

Comments raised in consultation on PR7b

Commenter	Consultee comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Mark Gardner (local resident)	Objections in principle to development of the PR7b site: impact on flooding for homes to the north of the site, impact on wildlife, e.g. red kites, deer, stoats, foxes, badgers, otters. Urges CDC to reconsider the site and requests the site is instead made a nature reserve.	Relates to the principle of development which has already been established through the local plan process with the adoption of the Plan	None
Canal and River Trust	The canal should be considered as an integral part of the site. Improvements to the towpath will be required	The Development Brief indicates that the development is to protect and enhance the Oxford Canal Conservation Area through the creation of a high quality landscape setting adjacent to the canal and sensitively designed buildings within the developable area. There are various references within the brief to the development improving access to and along the canal towpath and providing an enhanced area of habitat as part of a green corridor adjacent to the canal.	Textual change to be made to 6.3.4 and 6.3.5 to emphasise tow path links and improvements
Canal and River Trust	Detailed comments re the bridge over the canal	These related to detailed proposals rather than specifically to the Development Brief	None
Woodland Trust	Recommends strengthening of section 6.5 with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% target for biodiversity net gain 	These are generic targets/objectives rather than specific to the Development Brief. The standards	None

	<p>across the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a tree canopy cover target for 30% across the site. • a greater than 1:1 requirement for tree replacement. • specifying UK & Ireland sourced & grown (UKISG) standards for new tree planting. • protecting and providing woodland to meet the Trust's Woodland Access Standard (the two boxes below) 	<p>go beyond the requirements of the adopted local plan policies.</p>	
Woodland Trust	<p>– That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size.</p>	<p>These are generic targets/objectives rather than specific to the Development Brief. The standards go beyond the requirements of the adopted local plan policies.</p>	None
Woodland Trust	<p>– 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.</p>	<p>These are generic targets/objectives rather than specific to the Development Brief. The standards go beyond the requirements of the adopted local plan policies.</p>	None
Woodland Trust	<p>Would ask that site layout and construction management plans ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • built elements are located at the areas of the site away from Trust's site • construction site access is away from the Trust's site • traffic access to any future development is 	<p>The proposals reflect the first bullet point and indicates vehicular access points being away from the Woodland Trust site. More detailed arrangements for access including for construction traffic will be required and assessed as part of the planning application.</p>	None

	away from the Trust's site.		
Woodland Trust	We would encourage the creation of new scrapes (ponds) connected to the existing canal-side ditch network, providing high quality habitats for invertebrates and wading birds.	The text could be tweaked to cover this	Sections 6.5 and 6.5.2 amended
Kidlington Parish Council	All houses backing onto Garden City must not exceed 2 storeys (not 2.5 storeys)	This would be expected as part of any planning application and so should be reflected in the Development Brief	6.3.1 amended
Kidlington Parish Council	Important that the drainage ditch along the site's northern boundary with Garden City is not overloaded and causes a risk to flooding for Garden City properties. The dev should lead to an improvement on the current situation	It would seem prudent for this local knowledge to be reflected in the Development Brief	Note regarding importance of not overloading existing ditches added to section 4.1, 4.2 and 6.5.2. Spur of drainage ditch and on the canal-side ditch added to relevant plans.
Kidlington Parish Council	The site should be served by two accesses, one from the roundabout and one through Croxford Gardens, and only cycle and walking should be permissible through the site	This has been discussed during the formation of the Development Brief and the current position arrived at. Development Brief to be left as is unless there is a need for OCC to change its advice	None
Kidlington Parish Council	How will the access onto the Kidlington roundabout be safely configured? The access appears to join the west service road of Oxford Road close to the roundabout	OCC is understood to be still working up these proposals and outside of the scope of the brief / more detailed than the brief would set out and outside the site red line as well	None
Kidlington Parish Council	Important that the cycle routes within the	Natural surveillance is included in the	Text amended at 6.4.5 to emphasise the

