939	John Melrose	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-939	John Melrose	LPR-A-044	The area is in open countryside between Great Bourton and Cropedy, this would harm the Cherwell valley visual amenity, the are floods and is unsuitable for housing

LPR-B-939	John Melrose	LPR-A-133	The Village of Great Bourton does not have the amenities/services to support such a large housing expansion ; without transport services to and from the village, new occupants of these developments would travel by car and the roads Crow Lane and Foxden Way, would be the only access for the development- they are narrow, quiet country lanes used by many for walking and are completely unsuitable for a large increase in traffic. The visual amenity of the Cherwell valley would be harmed by these areas having housing, damaging the local tourist industry and visiting walkers. Some the area involves trees which have conservation orders on them.
LPR-B-939	John Melrose	LPR-A-114	The Village of Great Bourton does not have the amenities/services to support such a large housing expansion ; without transport services to and from the village, new occupants of these developments would travel by car and the roads Crow Lane and Foxden Way, would be the only access for the development- they are narrow, quiet country lanes used by many for walking and are completely unsuitable for a large increase in traffic. The visual amenity of the Cherwell valley would be harmed by these areas having housing, damaging the local tourist industry and visiting walkers. Some the area involves trees which have conservation orders on them.
LPR-B-939	John Melrose	LPR-A-068	The Village of Great Bourton does not have the amenities/services to support such a large housing expansion ; without transport services to and from the village, new occupants of these developments would travel by car and the roads Crow Lane and Foxden Way, would be the only access for the development- they are narrow, quiet country lanes used by many for walking and are completely unsuitable for a large increase in traffic. The visual amenity of the Cherwell valley would be harmed by these areas having housing, damaging the local tourist industry and visiting walkers. Some the area involves trees which have conservation orders on them.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 1	I am generally supportive of the vision and pleased to see the references to rural communities
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 2	Objectives around sustainability and addressing climate change are the most important. Supporting tourism (KO6) is less important. KO22, which attempts to support behaviour change through planning policies, is unlikely to be successful and I would not agree with its inclusion. I would like to see a specific objective about encouraging and supporting start ups and small local businesses in order to build a strong and resilient local economy
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, Mostly on previously developed land and At the larger villages
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Question - Supporting	There needs to be a policy which supports the provision of low cost options for small businesses- these could be in larger villages or in town centres, helping to revitalise both
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Question - Supporting our Town	Consider ways to enable the utilisation of empty retail spaces for community use, start ups, art and entertainment etc
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Question - Separation Distances	yes.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation and Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Yes agree with approach. Yes approach should be different for rural areas.I don't think it is feasible to provide viable public transport options for villages and rural areas that would enable travel to work. The switch to home working is more important, and digital infrastructure is key to this.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages

LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 19	to the south of the town
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. Would be happy to have specific sites and/or numbers of new houses agreed with local communities, provided that there is a commitment from the Council not to permit any development outside these. Currently sites have been agreed which are not in line with the Local Plan
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 32	There is not enough information provided to consider this issue in detail. I would hope there would be more forthcoming before a final decision is made. For example, give more weight to accessibility by public transport, walking or cycling than what?
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Question - Settlement	Yes. This would prevent the settlement creep we have seen and provide a degree of certainty for both villages and developers. It would also maintain separation between existing communities
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Option 34	Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Parish Profile	I have only looked at a few but it is evident that there are some parishes with practically no services and facilities. I believe that allowing for housing development at these would be at odds with the Plan's stated Vision and Objectives around sustainability and meeting the challenge of climate change It is not the case that if houses are built, services will follow; people will buy houses and travel into towns and to stations for work, shopping and leisure, increasing traffic and emissions. It takes a lot of effort to establish and maintain new services which are viable in village communities and practically speaking it is unlikely to happen. Concentrate on providing walk-to facilities on new estates.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	It's a bit of a chicken and egg situation as there may be issues arising from a Neighbourhood Plan that would benefit from inclusion in the Local Plan but you won't know about those until they're done. A set of general principles about what type of thing could be supported might be the way to go.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	LPR-A-088	I would not support any of the sites south of Great Bourton; they would add disproportionately to the size of the village, which does not have any services or facilities, and would lead to significant extra traffic and emissions, in contravention of the specific aims of the Local Plan; threaten the separation between Great Bourton and Little Bourton; reduce the amenity of Foxden Way, currently used by both villages for recreational purposes including healthy cycling and walking; and adversely impact on the rural nature of the village environment. There would be an inevitable increase in traffic to School Lane and Crow Lane, where current developments are already causing damage to roads and threatening further damage to adjacent properties, including our own.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	LPR-A-090	I would not support any of the sites south of Great Bourton; they would add disproportionately to the size of the village, which does not have any services or facilities, and would lead to significant extra traffic and emissions, in contravention of the specific aims of the Local Plan; threaten the separation between Great Bourton and Little Bourton; reduce the amenity of Foxden Way, currently used by both villages for recreational purposes including healthy cycling and walking; and adversely impact on the rural nature of the village environment. There would be an inevitable increase in traffic to School Lane and Crow Lane, where current developments are already causing damage to roads and threatening further damage to adjacent properties, including our own.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	LPR-A-114	I would not support any of the sites south of Great Bourton; they would add disproportionately to the size of the village, which does not have any services or facilities, and would lead to significant extra traffic and emissions, in contravention of the specific aims of the Local Plan; threaten the separation between Great Bourton and Little Bourton; reduce the amenity of Foxden Way, currently used by both villages for recreational purposes including healthy cycling and walking; and adversely impact on the rural nature of the village environment. There would be an inevitable increase in traffic to School Lane and Crow Lane, where current developments are already causing damage to roads and threatening further damage to adjacent properties, including our own.
LPR-B-940	Hilary Morse	LPR-A-133	I would not support any of the sites south of Great Bourton; they would add disproportionately to the size of the village, which does not have any services or facilities, and would lead to significant extra traffic and emissions, in contravention of the specific aims of the Local Plan; threaten the separation between Great Bourton and Little Bourton; reduce the amenity of Foxden Way, currently used by both villages for recreational purposes including healthy cycling and walking; and adversely impact on the rural nature of the village environment. There would be an inevitable increase in traffic to School Lane and Crow Lane, where current developments are already causing damage to roads and threatening further damage to adjacent properties, including our own.

LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 1	Thousands of houses are being built, primarily on the arterial roads in and out of Banbury. Roading infrastructure is not being updated and congestion and travel times are increasing with each new development. Whole areas are now 'car parks' for several hours a day with stationary cars, vans and trucks belching out toxic fumes into our homes. Banbury needs a ring road- NOW. There are few alternatives to joining the congestion if you want to 1. Get to and from work (with declining bus services there is no option but to drive) 2. Take children to school- a lot of new/proposed developments are not within walking distance of a primary school (not even considering if the nearest schools have capacity!) 3. Visit a supermarket- you must illegally turn right on a red signal to break the traffic into Sainsburys and can wait up to 4 sets of lights to get to the front of the queue. The Tesco roundabout and the surrounding roads are gridlocked for hours per day 4. Access the M40- you MUST travel through central Banbury We wonder why Banbury town centre is a ghost town of empty stores and seems to have only a plethora of charity shops, barbers, nail bars and cafes yet road congestion makes it exasperating to try and get there. and then after an 8 minute drive taking 20 you have to pay to park. From Twyford it really is quicker and less frustrating to drive 20 minutes to Bicester - clear road with no obstruction, super large supermarket and free parking outside large retail outlets - than to attempt to struggle through Banbury at the weekend or a weekday after school. M&S is the only 'main player' left in Banbury town centre and for how long? The Bicester ring roads are a breeze to navigate and you can quickly get from one area of Bicester to another, <del>instead of sitting in the roading chaos of Banbury</del>
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 2	You cannot maintain a sustainable local economy by building more and more houses along arterial roads into Banbury. The town centre is in it's death throes and making the roads even more congested will do nothing to help. Increasing the numbers of vehicles to include those from new developments will turn more and more people away from local business as the congestion and time to travel becomes too frustrating. You cannot make any positive claims towards climate change when you are creating more congestion and gridlock on the arterial roads into Banbury. Where is the survey to support an extra 1000 cars from the 2 new proposed developments on the edge of Twyford will not congest the Oxford road more? How are they to break the traffic to enter and exit the developments without traffic lights? Traffic lights will gridlock Twyford EVEN MORE than currently. Every day cars queue the length of Twyford and through Adderbury for several hours belching out toxic fumes into the lungs of kids walking to/from school and into local homes. Where is the evidence to support making this congestion even worse by backing the traffic up to allow hundreds of people in and out of these developments will not increase the level of toxic fumes in Twyford? Does Cherwell know if stationery vehicles emit higher levels of toxic fumes into the atmosphere than cars perpetually in motion of 20-30 miles per hour?
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 3	a combination of all of the above.Connectivity and Transport. Bus services have declined over the past few years. There is now only one bus from Adderbury/Twyford to and from Banbury which runs roughly once an hour and goes directly to the town centre bus station. Cherwell intend allowing hundreds and hundreds of new houses on the edge of Twyford- are they all to get this one bus per hour, or simply get in their cars and further congest the roads? What options do people have if the one bus doesn't operate to/from work at a time to suit your hours, or if you don't actually work in the town centre. There are NO public transport options. Employment land sites need to be built AWAY from the town centre to try and decrease congestion- currently everyone is funnelled into a bottle neck whether you are shopping on the other side of town, joining the motorway, shopping town centre, or getting to work.
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 5	Other - Ask the big retailers why they pulled out of Banbury town centre which is a wasteland of charity shops, barbers, betting shops and cafes. Then ask, looking at Banbury town centre offerings, WHY WOULD people come?
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Housing Policies	How can you mention sustainable and affordable housing in the same sentence? Exactly what is sustainable about the massive Longford Park Estate (other than a fine revenue stream for both the developer and Cherwell fees). Bandying around terms like 'sustainable' yet not ensuring homes are built with sustainable materials following sustainable industry trends like generating 100% of energy needs via solar or wind makes a mockery of the term 'sustainable'.
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Separation Distances	yes - Roads are too narrow - it is unbelievable to think Cherwell cannot associate 'lack of walking distance' and 'lack of good bus services' with let's build really narrow development roads and act all surprised when every home and every flat has AT LEAST one car....
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 11	Other - Everybody has an obligation to create/use renewable energy generation solutions if they can. This includes solar panels, small residential wind turbines etc.. There is NO reason housing developments cannot be mandated to provide a source of renewable energy generation for the homes on the development. There is NO reason the development cannot be self-sustaining in energy generation and even sell back to the national grid.
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Green Belt	Yes - keeping it. We hear Cherwell going on about the 'green belt' and then systematically dismantling it with each new large development. Cherwell is proposing to drastically reduce the green belt between Twyford/Adderbury and Bodicote.



LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 12	Other - How about where biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures cannot be achieved on site the site does not get approval!!!! You cannot talk about the importance of biodiversity and ask us what to do when you, as an organisation, fail to achieve it
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play. With large housing developments having such narrow roads Cherwell MUST recognise safety issues of children out on the footpaths and crossing roads. Children MUST be provided with play areas but these should be accessed safely
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Drive through Longford Park Development to witness what does NOT constitute 'good design'.
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Transport & Connectivity	No do not agree with strategy. One bus per hour that only goes to Banbury town centre bus station does not constitute good connectivity. People are forced into their cars through lack of adequate public transport, lack of near by medical facilities, lack of nearby schools having capacity. The new cycle route down Bankside in Cherwell Heights is a bit of an own goal. If 2 cars are travelling in opposite directions along Bankside then BOTH cars have to infringe the cycle lane to pass each other - doesn't bode well for the cyclists! If there's not room why do it? No the approach should not be different for rural areas - We have to travel through rural areas to get to other retail centres as the arterial roads into Banbury are so congested.
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). The digital era is here to stay and innovations continue at a head spinning pace. Areas with current low or flaky provision should be expected to improve over time therefore Cherwell should expect all developments to look to the future digitally.
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy. And Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are. Cherwell is proposing two large developments of around 1000 houses in the green belt between Twyford and Bodicote. 1000 houses = minimum 1000 children, 1300 adults, 1100 cars. There are no GP surgeries nearby. There is no local shop within walking distance. There is no primary or secondary school within walking distance. The double decker bus taking Twyford students to The Warriner is completely full. Surely infrastructure should be in place BEFORE developments go ahead? There is only 1 bus per hour running past the proposed developments. Medical facilities at The Horton have been reduced. Exactly what infrastructure IS proposed to support these huge developments that will take away the green belt, not be sustainable, cause additional traffic congestion and further pollute the air??
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 19	to the north of the town to the west of the town
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes. The historic value speaks for itself. Either commit to preserving history or take the money and sell to the highest development bidder
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. Before deciding on a residential led or mixed use Cherwell needs to consider WHERE the commercial premises will go? Should these premises leave town like most of the larger retailers? Where will people get those much needed services from
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	More trips to Bicester on a clear unobstructed roadway!! Hover cars would be great too. Seriously how do you think people are going to do grocery shopping? I don't think the S4 allows me to have an armchair on my lap.
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission

LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. There are 2 large developments proposed in the green belt between Adderbury/Twyford and Bodicote. Currently traffic is stationery the length of Twyford in one direction and often extending down through Adderbury to Station Rd Industrial Estate in the other direction. These 2 developments will not be able to cut the traffic on the Oxford Rd without traffic lights. Additional traffic lights will cause further congestion and grid lock. Kids walking to/from school with stationery traffic belching out toxic fumes. There are no medical facilities nearby. No corner shop. No primary or secondary school within walking distance. The Warriner double decker taking Twyford students is completely full. These developments will cause tremendous disruption during building and traffic congestion post building and will ensure Banbury town centre and retail areas are too much of a congested frustrating drive to make and send us existing residents to Bicester or Chipping Norton. Currently Rochester Way and Deene Close are a rat run for cars to avoid the length of Twyford queue to access Ayno Rd- these 2 roads are sub-width roads with 4 blind corners where passing a parked car puts you completely against the opposing curb. Further congestion with 1000 more cars from these developments will make this rat run even more dangerous. Why oh why do we have to further clog up arterial roads into Banbury? People will now sit in traffic from the institute in Adderbury until their final Banbury destination with only the smallest respite along the green belt (which is stationery for Bodicote lights in the evening)
LPR-B-941	John Shurey	Question - Settlement	Yes - Bodicote is no longer a village. Adderbury/Twyford is being merged in Banbury piece by piece. A settlement is exactly that, a settlement not a suburb.
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 1	The vision is too all encompassing. On the one hand it mentions protection of Bicester as a market town and then it discusses transforming Bicester market town into a vibrant economy based on Bicester Motion and Bicester Village
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 2	Objectives around climate change should be towards the front of the list as well as ensuring nature recovery. The UK is one of the most nature depleted countries on the planet. Cherwell has a climate change framework and nature recovery plan; these need to be realistic and achievable and should inform any decision making on future plan.
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. The plan should define transport interchanges. Does this include class B8 developments adjacent to motorway junctions? Preference would be for 3 but there may be occasions where development is appropriate in villages particularly if it enables them to be more sustainable.
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Developers should clearly show that they have used the rules of hierarchy re biodiversity off site and using mitigation off site should be a last resort. Option 1 close to the site should be defined. Anywhere in CDC or within a prescribed distance of the development site. Note sure about prioritising in CTAs. May result in harmful loss of threatened species where equivalent habitat loss is not able to be created in the CTA. As with the Oxfordshire Plan there should be an option to consider a 20% bng. A consistent calculation tool should be used i.e. 3? All developments should make their calculation accessible and CDC should assure itself that it is have the necessary resource to challenge BNG assumptions. Where recovery is off site the equivalent habitat should be provided to that which has been lost.
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Question - Transport & Connectivity	No do not agree with the strategy. Reducing the need travel needs to be in both urban and rural areas. Developments such as expansion of Chesterton Sports facility and Great Wolf do not help in this regard. These developments with their large car parks do not encourage people to drive less. Local Plan needs to be more ambitious in this regard if CDC aim of net zero by 2030 is to mean anything. It is not about reducing the need for travel but reducing road transport as a whole.
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. There may be some scope for some development to be redirected to wider areas. For example to support new employment in villages and limit travel from outside of the village and the wider district. However this should be strictly controlled, criteria based and ensure that rural areas remain characterful and landscape is protected.
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-942	Nicholas Dolden	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. St Mary's parish covers Banbury town centre, and includes the allocated sites Banbury 1 and Banbury 8. It would add greatly to the vibrancy and attractiveness of the town centre to visitors if it had a larger resident population. The national "Living over the Shop" initiative collapsed several years ago because of the difficulties and expense of residential conversion, but the number of empty upper floors (and consequent neglect of maintenance) continues to blight Banbury's historic town centre and diminish its attractiveness as a place to visit.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington)	Not strictly speaking a land-use policies, but CDC could make greater use of Repairs Notices to make sure that the owners of the many listed buildings in Banbury town centre that are suffering from neglect keep them in good condition. It could also actively seek out sources of grant-aid. One important Grade II* building ought to be on Historic England's national Heritage at Risk register. Maintaining the character and appearance of the town centre by keeping its buildings in good condition is critical to its attractiveness as a retail destination and hence its longterm sustainability.

LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures. The centre of Banbury suffers from a large number of Victorian houses in multiple occupation that have been divided into small bed-sits and otherwise inadequate privately rented residential accommodation. (Grimsbury, in St Leonard's parish, suffers from the same problem.) There needs to be a significant increase in the availability of genuinely affordable rented accommodation that remains genuinely affordable in perpetuity. Shared equity and other so-called affordable tenures are likely to be beyond the means of many of the current residents.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement. The social consequences of abandoning Parker Morris standards have been dire.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Question - Separation Distances	Terraced housing (which does not raise concerns about overlooking) will help to achieve the housing densities necessary to support a sustainable "20 minute neighbourhood".
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Question - Travelling Communities	Banbury St Mary's is the traditional parish church used by many of the traveller and showman families who used to have their "ground" within the Borough boundary, and who have since moved to Bloxham or South Newington. It would be helpful for them to continue to have a "ground" close to the town, preferably in a location from where they can access local facilities on foot, including shops, without having to walk along the A361.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	St Mary's is particularly concerned with allocated site Banbury 1 (Canalside), which is in our parish, and we submitted detailed comments on the masterplan some years ago. The critical points we made then - all of which anticipated the new emphasis on design in the NPPF - were (a) the importance of providing a green tree-lined corridor along the canal (think Amsterdam) that would make it a must-stop-off point for narrowboats; (b) providing for mixed uses, combining mixed-tenure and mixed-size residential (to achieve a balanced social mix) with live/work units and small office suites and workshops suitable for start-up enterprises, with retail and catering being limited to neighbourhood convenience stores and canalside cafes and restaurants; and (c) drawing up a design code that would fix storey heights and provide for a palette of materials and colours while requiring that adjacent buildings were not designed by the same architect or developer, so that the visual "scale" of any development would remain limited and human, and reflect the variety and interest found in the historic town centre.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Yes. Banbury's historic town centre already provides such a neighbourhood, which is why further residential occupation is desirable.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Option 18	Other - The brownfield sites Banbury 1 (Canalside) and Banbury 8 should be prioritised. CDC should identify ways of facilitating land assembly and taking the initiative in leading their redevelopment.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Option 19	new site suggestion - Other under-utilised brownfield sites in the town centre could usefully be identified.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Question - Important views of Banbury	Yes. St Mary's is Banbury's only Grade I listed building and its most famous landmark. Although the present building is only 200 years old, the town almost certainly grew up around its AngloSaxon predecessor, which would have dominated the wide market area leading down to the bridge (an area defined by Parsons Street to the north and the High Street to the south). As the town's most important historic building it is now central to its aspiration to be a visitor destination, and the views of it from the surrounding hills (and from the railway) are a critical part of the town's identity and distinctiveness.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Option 21	St Mary's is particularly concerned with allocated site Banbury 1 (Canalside), which is in our parish, and we submitted detailed comments on the masterplan some years ago. The critical points we made then - all of which anticipated the new emphasis on design in the NPPF - were (a) the importance of providing a green tree-lined corridor along the canal (think Amsterdam) that would make it a must-stop-off point for narrowboats; (b) providing for mixed uses, combining mixed-tenure and mixed-size residential (to achieve a balanced social mix) with live/work units and small office suites and workshops suitable for start-up enterprises, with retail and catering being limited to neighbourhood convenience stores and canalside cafes and restaurants; and (c) drawing up a design code that would fix storey heights and provide for a palette of materials and colours while requiring that adjacent buildings were not designed by the same architect or developer, so that the visual "scale" of any development would remain limited and human, and reflect the variety and interest found in the historic town centre.
LPR-B-943	St Mary's Church Banbury	Question - Addressing Inequality in	See my earlier comments on the importance of providing social rented housing that is affordable in perpetuity.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 1	I agree with all objectives but suggest that all new housing should be required to have in built heat pumps to provide sustainable heating throughout.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 2	I don't agree with the supposed need for continual growth, both in the size of the town or surrounding villages, or in the area's economy. Sustainability should be about utilising our existing infrastructure more efficiently to conserve the countryside that surrounds us
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.

LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Question - Separation Distances	yes
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Question - Green Belt	It is vital that we limit the boundaries of all communities to sustain the green belt. We are opposed intrinsically to all future housing that closes the green gaps between existing communities.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 19	Other - No more green field sites should be considered. LPR-A-185 and LPR-A-116 are extending the town too far in the Bloxham direction. I would question the need given that there is still a massive amount of housing already approved but not yet built
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 30	other - The rural areas should remain exactly that. There is no need for further housing.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 31	Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Question - Settlement	Yes - draw a line at existing boundaries and don't encroach beyond that.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	LPR-A-070	totally opposed to the site as being grossly intrusive on the green belt and ruining the definition of village boundaries.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	LPR-A-100	totally opposed to the site as being grossly intrusive on the green belt and ruining the definition of village boundaries.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	LPR-A-151	totally opposed to the site as being grossly intrusive on the green belt and ruining the definition of village boundaries.
LPR-B-944	Peter Piddock	LPR-A-091	totally opposed to the site as being grossly intrusive on the green belt and ruining the definition of village boundaries.
LPR-B-945	Emma Tortise	LPR-A-091	objection.
LPR-B-946	Susan Smith	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-946	Susan Smith	Option 19	to the north of the town. Adderbury cannot sustain further housing
LPR-B-946	Susan Smith	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-946	Susan Smith	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-946	Susan Smith	Option 30	Other - stop all developments
LPR-B-946	Susan Smith	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Question - Important views of Banbury	yes.
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. If we are losing retail, convert into accommodation
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	More cycle lanes
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Preserve rural areas for the good of everyone

LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 32	Yes. Primary School Village Hall Local Shop Regular Bus services. Yes - walking/cycling
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Question - Settlement	Yes, to keep the definition of traditional villages, to protect the green and open spaces around settlements, to protect footpaths and to protect ancient field systems.
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-947	Caroline Elmitt	Bodicote	the proposed land to be included in the profile is poorly served by access, with the roads through Bodicote narrowed by parking, and development would have an unacceptable impact on the already busy local community. The tracks alongside the proposed fields are well used by walkers and cyclists and they would be negatively impacted. I strongly suggest that the proposal be turned down.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 1	The Woodland Trust welcomes the vision for an environmentally resilient district where the biodiversity resource is enhanced. We note the context given by the Oxfordshire 2050 plan and the OxCam Arc Leaders' Environment Principles as well as Cherwell's Community Nature Plan and would ask that these continue to inform the district's vision.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 2	We welcome the key objectives on meeting the challenge of climate change, and healthy placeshaping. In particular, we consider the following to be important: • KO 12: Deliver developments that minimise and are resilient to the impacts of climate change, including extreme weather events such as flooding, drought and heatwaves. • KO 13: Protect and maximise opportunities for biodiversity net gain and the enhancement of Cherwell's natural capital, and minimising pollution across the whole of Cherwell. • KO 14: Secure new green and blue infrastructure provision to improve sustainable connectivity, improve habitat connectivity to mitigate climate change impacts on biodiversity, and mitigate against the effects of development on the microclimate. • KO 15: Protect, conserve and enhance 'natural capital' assets such as soils, woodlands, hedges and ponds in order to capture and store carbon. • KO 26: Support access to green and blue infrastructure so that residents can enjoy the benefit of the natural environment on their physical and mental health • KO 28: Provide sufficient accessible, well maintained good quality services, facilities and infrastructure, including green and blue infrastructure, to meet health, education, transport, open space, sport, recreations, cultural, social and other community needs, reducing social exclusion and poverty, addressing inequalities in health, and maximising well-being.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. Development should ideally be concentrated on previously developed land, and take the opportunity to enhance its biodiversity and contribution to green infrastructure (including retention of existing trees) rather than encroach upon natural greenspace elsewhere.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 5	Other - Whatever mix of uses is supported, these should be developed so as to support urban greening and protect existing green infrastructure and green spaces. The National Model Design Code prioritises urban greening and street trees. An up to date tree strategy with guidance on protecting, enhancing and connecting urban trees would be a valuable addition to the local plan
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Question - Supporting our Town	As part of the response to the climate and nature emergencies, we recommend setting an overall tree canopy cover target for town centres, and setting a specific % canopy cover target for development sites, as a contribution to meeting biodiversity net gain requirements
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government. Cherwell is an area of high housing demand where applicants can reasonably be asked to comply with higher standards in order to access valuable residential development opportunities. In line with the OxCam Arc leaders' environmental principles, the local plan should support making more efficient use and management of waste and resources, working towards a circular economy with no net waste and promoting the use of sustainable building materials and construction guidelines.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Question - Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	The Woodland Trust supports an increase in UK woodland cover from its current 13% of land area to 19% by 2050 to tackle this country's biodiversity and climate crises. To help achieve this, we recommend that local authorities should set districtwide canopy cover targets and commit to a minimum 30% tree canopy cover target for new development land. supporting information uploaded with this response - Woodland Trust Emergency Tree Plan for the UK (Jan 2020).
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 12	Other - The Local Plan should support a flexible approach where the investment in nature recovery will do most good. This would by default be the opportunities identified in the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy. However, there should be flexibility to support other more local projects that demonstrate potential for net gain, if appropriate, such as those identified in the Cherwell Community Nature Plan. It may be appropriate to prioritise local or community woodland creation close to development sites. Woodland creation is a specific priority of the national Nature Recovery Network as well as an important contribution to climate resilience and providing accessible natural greenspace for current and future residents.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain

LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Question - Biodiversity & The Natural Environment	In addition to the policy headings in section 5.7.12 we would urge a separate policy on trees and woodland. Ancient woodland and veteran trees should have dedicated policy protections, including requirements for buffers and root protection areas. Guidance on street trees and trees on development sites would be a valuable contribution to meeting the requirements of the NMDC and biodiversity net gain. Supporting information uploaded with this response - Woodland Trust Planning for Ancient Woodland (July 2019)
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. The Woodland Trust has developed a Woodland Access Standard to complement Natural England's Accessible Natural Green Space Standard. This recommends that: – That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size. – That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Option 15	Supporting information uploaded in this response - Woodland Trust Space for People (May 2017)
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Trees are recognised in the National Model Design Code as a vital element of healthy and attractive places. The Woodland Trust advises that any design code should include: 1. A presumption that existing trees will be retained The starting point for any development should be based on an understanding of existing trees, mapped and categorised in line with BS5837 Trees in relation to construction and design. Design codes should outline how design should be informed by this understanding, with impacts on existing trees and woods minimised and require clear, evidenced and justified reasons for the removal of any trees. 2. Buffer zones to protect ancient woodlands and ancient and veteran trees and other mitigation In order to reduce the indirect impacts of development on woods and trees, buffer zones are essential. Buffer zones also provide space to support natural regeneration of ancient woodland, or space to support tree planting. 3. Increase in canopy cover For new development, the Woodland Trust advocates for a minimum 30% canopy cover. This level, and higher, has been shown to have significant health and wellbeing benefits. Delivering new and enhancing access to green spaces, including woodland should also be supported through design codes. Supporting information uploaded with this response- Woodland Trust Residential Developments and Trees (Jan 2019).
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	Question - Development Management Policies	We recommend including policy on incorporating trees on development sites, for urban greening and for canopy cover, as well as specifying ratios for tree replacement where existing trees are lost.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	General	Development which would result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees should not be permitted. The Woodland Trust objects to the allocation of sites which include ancient woodland. Such allocations would be inconsistent with the enhanced protection afforded ancient woodland in the NPPF. We recommend redrawing the site boundaries to exclude areas of ancient woodland from land allocated for development. Where ancient woodland is adjacent to a development site, we recommend that as a precautionary principle, a minimum 50 metre buffer should be maintained between a development and the ancient woodland, including through the construction phase, unless the applicant can demonstrate very clearly how a smaller buffer would suffice. We attach a file indicating sites where we have identified a potential impact on ancient woodland. The Woodland Trust is grateful for the opportunity to respond to the Cherwell Local Plan. We would be happy to discuss any of the policy issues raised in our response as the plan develops. Supporting information uploaded with this response- Woodland Trust Local Authority Tree Strategies (July 2016) and Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees.
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-103	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Site is adjacent to is adjacent to: Arncott Wood ASNW, SP61721693, 8.85 Ha
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-138	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Looks adjacent to: Kennel Copse ASNW SP52552740, 1.43 Ha at NE corner
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-085	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Adjacent to: Longlands Spinney ASNW SP60702444 0.38 Ha. Site Contains Veteran tree: 191405 pedunculate oak and Notable trees: 191399, 191400, 191401, 1919402, 191403, 191404, 191408, 191409, 191411 All pedunculate oak
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-112	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Site Contains Veteran tree: 191405 pedunculate oak and Notable trees: 191399, 191400, 191401, 1919402, 191403, 191404, 191408, 191409, 191411 All pedunculate oak
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-060	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Adjacent (north of site): Weston Wood, ASNW, SP54451771, 19.06 Ha. Forms two sides of border of: Oddington Wood, ASNW, SP55001690, 0.66 Ha
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-132	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. CONTAINS: Longlands Spinney, ASNW, SP60702443, 0.38 Ha
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-060	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Adjacent to: Weston Wood, ASNW, SP54521764, 19.06 Ha
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-164	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. CONTAINS: Meizen Copse, ASNW, SP54571855 0.31 Ha
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-173	Supporting information uploaded with this response- Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. CONTAINS: Unnamed ASNW, SP55251957, 0.44 Ha

LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-205	Supporting information uploaded with this response - Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Contains Notable Tree Tree Id: 220814 Common Ash
LPR-B-948	The Woodland Trust	LPR-A-029	Supporting information uploaded with this response - Assessment of impact on ancient woodland and ancient & veteran trees. Adjacent to AW - Gravenhill Wood, ASNW, SP58772039, 18.42 Ha
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 1	It appears that many aspects of 10 & 11 are key if local quality of life is to be maintained and yet at odds with developing the area significantly. The vision needs to clearly differentiate between what development is suitable for a town and what is suitable for rural villages/open countryside and farmland.
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 2	KO1 : I am in disagreement with this. What is sufficient? In reality, what is increasingly happening is that people from the cities are now buying second homes, in Cherwell, driving up the prices for everyone. There will therefore never be "sufficient" homes as the more you build, the more people move to the area and then commute to other urban areas, often outside Cherwell, to work.
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 4	Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. Online retail is here to stay and therefore it appears that our towns are too large to support the levels of high street shopping people wish to do. Banbury town centre is in serious decline, made worse by the Gateway development. It seems appropriate, if we are to protect our rural villages, historic locations and maintain a strong farming presence in the area, to redevelop the excess retail outlets back into attractive but modest, town housing which is affordable
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Question - Separation Distances	No. In many countries in Europe, small, low-rise apartment blocks are common and popular. Any development needs to include a mix of styles which optimises the use of the land. Building large, executive homes with a third of an acre attracts commuters from outside Cherwell , contributing little to the local economy, and is wasteful of our precious green land & countryside. Far better to house more people with a mix of apartments, terraced & semi detached housing & family homes, creating a real sense of community. Ultimately, there have to be compromises & far better to provide more starter homes at affordable prices than a myriad of little boxes, all separated but without character and too expensive
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Protection of historic environment is important. Many villages are of historic interest, often because of their connection to the surrounding working farmland. Building around such villages & reducing the farmland and natural open spaces seriously diminishes our heritage and historic environment of Cherwell, turning such villages into little more than a "snapshot" of a bygone era with no historical context. Protection of rural villages is key to Cherwell's development plan. Tacking on estate after estate, such as has happened in Adderbury and Bloxham, is having a negative impact on the historic environment of both locations.
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Question - Transport & Connectivity	measures to help drive less - Continued home working, increase the capacity and capability to treat sick patients at the Horton and save frequent trips to Oxford.
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 19	to the north of the town to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for)

Page 21 of 48

LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. The characters and communities of local villages such as Adderbury and Bloxham have been diminished by the addition of multiple housing estates tacked on in recent years, creating a surge in the population of each. From road congestion, speeding and road safety issues to air pollution and antisocial behaviour, the impact of new housing in recent years has been sad to see. Much of the development has been contrary to the local council's stated objectives and local needs. Any future development in the Adderbury, Bloxham area should therefore be limited to small scale infill of 35 houses, sympathetically designed to contribute to the local character, and to prevent turning the area into little more than an extension of Banbury. Milton is a conservation village and any development in its parish on the caravan park and adjacent should therefore be part of a separate consultation this land falls into Milton and should not be viewed as part of Bloxham.
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. Neighbourhood plans were encouraged and developed at great expense- they should now be used and respected
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 32	No; no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Question - Settlement Boundaries	It seems that developers are influencing government inspectors by putting options on land, with no respect to the safeguarding of rural villages & tranquil, rural living and way of life. Perhaps therefore the only way to protect villages is by defining the settlement boundaries, to deter developers, in consultation with the villages.
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-949	Mrs F Plumb	Milton	Milton is a conservation village - any development on land within the parish, including the land adjacent to Bloxham (caravan park and field) should be subject to a separate consultation, involving Milton village. The additional traffic on the Bloxham - Adderbury road due to the extensive housing developments in both villages, is already causing serious issues (safety, pollution, reducing the rural location of the village) for Milton & diminishing its rural location.
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	yes need a policy to control redevelopment to apartments. Key criteria of a policy- suitability of location and the proposed infill to ensure it meets local needs
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 26	Other - no green belt review.
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Cycle links Already good public transport inc trains
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 27	Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 30	Other - Limit to brownfield sites or in fill only
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plan:
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 32	No - no more weight due to accessibility to urban centres
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Question - Settlement	Yes we should not be developing in green belt or beyond settlement boundaries
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-950	Chris Rogers	Islip	The proposed sites around Islip would creat a town rather than a small village. It is unnecessary development in the green belt outside of the settlement boundaries. The scheme has been driven by landowners who don't live in the village and it is purely driven by greed and money without care for the people living in the village many of whom live in the village for the green space and views across the agricultural land. The proposals would take out of production a great deal of agricultural land something we shouldn't be doing given the green agenda and buying local. We need to support our farmers not take productive land away from them.
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	Option 19	To the north of the town and to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	LPR-A-107	Object. All sites on the B4035 to the west of the town are not suitable because they will draw more traffic into the town centre (as it transits to the motorway and/or retail areas of the town) and exacerbate traffic congestion and poor air quality. Equally this part of the B4035 is straight fast road and there have already been several major accidents around the recently opened farm shop entrance. Further development here would make this more dangerous as multiple accesses would be needed to the main road. Development to the west would also start the inexorable creep to joining to the hamlet/village at Broughton



LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	LPR-A-166	Object. All sites on the B4035 to the west of the town are not suitable because they will draw more traffic into the town centre (as it transits to the motorway and/or retail areas of the town) and exacerbate traffic congestion and poor air quality. Equally this part of the B4035 is straight fast road and there have already been several major accidents around the recently opened farm shop entrance. Further development here would make this more dangerous as multiple accesses would be needed to the main road. Development to the west would also start the inexorable creep to joining to the hamlet/village at Broughton
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	LPR-A-182	Object. All sites on the B4035 to the west of the town are not suitable because they will draw more traffic into the town centre (as it transits to the motorway and/or retail areas of the town) and exacerbate traffic congestion and poor air quality. Equally this part of the B4035 is straight fast road and there have already been several major accidents around the recently opened farm shop entrance. Further development here would make this more dangerous as multiple accesses would be needed to the main road. Has recently been the subject of a planning inquiry appeal which was rejected due in part to the fact that any further development to the west would block the amenity of the views to the ancient site of Crouch Hill which is the highest point in Banbury and a major informal area for recreation. Development to the west would also start the inexorable creep to joining to the hamlet/village at Broughton
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	Keep all development as close as possible to the motorway access so the town centre is less congested by cars drawn through the centre, thus making it unfriendly to walkers and cyclists.
LPR-B-951	Jeff Ridgley	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Ensure all large housing developments have an equal size area for recreation as part of the planning agreement
LPR-B-951	Louise Edwards	Option 1	point 6) the economy is not as described, it is mainly low wage, short term and limited, and transport links are not good in rural areas. The vision is not compatible with the housing policy.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 2	Bicester Motion is not a sustainable tourist attraction - it glorifies fossil fuel use and a masculine culture, this belongs in the 1960s
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
LPR-B-951	Louise Edwards	Option 5	Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. It is important to the success of town centre that the architecture is considered as a whole. Kidlington centre is an architectural mess and not an inviting environment
LPR-B-951	Louise Edwards	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Encourage pop up shops to support young local entrepreneurs who want to try out an idea.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015. Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Ensure that water supply, and sewage disposal are above requirements to avoid local rivers and waters becoming polluted with sewage.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Green Belt	Releasing more green belt north of Oxford will destroy unique villages and habitats and result in urban sprawl.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all age areas of play
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	All local green spaces must be publicly accessible. Provide public transport to key heritage amenities and require discounted entry for local residents

LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	must include full accessibility and good quality information freely available eg maps and guides on what is available.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Don't agree with approach. The approach shouldn't be different for rural areas. Getting to transport connections from local villages requires car use. Cycling to Oxford Parkway from Islip is not safe, especially at night. Safe cycle paths are essential. Buses do not link to transport- buses from Islip don't go to Parkway or Kidlington. Use smaller public transport vehicles and increase safe cycle routes. Provide buses to the nearest centre, Kidlington. Islip is connected to Bicester and Headington but not Kidlington which is 2 miles away. Provide buses connections at Kidlington to Witney, Woodstock and Langford Lane.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 23	to the north of the town
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 24	Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. Encourage pop up shops for new businesses to try out ideas and bringing in visitors more often.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 25	Facilitate such developments through a criteria based policy
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Kidlington Infill Housing	Yes
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 27	Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	a bus service to Kidlington
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	consider an outdoor Lido pool
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Islip- the Church commissioners's bid to develop all land around Islip is shocking and irresponsible and shows no respect for the local community. Islip does need more housing but over 3,000 units would destroy the village
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 32	No more weight to facilities. Accessibility yes - walking/cycling
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Settlement	yes to avoid urban sprawl.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Parish Profile - Islip	Islip - the church commissioners bid for developing all land around the village would destroy the community. There is a need for another 50 houses but infrastructure of transport, sewage and roads must be planned as well.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Hold training days and have mentors to help communities plan.
LPR-B-952	Louise Edwards	LPR-A-223	Object. This level of increase will destroy Islip village and it will become a suburb of Kidlington. There is not enough transport, drainage or highway to permit this increase.
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 1	I think the proposed vision is sensible - broadly - but does seem to overexposure certain villages to greater development (which using legacy data to support / justify & ignoring significant ongoing issues already affecting said villages)
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 2	This is critically important but, again, I think certain aspects (climate change / healthy environments) are being selectively considered- especially when development is being focused on & decisions are being taken to ignore fields / hedgerows etc. around existing / populated areas
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury

LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 19	To the north of the town and to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11)
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes. We have to protect some sense of Banbury's history & St Mary's is a key part of that - it's short termist / opportunist development - which can never be undone.
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 22	consider further urban extensions focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Bicester
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 23	To the south of the town; to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11); and, to the west of the town
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for). Heyford Park seems to have been a smart development- multiple profile of properties, services (inc schooling, national and local retail), with significant opportunity to further expand. My concern, however, is that with increased residential, there needs to be thought given to police coverage (multiple Thames valley police have shared the lack of coverage for HP)- the council has a responsibility to ensure that with more development comes further resources to protect residents
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy. Police coverage - Adderbury, Bloxham, Deddington etc. Are all suffering from increased crime, with the local Thames Valley police being open that they are so overstretched they can't respond as needed. No more weight due to accessibility to urban centres
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Question - Settlement	I am not sure that short term "flexing" of rules is at all appropriate- unless the strategic plan is to remove all villages - they are not replaceable and some thought must be given to protecting them
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-953	Ben Twynam	Parish Profile - Adderbury	Object. Concerned around the level of development being proposed for Adderbury. The village is suffering from bad traffic/congestion & with further development this will get worse. I'm astounded that a council that talks about preservation of natural habitat, can then decide to allow more properties to be built around a village that can't support through services & needs to protect the natural habitat around the village. Crime is increasing, traffic is increasing, pollution and rubbish is increasing. The local school is already quite full and I'm unsure how significant additional houses/residents can be served appropriately. Selective /smaller scale development is important, people need houses, but the idea of 250+ new homes is crazy. Surely there are smarter decisions that can be taken on more appropriate locations (eg existing "new" neighbourhoods like Heyford Park) where the services are set up to serve a larger new population, access is more straightforward & there is less of an impact on the landscape/new development - like a significantly increased in size Adderbury would be. Historic (buildings/communities/green spaces etc) villages won't be created again so we shouldn't be short termist an ruin them using incorrect data to justify decisions.
LPR-B-954	Jen Roest	Option 26	Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses
LPR-B-954	Jen Roest	Option 27	Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential. Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close
LPR-B-954	Jen Roest	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Kidlington & the Surrounding Villages	Prioritise creating a segregated cycle route either adjacent to the road or alongside the railway line from Islip to Kidlington and Oxford. The whole village is dependent on cars unnecessarily and uses them for short journeys because a) the cycle route along the Kidlington road is far too dangerous, particular with children, and b) though the village has a train station, the frequency of trains is too low to enable anyone to use the train flexibly. There is a very large number of people keen on cycling who would love to cycle both to Kidlington and Oxford instead of using cars, but without adequate cycling routes this is not possible. It would be minimal effort and cost to create a new route to Kidlington and/or Oxford parkway but it would transform the connectivity for village residents improve our quality of life and health, as well as significantly reduce reliance on cars. This would improve the wellbeing of those in kidlington, Oxford and the surrounding areas who would benefit from recreational cycling routes to the village. Unsure where to put this comment, but just to emphasise the need for more frequent trains connecting Islip to Oxford and to Bicester. Climate change targets could more easily be met by addressing the over use of cars for short journeys. A large proportion of Islip residents would happily cycle or use the train instead of our cars for short journeys but cannot currently do so owing to the trains being far too infrequent, as well as the lack of safe cycle routes connecting us to kidlington and Oxford. The new train route connecting Oxford to Cambridge will increase train traffic substantially through the village but with no increase in frequency of trains stopping in Islip to help improve quality of life for residents themselves. This is unjust. Increase train frequency and cycle connectivity.
LPR-B-954	Jen Roest	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington

LPR-B-954	Jen Roest	Question - Kidlington Sports, Recreation and Community Needs	Improving the cycling connectivity between Islip, Kidlington, the surrounding villages and North Oxford would absolutely be improving and addressing the communities recreational options and needs as for so many of us, cycling is a both a mode of transport but also a form of recreation for us and our families. Without safe cycling routes we cannot cycle anywhere with our families. This also fits with the 20 minute neighbourhood idea. In Islip we are currently unable to access food, recreation, and other services etc., but by simply improving cycle infrastructure, we could easily enjoy these in both Kidlington and north Oxford.
LPR-B-954	Jen Roest	Option 30	Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs
LPR-B-954	Jen Roest	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-955	Kathryn Grant	LPR-A-221	Object. Some new housing would be good - on the land where the oil depot was but the proposals for thousands of houses in the area would be detrimental. There are flooding issues, traffic issues and the discrediting of the Arc proposal in general. Changes to life in general due to Covid19 are, of course, not referred to but will impact working patterns and the desirability of houses covering the green belt which impacts on our micro and general climate.
LPR-B-955	Kathryn Grant	General	It is not easy to use this form - a summary of questions at the beginning or a route map through it would have helped.
LPR-B-956	Bicester Athletics Club	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. We would remind the Council of the current Local Plan's aspiration to provide a local athletics running track (page 135). We are an established running club and are the only running club in the vicinity dedicated to junior athletes and providing coaching and competition for track and field athletes. We provide a wider service to the community. We will be assisting North Oxfordshire School Partnership in the local Bicester Cross Country Schools Competition. Very recently we hosted the first round of the Oxfordshire Sportshall Competition as well as hosting the first round of the Oxfordshire League Cross Country meeting at Bicester Heritage. These events attract athletes from right across Oxfordshire as well as other neighbouring counties. We currently use facilities provided at Bicester School. This includes use of a marked out running track on grass and lottery funded all weather jumping and runway facilities. Due to the location of these facilities, that are on top of branches growing underneath, it is cost prohibitive to provide root barriers to prevent their growth. We are currently into a massive fund raising exercise to provide funding to update these facilities and fund other equipment. We would probably be in favour of any outdoor sports provision wherever it is provided. We are not part of Bicester Sports Association and I am not aware that anybody has contacted us with regards to our specific requirements. We were not part of the Bicester Sports Field study. Bicester is a growing town with growing sporting needs. Running continues to be popular in Bicester which needs to be recognised. A failure to provide the necessary facilities will inevitably mean that we will either lose athletes to the sport or they will travel to the nearest running track facilities which are 15 miles away in either direction in Banbury and Oxford. Given the desire to reduce the need for travel, minimise climate change impacts and to secure sports facilities at our main settlements, so that they are nearer to where residents are living, it is imperative that we have a guaranteed facility for the future. Support seeking to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. The option of securing new pitch provision has not really proved effective. It is not always clear whether these are general recreational facilities or dedicated sports provision for sports clubs. As for the other option of enhancing existing facilities, that is perpetuating the status quo. We think there needs to be a definition of what is meant by main settlement. There is of course a sports hub of sorts in Chesterton. Does this count as in a main settlement? I would argue not as to use it requires travel from the main settlement to a neighbouring village. It is a shame that the sponsors of that development could not work with Bicester and sports wide to provide the necessary hub locally in Bicester. It would help if CDC engaged with the representatives of all of the main organised clubs. We are concerned as to how you are going to secure this sporting hub given the current pressures on green space in Bicester and whether there may be even some double counting if new pitch provision continues to be provided as part of a new development. I think it would show leadership if the Council were to convene a meeting of all of the interested parties to ascertain where the shortfalls are in organised sports provision and the available options for remedying this.
LPR-B-957	Catherine Thomas	LPR-A-091	Strongly object.
LPR-B-958	Elizabeth Maule	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-958	Elizabeth Maule	LPR-A-091	Object. Allowing this land to be included within the plan leaves it open to development. This is the last undeveloped corner of the village. Development of this site would conflict with the National Planning Policy with reference to transport, access, sustainable development and enjoyment of the countryside
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 1	The vision is hard to disagree with. While the word sustainable is used frequently and the energy efficiency of new developments is referred to there is no explicit reference to ensuring that active and sustainable travel are prioritized
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 2	KO8 is particularly important: CDC should make higher demands of developers to develop the transport network in the vicinity of new developments, ensuring that active travel and public transport are convenient. I cannot see strong emphasis on discouraging activities associated with global warming and encouraging greener businesses. This is implied in K10 to K19 but something explicit in the first section would be useful. KO16 is equally important. Buses, walking and cycling must be prioritised over private car use, particularly in a town like Bicester where growth will lead to more congestion and pollution. Eg cycling has been tolerated but not encouraged and car addiction has been colluded with. The language of KO16 should be strengthened to reflect that it will not be business as usual. KO 20-31: these objectives appear to be mutually exclusive unless great imagination and creativity are employed. CDC wants more houses at the same time as more places where their inhabitants want to go outside nearby to thrive on socializing, exercising and enjoying nature. This may be achievable by careful attention to the size and location of any essential new housing and business developments as well as the layout of these. Restricted on road parking or car parks at the edge of a development (with the option to pay for a space) would allow the public areas to be more congenial for people of all ages to gather, for children to play and for plants and wildlife to thrive. CDC should signal that it will be discouraging the monotonous housing estates which have predominated recently and wishes to explore exciting new models

LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. At significant transport interchanges. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Supporting	Policies whose aim is to promote businesses which are likely to thrive in a decarbonised world and sites which are easy to get to without a car.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. There appears to be some oversupply of town centre retail and business premises, but town centre shopping and leisure would be supported by judicious limitation of parking and moving motor traffic, better access by public transport and active travel.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units? A mismatch at present between need and provision, and that much of the employment being generated, at least around Bicester, is not particularly high wage. I understand there is profitability for developers in larger houses but this should be tempered by local need
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Separation Distances	Separation distances can be irrelevant when considering the efficiency and quality of life in group of dwellings. Eg terraces, flats and semi's can be very energy efficient and, so long as party walls are properly built, cause no disturbance. Shared safe space and gardens can be more valuable than a thin strip of separation between technically detached houses. New estates in Bicester seem to have fallen into a trap of building ill proportioned detached houses with tiny gardens.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 10	Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan. CDC should not diverge from the rest of the county in this matter
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Retrofitting of	I understand that retrofitting a listed building (of which there are huge numbers) would be highly problematic. Great care is needed but householders need to be reassured that they do not have to choose between historic charm and a clear conscience with regard to energy efficiency. Many will be able to afford bespoke upgrading
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 11	Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	The Eco town designation in Bicester should be reviewed, tightened and extended to show that as part of the Oxford to Cambridge Arc CDC is at the forefront of sustainable living, thereby making itself more attractive to those who value this ethos.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain. Biodiversity has diminished recently in many locations for plants and animal life. It is our duty to try to restore this, not simply demonstrate the size of the impact of a new development
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. Play opportunities should be available and encouraged in many locations in all communities. With good design places can be created for adults to chat, children to play and plants and animals to flourish in the same location
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	It can emphasise the value of communal spaces close to people's homes, making them congenial for informal meeting and activities. The layout of a cluster of houses can help or hinder. Keeping roads and cars separate can often help, making the spaces quieter and safer for children.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Strongly agree.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree with approach and should be different in rural areas. Strongly agree with the inverted triangle and travel being a determinant of location of future developments. Support limits to parking spaces in new developments or a workplace parking levy. CDC should subsidise public transport in certain places. Better infrastructure for active travel would be relatively cheap and would be a strong incentive to cycling and walking. It is difficult to work out the intended route across a junction and this discourages ambivalent users. The 2015 plan states that 31% of Cherwell's population is in rural areas. Unless they grow in keeping with the district as a whole they will become progressively less diverse and will remain difficult to get to except by car. Some growth accompanied by major improvements in public transport (probably bus), including mornings and evenings should be considered. Improved IT is also desirable. I would remove free car parking in town centres and remove parking in otherwise attractive places, eg I would charge in Bicester Sainsburys car park and remove parking from the market Sq. I would improve cycling and walking infrastructure, along the currently problematic radial routes, create more 20mph zones, increase cycle parking spaces. Local bus services do not coordinate with train times and do not run early in the morning or during the evening

LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).. Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Transport Policies	I am more familiar with national and OCC documents than local CDC ones.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. 2015 local plan has identified very large areas for greenfield development and much of this has not yet been realised. It would be inappropriate to allocate further sites for expansion until the impact of the 2015-2030 plan can be judged.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 23	It is unlikely that Bicester residents would welcome even more expansion, and it is difficult to see how expansion could avoid being urban sprawl. It would be preferable to identify large sites well outside Bicester which can have their own infrastructure and transport links incorporated.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 25	Facilitate such developments through a criteria based policy
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Bicester's Local Green Spaces	Oxford Rd: I strongly support the designation as a LGS because it is an easily accessible, long established and very much appreciated local sports ground. Young people can reach it without having to be driven there and for many it has associations going back over several generations. I am aware of complicated legal issues but suspect it was an error to agree to an alternative use. Gavray Meadows: strongly support. This could link with the green strip through Langford village to create a valuable green corridor from near the town centre to the edge. The site supports a great diversity of wildlife and should be regarded as an essential part of Bicester's natural capital.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Bicester	Remove car parking from Market Sq and reduce through traffic, address the serious problem for cyclists at the Banbury Rd/Buckingham Rd junction at the top of North St, implementation of OCC's LCWIP for Bicester. For less healthy residents, improvement to bus services.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 30	Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs. If CDC is required to identify sites of major growth very careful development of some villages will be necessary to avoid further "sprawl" of places like Bicester
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. The identification of sites should be led by a systematic analysis of potential for good communication links and infrastructure, and profile of need as determined by demographic analysis by the local authority, together with liaison with the local community, not by sites suggested by property developers. Some of these will be appropriate and some inappropriate but they have no duty to balance the complex considerations or be fair and are not likely to be acceptable to the residents, who are likely to be cautious about change. CDC must very clearly show that it is disinterested if it is required to make contentious decisions
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, Pharmacy, Regular Bus services. These are not further services but explanation of the above. Secondary school and GP surgery are features of quite large settlements. Ready access to these is plainly important. Smaller villages without them are likely to be satellites of larger ones which have them. Development of a site should be on the basis of potential infrastructure rather than existing; otherwise there is bound to be enlargement of the already large villages. Yes- public transport. If weight were given to walking and cycling to the local centre this would lead towards an undesirable coalescence of the larger towns and their nearby villages
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Question - Settlement	Don't know. to create a boundary would lead to the expectation that the area within it would be developed.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	Caversfield	Four sites have been suggested in Caversfield. Three of them would edge towards making Caversfield continuous with Bicester and the fourth would represent a doubling in the size of the village at a stroke. These would be a radical change from the trend of recent years as Caversfield is a category C village. Plainly any further consideration of these sites should only be after a rational and disinterested review of strategy.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	LPR-A-039	Object. This would physically link Caversfield with the rest of Bicester and Elmsbrook, contributing to "urban sprawl" or coalescence. It would begin to remove the rural corridor which runs north between Fringford Rd and Banbury Rd.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	LPR-A-147	Object. Development would radically alter the village, perhaps doubling it. Unless motor access was restricted to Buckingham Rd it could easily damage the relatively quiet and popular route for walkers and cyclists from Bicester out into the country along Fringford Rd. Such a large plan should not be considered further until there has been a disinterested review of the future of the village, which is currently category C.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	LPR-A-003	Object. Would further contribute to this merging with Bicester, if eventually approved. Important to decide strategy rather than respond to speculative development proposals.
LPR-B-959	Rick Highes	LPR-A-144	Object. Would further contribute to this merging with Bicester, if eventually approved. Important to decide strategy rather than respond to speculative development proposals.
LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries

LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	Option 28	Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way
LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Protect the Green Belt
LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs
LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	Option 32	No more weight due to availability of facilities. No more weight due to accessibility to urban centres
LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-960	Michael Graham	LPR-A-223	Object. Development is inappropriate in size, part of it is floodplain. Islip needs to be maintained as a village and development here contravenes the green belt. This a greedy land grab by the church in attempt to cash in.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Town Centre Uses (Banbury,	Better parking in town centres. Encouragement of shops that cater to all not just the young.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 6	Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? Why is this no already policy if these are standards?
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Separation Distances	Yes. Why are these not already in place. Cramping houses in is not good for the soul, let alone the environment.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Housing Policies	I don't understand whether introducing standards for accessibility would be better or worse than continuing to use building regulations.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Not all existing building stock is historic buildings. Buildings need to be utilises otherwise they decay further.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation? Make all new homes have solar powered heating for water as a minimum
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Green Belt	I'm not sure I completely understand what is meant by 'local green belt' matters but if too many houses are built around Banbury the villages will no longer be villages but suburbs of Banbury!
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the. Impact of the proposals. Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of onsite provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use. The sports provision that is currently being provided needs to be maintained to standard that ensures it is fit for use until such a time that new pitches can be provided. Relying on schools to provided and maintain these pitches is not the answer as they are unable to provided sufficient resources to do this- or if they have sufficient resources are unwilling to use them to maintain the facilities. Specifically, the astro at Coppers School, Bicester
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	All buildings should be included in SPD, then the 'bread factory' on the canal in Banbury would look more attractive and not like some unconsidered factory when viewing from Spiceball park.

LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Why is work not included in the 20 minute neighbourhood? As there is a need to be more sustainable being able to get to work in a sustainable should surely be a factor in this decision.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree with approach which should be different for rural areas. More frequent buses at convenient times and to more locations. Better upkeep of off road footpaths connecting villages - winter turns them into inaccessible quagmires.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).. Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure. Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 19	to the north of the town
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 20	consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission? In converting shops etc into homes the conversions would still need to meet the minimum standards set out in housing internal space standards or those determined as a 'better' minimum.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 21	Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area. Please don't let it be ugly or closed in like the new development that is currently going up.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	I don't very often drive into Banbury, other than go to the supermarket or out of town centre, as there are limited facilities in town. We live in a village, the school, doctors, dentists and childrens clubs are all in neighbouring villages.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Housing in rural areas should be relative to the facilities that are available and their capacity to expand. If village schools are full where do the children go to school? Most village schools have limited capacity to expand. Rural roads are not designed for lots of traffic, specifically 'rush hour traffic'
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 31	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Village Hall. Pubs - ones that are pubs, not restaurants residing in pubs. No more weight due to accessibility to urban centres. What are you expecting people to travel in to urban areas to do that they don't need a car for? You need a car to go to the supermarket and out of town shopping centre and it's not practical for most people to walk or cycle 5 miles to swimming lessons
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Settlement	Yes. villages should retain the village identity, not become sprawling housing estates
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Parish Profile	i can't find the relevant information in the document
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Providing further support to Parish Councils to actively encourage villagers to engage with undertaking a neighbourhood plan. Our Parish Council, they did not have the capacity to undertake a plan and the village did not rise to the occasion - i'm not party as to why as we were not resident in this village at the time. People have strong opinions about local planning, but not always enough time or energy to tackle something they don't as a collective really understand.
LPR-B-961	Amy Jackson	Option 30	The plan sent out appeared to be a plan with lots of areas allocated for housing! A number of the fields in our village 'they considered would be suitable for development' are under water for most of the winter! This may have been a well intentioned call, but has raised a lot of concerns over land that will probably never be built on as it's waterlogged for months on end or a flood plain. Not that that has ever stopped planners from awarding inappropriate planning permission on floodplains before. Why are there so many sites attached to villages that would double or treble the size of the village? There was no guidance regarding number of houses on any of these sites or the provision of additional facilities. Just tick boxes indicating the type of facility with no regard to whether the facility in question can actually service the size of the village without the additional housing marked on the plan.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 3	At significant transport interchanges
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Question - Supporting	Developing apprenticeships
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes



LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units? The housing does actually need to be affordable. A 200k+ starting cost for a first time house buyer isn't affordable
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Question - Separation Distances	New housing is so close together. Roads are small and parking a nightmare
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 12	Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. We need to protect nature and our environment as much as possible.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 15	Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Protect our local footpaths. Stop building on all our farm land.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Protect farm land and green open space. Housing to be in keeping with the land.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 19	Develop empty buildings in town
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Question - Important Views of Banbury	Yes - View of across the county side are being ruined by housing development
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 20	allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Funding to develop these areas.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. One of the reasons I love banbury and the surrounding area is not we are 10 mins from the countryside. This is being ruined by building work. We need to save our green spaces. During Covid one of the few things people had was walking. For mental health and wellbeing this is so important. We need to stop using every green space for housing.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Villages know the best sites, where will flood etc.
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. Village needs to have the capacity for more housing especially schools. Yes - Both
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 33	Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-962	Emma Hunt	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land. We are in a climate crisis. Any sustainable future needs understanding that on finitie planet, growth of the built environment at expense of nature must stop. Existing populations more than big enough so we need a circular economy not economic growth. Existing Green Belt essential buffer against loss of nature.
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Retrofitting is key to combatting climate change and doesn't harm heritage.
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?

LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	Conserving all existing nature is crucial to combating climate change and providing resilience to its severe effects which are already locked in.
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Question - Green Belt	Green Belt must be preserved. Its key to combating climate change and heart of our identity.
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible. Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals;. Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Loss of biodiversity and general nature must be safeguarded against and rewilding should be considered.
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 14	Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach. Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined with areas of play. Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Existing Green Belt secures historic landscapes and view
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	yes
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).. Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy?
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries. Green Belt must be protected
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre. Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential
LPR-B-963	Dr Igor Dyson	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington. Support LGS proposed by KDW
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 1	Overall the vision is good. But it is very important that goal 4) (choice of homes) is not pursued so as to be out of balance with goals 10) 11) and 14) [protection of environment, enhancing of biodiversity, and support for rural communities, including maintenance of villages for thriving communities. Some of the proposed housing developments in my area (Islip), if approved, risk merging this thriving village into larger conurbations, and thereby losing its distinctive character and natural environment (including farmland and spaces for natural amenities).
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 2	KO4 is of general importance. But Ko5 Ko6 and Ko9 are particularly important to sustaining quality of life in this largely rural area, and thereby its attractiveness for incoming labour, families and businesses. Balance in infrastructure and housing development is essential to avoid interfering with those mentioned key goals
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 5	Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes. Maintaining the character of our town centres, established over centuries, is essential to the area's character
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units? More housing for rural workers (eg agricultural, care workers) will be essential, which means affordable housing
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?

LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 8	Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 9	Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes? Accessibility provision is weak and must be strengthened.
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Question - Separation Distances	separation distances essential for preserving the character of existing communities
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Question - Green Belt	It is essential for the largely rural character of the area that the Green Belt is substantially maintained
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 12	Secure as close to the site as possible
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 14	Integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	The overall balance of housing areas (new versus historic) needs to be maintained so far as possible, as this extent of historic housing is a distinctive feature of this region
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree with approach which should be different for rural areas. Rural areas in the region currently have poor transport. Transport needs to be improved, and to do this, low carbon tech should be used, to balance overall environmental costs
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).. Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 22	Limit development at Bicester to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages is absolutely essential to maintain the region's distinctive character. An undifferentiated spread of buildings between Bicester and Kidlington will reduce amenities and life quality, and discourage people from moving into the area by removing the areas most attractive feature - its differentiated built and natural landscape
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 23	to the north of the town
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 24	Consider the use of an Article 4 Direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential without the need for planning permission
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 25	Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 26	Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 27	Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington Village Centre
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 28	Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. The Oxfordshire strategic vision includes sustaining 'a rich and diverse environment, comprising high quality places where people want to live, work, visit and invest' - reflected also in the Oxfordshire draft plan vision and Cherwell's own goals, as a 'predominantly rural area'. A key element in that diverse environment is the area's villages, separate communities that are distinct and have their own identity. It is vital that important housing growth is done carefully in line with what each community need, so as to sustain those communities, and not to merge or damage them.
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Housing is a need in rural areas, and it needs to be addressed in consultation with local communities. Only in this way will diversity and support for the planning process be sustained
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. Yes- public transport
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Question - Settlement	yes - otherwise the distinctive shape and character of existing communities will inevitably be lost, damaging diversity
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 33	Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the economy
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. The balance between necessary housing growth and the region's distinctive diversity of the natural and built environment, is essential, if the area is to remain attractive
LPR-B-964	Nick Couldry	LPR-A-223	Object. Proposes a very major expansion of housing in an area of distinctive character, which is currently wellbalanced. The area of Islip needs at most a further 50/60 homes if the village is to retain its character as a diverse but distinct village (in a way consistent with the Cherwell and Oxfordshire visions). The proposals for new homes around the village will a) be excessive (ie beyond local housing needs), b) be likely to lack sufficient infrastructure, c) will risk destroying the current thriving village community by damaging one of its main shared amenities: access to the surrounding countryside, including farming land worked by local famers who are part of the village community. Point c) will damage the local biodiversity, which is distinctive and important.
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Option 1	all I can see is building, building, building. when will it stop?

LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Option 3	Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Question - Transport & Connectivity	The fact that the proposal I mentioned includes a link road as a sweetener holds no ground. There's a road there already.
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Option 18	Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Option 19	Nowhere
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Question - Banbury's Open Spaces	Enhanced - Spiceball Park is poor - many people travel elsewhere just to go to a decent park. St Nicholas Park in Warwick should be an example of where Spiceball needs to get to. It's depressing, embarrassing and dangerous.
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district
LPR-B-965	Julie Blake	LPR-A-185	Object. This proposal is devastating to the countryside in Nethercote and Overthorpe. When will our beautiful fields and open green spaces be valued by the council? This monstrosity of storage/industrial units will be a blot on our landscape forever and should never be allowed. And what about the people who live on this site? They would be surrounded by warehouses. Shame on anyone who decides this is a good idea. We should be preserving green space and not building on it.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 1	Creating a separate Vision for Cherwell could be confusing and it could in part duplicate what is within the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Strategic element is left to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. Support the Draft Oxfordshire Plan Vision (July 2021) in particular we would highlight our support for the following part of the draft vision: "A wide range of secure and good quality housing options are within reach for all. Existing and new communities are well connected, integrated, distinct, attractive and desirable places to live; their design and layouts facilitate healthy lifestyles and sustainable travel options."
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 2	Five spatial strategy options does not fit comfortably with the questions set out in the representations form. Clarity is needed in the next consultation so that question numbers/references are consistent with the relevant parts of the Consultation Document. The emerging Local Plan will need to meet the tests of soundness within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and this includes being consistent with the emerging Arc Spatial Framework and the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050. The latter includes spatial options for the entire County and it acknowledges that ultimately through testing, the preferred approach is likely to comprise a selection from among the spatial options within the consultation document.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 3	We consider that land at Upper Heyford is a sustainable location than should feature in the spatial options.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 4	A mix of spatial options is required and this is likely to include land at Upper Heyford.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 6	The answer must be led by the evidence on need for housing, both market and affordable housing and viability testing to understand what the market can sustain. The latest position is the Oxfordshire Councils Growth Needs Assessment also known as OGNA. This and any evolution of the July 2021 publication is intended to help shape the appropriate level and distribution of housing and employment in Oxfordshire over the period to 2050. Levels of affordable housing has to be tested through viability appraisal so as to avoid an adverse impact on housing delivery in the context of housing targets and place-making within the vision and objectives for the plan. The viability testing is also necessary in the context of new emerging policy requirements placed on the provision of new development, for example in relation to carbon targets and provision of biodiversity net gain. Affordable housing need is infrequently met even in authority areas where the overall housing requirements are met in some of the accounting years. Models of delivery of affordable housing must extend beyond s.106 provision as part of market led housing development. 'Exception to Policy' development rarely features fully in local plans and yet the NPPF requires planning policies to identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. This includes provision of a range of affordable housing types and tenures and small sites. It is likely that a range of affordable housing levels is appropriate across the District to reflect variations in the local market and this needs to be set within development viability appraisal work and whether the Council intends to rely solely on s.106 as the mechanism for securing contributions without introducing the Community Infrastructure Levy.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 7	The NPPF seeks a range of housing types which includes variation in different forms of tenure. The definition of affordable housing in NPPF, under Annex 2: Glossary and relevant policy advice and guidance from Government is relevant here. This seeks by and large to expand the range of tenures defined as affordable including affordable housing for rent, discount market sales and starter homes. These must feature within policy or guidance within the District. As it is so difficult to plan for delivery over such a plan period it might be more appropriate not to define a tenure split in policy but refer to evidence guiding discussions on sites set within preparation of supplementary planning guidance on affordable housing.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 8	Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements that exceed the minimum national standards set by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether additional standards in their area can be justified, with evidence to support the policies in their Local Plans. The need for affordable housing, we see this issue as being Oxfordshirewide and not one that should be decided upon by each local authority. The Oxfordshire authorities should consider the impact of applying NDSS or above as part of the Local Plan viability assessment. In considering the costs relating to optional Building Regulation requirements or the NDSS, authorities could take account of the evidence in the Impact Assessment issued alongside the Housing Standards Review.

LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Question - Policies for Climate change, Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy	We support the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in order to tackle Climate Change. The focus of this effort should be on developing strategies that go beyond development plan policy and that turn sustainability targets and commitments into reality. We support the principle of sustainable design and construction, subject to seeing the proposed detail including the specific targets and appraisal of the targets in deliverability and viability terms. This is a matter, we feel, for the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. The bigger challenge in terms of reducing carbon emissions from built development is to address existing stock; both residential and non-residential. The Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Plan should contain policies that allow for enhanced sustainable design for regeneration and refurbishment of existing buildings, including those with heritage value. We support the principle of increasing the capacity of renewable energy sources, and note the content of the emerging Oxfordshire Plan 2050, which has a target for 100% of energy needs for major developments to be met from renewable energy sources. We have expressed concerns about this objective as it is not clear on what scale this would apply i.e. those renewables to be provided within the administrative area of the County. Decarbonising the grid is a national objective and includes sources of supply that are offshore. A more localised approach is not therefore appropriate. Equally, the objective should be set on a phased basis, subject to an impact assessment and reflecting national objectives. We question whether there are sufficient technical solutions available at this time that are affordable to all for all major development (assumed to be 10 dwellings and above and 1,000 sq.m and above) to be supplied solely by renewable energy sources. Further viability analysis is therefore required in order to establish a realistic and achievable target. In relation to Water Efficiency, we request a technical assessment be undertaken of the potential to reduce further levels of usage below 110 litres per person per day. Whilst the objective has merits given the effects of Climate Change, there are concerns about the impact on deliverability of homes
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 12	This is another matter which could be dealt with County-wide and is included in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. We welcome the aspiration within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 for Biodiversity Gain. The proposed target of 20% biodiversity net gain as a benchmark for the whole of Oxfordshire goes beyond the Government's currently stated intention as set out in the Environment Act 2021. In order for this objective to be shown to be reasonable, we have requested that further analysis is provided along with greater detail of the policy and how it is intended to operate. The 2050 Plan is able to set a more aspirational target than that set in national legislation, but any such increase needs to be fully evidenced to show it is achievable and will not adversely impact on the viability and hence delivery of development at the target levels required. An alternative policy option which we advocate is to consider a phased introduction of the policy, with increasing levels of net gain over the plan period, subject to monitoring outcomes. This is a County-wide matter.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 13	This is another matter which could be dealt with County-wide and is included in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. We welcome the aspiration within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 for Biodiversity Gain. The proposed target of 20% biodiversity net gain as a benchmark for the whole of Oxfordshire goes beyond the Government's currently stated intention as set out in the Environment Act 2021. In order for this objective to be shown to be reasonable, we have requested that further analysis is provided along with greater detail of the policy and how it is intended to operate. The 2050 Plan is able to set a more aspirational target than that set in national legislation, but any such increase needs to be fully evidenced to show it is achievable and will not adversely impact on the viability and hence delivery of development at the target levels required. An alternative policy option which we advocate is to consider a phased introduction of the policy, with increasing levels of net gain over the plan period, subject to monitoring outcomes. This is a County-wide matter.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	This is another matter which could be dealt with County-wide and is included in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. We welcome the aspiration within the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 for Biodiversity Gain. The proposed target of 20% biodiversity net gain as a benchmark for the whole of Oxfordshire goes beyond the Government's currently stated intention as set out in the Environment Act 2021. In order for this objective to be shown to be reasonable, we have requested that further analysis is provided along with greater detail of the policy and how it is intended to operate. The 2050 Plan is able to set a more aspirational target than that set in national legislation, but any such increase needs to be fully evidenced to show it is achievable and will not adversely impact on the viability and hence delivery of development at the target levels required. An alternative policy option which we advocate is to consider a phased introduction of the policy, with increasing levels of net gain over the plan period, subject to monitoring outcomes. This is a County-wide matter.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	The NPPF, in particular section 12 Achieving Well Designed Places, is relevant for this topic. Policy can set standards and this can be illustrated/explained through supplementary planning guidance at the County-level.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	This is a useful concept but one which needs exploring to see about a 'real world' implementation.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Transport and connectivity are vitally important aspects of place-making for sustainable development and to realise objectives of net zero. Spatial options for new development influence performance from the outset. Land on the edge of urban areas which are well connected or can become well connected through public transport and walking and cycling are typically preferable to options more difficult to connect up to higher order settlements with the range of services and amenities.
LPR-B-966	Savills for New College Oxford	Option 29	Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for). Heyford Park/Upper Heyford is a sustainable location for additional growth, that is deliverable. It should be one of the spatial options for additional growth along the lines of Banbury and Bicester
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 3	A combination of all the above. Small businesses need to be sited more rurally to give people a chance to work where they live and not travel.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 4	Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 6	Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units? Homes built as 'affordable housing' should have restrictions stating that they can't be rented out for 10 years to prevent landlords buying them all up

LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 7	Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent? Homes built as 'affordable housing' should have restrictions stating that they can't be rented out for 10 years to prevent landlords buying them all up
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Question - Separation Distances	Yes
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Question - Biodiversity & the Natural Environment	Provide seeds so that communities can plant bee and insect feeding flowers on verges, hedgerows and suitable open spaces.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Priority needs to be given to digital infrastructure. To have mobile phone blackspots is rubbish in this technological age. Also the same applies to broadband, it should all be fibre all the way to the house. Also if you don't want people to use cars to commute to towns then you have to promote cycling and motorcycling as alternatives and provide buses more than once a week. Better bus service to villages. Better motorcycle parking.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 19	to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11) and to the west of the town
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 21	Leave it alone. It's already developed too much.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Question - Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury	A useful bus service to and from the villages. Free Motorcycle/Moped parking with security.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs. Development in villages should be proportionate. to overwhelm a village with too many new homes will adversely affect residents. If every village adds 10% of their current stock in new homes it will be gradual and proportionate. If you want villages to back your plans then you need to support the village ie consider the other things needed to function. It's already impossible to get a Drs appointment in Cropredy, if you don't provide additional health support it will be ridiculous. Cropredy has approx. 300 homes, the current development plans could see 150 homes built. That's way too much for a community.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 31	Use a combination of the above. Development in villages should be proportionate. to overwhelm a village with too many new homes will adversely affect residents. If every village adds 10% of their current stock in new homes it will be gradual and proportionate. If you want villages to back your plans then you need to support the village ie consider the other things needed to function. It's already impossible to get a Drs appointment in Cropredy, if you don't provide additional health support it will be ridiculous. Cropredy has approx. 300 homes, the current development plans could see 150 homes built. That's way too much for a community.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Village Hall, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Pharmacy, Regular Bus services. Yes- Both
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Parish Profile - Cropredy	The proposed development of Cropredy is massively disproportionate to the current size of the village. The new development land would double the size of the village whilst many nearby villages have no planned development at all
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Question - Neighbourhood Planning	Talk to them and make sure all villages share the burden.
LPR-B-967	Heather Nicholls	Cropredy	The size of Cropredy would be double by the proposed sites. That's too much when other nearby villages have none. We all need to share the burden. We all have to bear the burden of increased housing but it needs to be no more than a 10% of a villages current size and all village need to take their share. Services like GPs need to be available in those communities, transport links to villages need to be made that are actually useful to residents. Housing needs to be mixed with at least 50% social/starter homes with limits on what can be bought for renting out

LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 1	1) There is nothing in the proposal about energy production, the level of development would result in a huge amount of emissions and lost nature during construction and a massive increase in pollution there after. Irreversible change. 2) New developments should be built to the maximum potential and should be focused on brown field land, not green field. 3) Yes neighbourhoods should be sustainable and positively impact the existing local community, not bulldoze and destroy what little amount of neighbourhoods are left. Most developments do not integrate with existing communities and are marketed to 'outsiders' who come to the area to commute in and out of it. This is not sustainable or positive. 4) Needs should be clearly defined. Choice is a luxury. When a problem is identified, the right solution for all involved should be found. 5) Agree needs to be significant investment in local infrastructure. 6) Agree, but only if growth is sustainable. 7) This is not well defined and doesn't clearly state what it aims to achieve. 8) Cherwell needs to work on this- it is not known for that. 9) This is a good target. Needs defining what this will look like and how it will be achieved 10) Absolutely agree, but it is more than market towns- the villages surrounding them are critical to the overall character of Cherwell. Most are earmarked to be over developed. 11) Only where appropriate should enhanced biodiversity be aimed for. The environment should be protected. 12) Agree 13) The investment should cover the entire community, not just new developments. 14) Agree but needs to be defined better. Not clear.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 2	KO1 - Should be to identify areas where housing and employment can be enhanced. It should not just be about finding land. The fact this is number one speaks volumes. KO8 - Infrastructure is crumbling and you want to put more pressure on it. It needs major investment to handle current volume. KO9- Absolutely key, yet placed at the bottom of the list. KO10 - Promote net zero but do not promote developments. This is not a benefit to the environment. KO12- Any development should have no impact. KO14 - What on earth is green and blue infrastructure? KO18 - this should be the priority of new build. Missing Critical Objective - Ensure new developments do not destroy the rich heritage.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 3	At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. Mostly on previously developed land
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 4	Provide a mixture of the above
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 5	A mix of the two
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 6	Decrease the amount of affordable housing. It brings in low socioeconomic people who are given houses. If needed, increase it in Banbury and Bicester where there is more employment, reduce it completely in villages. If they need affordable housing, they should be housed near work, near travel hubs so they can easily get jobs, work hard and then work towards moving to a nicer village. I've seen first hand who lives in affordable housing - most don't work and are being given houses that they don't respect. It destroys neighbourhoods. I've moved twice because of social housing.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 7	Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 8	Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? They should be a minimum requirement. There should be no luxury to this or incentivise people to use this as a 'easy' way to live
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 9	Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Housing Policies	Yes, focus on brownfield sites, keep affordable housing to a minimum in villages.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Separation Distances	This is needed to stop developer packing too many houses into a small space.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Travelling Communities	They shouldn't have any right to using land or facilities if they are not paying for them.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 10	Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Retrofitting of Historic	Its very simple. Maintain what is historically important - facades, details, etc - and marry these with the most suitable applications.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 11	Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Green Belt	Green belt should be protected. Only when there is no other alternative should it be considered. We are rapidly losing this in the middle of a climate emergency. Future generations will be disgusted with the way we are destroying the environment to build poor quality homes
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 12	Stop the development of the site
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 13	Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b) demonstrate environmental net gain
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 14	Provide children's play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 15	Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Protecting the Historic Environment	Yes - an development should not change the local environment - for nature or those who live there. If it does, it should be stopped immediately.

LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Achieving Good Design & 'Beauty'	Stipulate the design of houses, stop major developments in villages.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - 20-Minute Neighbourhoods	Agree
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Transport & Connectivity	Agree with approach but should be different for rural areas. Better, more reliable, more convenient, greener, cheaper travel would encourage less driving
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 16	Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).. Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure. Existing houses and buildings should also be future proofed and upgraded.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Transport Policies	A detailed review of current capacity and load to establish how far away from breaking point we are.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 17	Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to climate action, healthy place shaping, and a sustainable economy? Look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 18	limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages. Develop areas around banbury without spilling out towards villages.. Do not develop in villages
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 19	To the north of the town; to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 J.11); and, to the west of the town.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	LPR-A-152	Object - bad position, not connected or integrated, too close to Adderbury Village.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 20	Consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission? Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rule:
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 21	Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable and well designed, mixed use area
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 30	Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 31	Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs. Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans. Use a combination of the above
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 32	Yes - Primary School, Secondary School, Local Shop, GP Surgery, Regular Bus services. Travel links. Yes - Both. Rural should mean that Rural. Not potential.
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Question - Settlement	Yes. To stop villages becoming towns and everything merging
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 33	Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 34	Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district. Define valued landscapes/ landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	LPR-A-178	Object. This will destroy Adderbury. Adderbury has the most sites identified of any location in Cherwell. It doesn't have a shop- the one listed is not a proper shop - post office - the one listed is open twice a week for two hours - or the school places or travel infrastructure. Adderbury is a village, not a money pot
LPR-B-968	Tim Watson	Option 30	Totally shambolic plan that is greenwashing the plan to develop a huge amount of green land into terrible developments. Can someone please realise the damage this will do to Cherwell and the villages, communities and people in it, and put a stop to this nonsense
LPR-B-969	Martin Beck	LPR-A-091	Object. If this site is successfully included in the local plan for development it would completely contradict the Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment Village Analysis 2016 "The south and south west extent of the village is defined by the extent of the Sor Brook valley which is considered sensitive in forming the setting of the village". Further "The open nature of the south and west boundaries of the village should be preserved to maintain the characteristics of the landscape setting". If greenfield development continues at the current pace to the south of Bodicote and the north of Adderbury then within a generation the suburbs of Banbury will be sprawling towards Deddington. The irretrievable loss of character of the Sor Brook valley, criss crossed with much used public footpaths and bridleways, would remove the amenity value.