	site integrate with a strategic cycle route within Kidlington and North Oxford. Also important that the development incorporates natural surveillance to the cycle and pedestrian links proposed	development principles listed under section 6.4.5.	importance of natural surveillance where possible
Kidlington Parish Council	Important that the play area is a meaningful one that will get use by residents. Also the orchard will require ongoing engagement with KPC re management	Comment noted	None
Kidlington Parish Council	No reference to AH provision and how this integrates into the design of the dev	Mentioned in the Executive Summary (pg1), section 3.1.1 (pg14) and at section 7.0 (pg57)	None
Kidlington Parish Council	Important that the dev is distinctive and high quality compared to many new large residential developments in order to respect the setting of the listed building farmhouse and its surrounds	This would be expected as part of any planning application and is reflected in section 6.0 of the Dev Brief	None required
Begbroke Parish Council	Plans for Frieze Farm Sandy Lane is not shown, and not sure it is for the Science Park Development, or ours and Yarnton. Surely 106 money could be used to help fund a bridge at Sandy Lane and a crossing for us.	Noted, but not especially relevant to PR7b relative to other development briefs. Infrastructure requirements for all of the Development Briefs are set out in Appendix 4 of the Partial Review Plan.	None
Begbroke Parish Council	If the proposed new Railway Station is built surely keeping Sandy Lane open both ways would make sense.	Not relevant to the Development Briefs	None
Begbroke Parish Council	Why is community orchard needed when	These matters have been worked through	None

	<p>there is already a formal orchard - seems just a buzz word to make everyone feel happy. Likely that in a few years it will be neglected and a waste of space.</p>	<p>in consultation with relevant technical consultees, including that additional provision is required, and the existing orchard forms part of the setting of heritage assets and its alteration would not be appropriate.</p>	
Begbroke Parish Council	<p>Vehicular access to the roundabout is far from ideal and will push more traffic onto a narrow service road. - don't know how southbound traffic will flow.</p>	<p>This has been discussed during the formation of the Development Brief and the current position arrived at. Development Brief to be left as is unless there is a need for OCC to change its advice</p>	None
Begbroke Parish Council	<p>Part of the brief calls up resin bonded gravel as a surface for roads - not a good idea as once it cracks you can't easily repair it and given the current performance of highways dept the area will soon look awful.</p>	<p>The need for this bespoke solution is a product of the development being served only by a vehicular access from the Oxford Road roundabout. The precise finish and its maintenance will be a matter more appropriately picked up at the planning application stage – the role of the Development Brief is to guide all parties as to the type of road and finish that will be required, i.e. not the normal metalled / tarmac solution</p>	None
Begbroke Parish Council	<p>Roads need to be wide enough for on street parking and adequate visitor spaces must also be provided.</p>	<p>Noted. Required road widths are set out in the Development Brief; beyond that this is a matter more appropriately picked</p>	None

		up at planning application stage	
Begbroke Parish Council	Who is going to cover the costs and be responsible for maintaining the orchard and play areas etc?	This is set out in Appendix 4 of the Partial Review Plan and will be a matter more appropriately picked up at planning application stage	None
Oxfordshire County Council	The dev brief should be amended to make it clear whether any provision for specialist housing is expected on this site	Policy BSC4 requires sites of at least 400 dwellings to provide extra care housing, so there is no requirement here	None required
Oxfordshire County Council	The Development Brief should clearly set out how enhancement and beneficial use of the Green Belt land within the allocation will be achieved or conditioned upon an application for dev on any or all of the 25ha expected to be used for residential development	We have had regard to the positive use of the Green Belt in putting these allocations/policies together, and have identified in each case provision for open space and biodiversity etc.	6.5.3 amended to include the beneficial uses of the green belt arising from the development
Oxfordshire County Council	6.4.3 Add as first bullet point: 'The main site access must include provision for pedestrians and cyclists alongside vehicular traffic which shall be carefully designed to enable pedestrians and cyclists to comfortably connect onto the existing infrastructure.'	Agree	Amend para accordingly
Oxfordshire County Council	6.4.4 Add as a bullet point on primary street development principles: 'At least 2m wide footways on both sides of the primary street.'	Agree, provided a caveat is added that this does not appear to the primary street south of the listed building complex, for heritage reasons and to help with the transition from built	Add text "At least 2m wide footways on both sides of the primary street, <u>with the exception of the primary street to the south of the listed building complex</u>

		part of the site to the Green Belt to the south	<u>which links to the two halves of the site"</u>
Oxfordshire County Council	Add as a bullet point on secondary street development principles: 'To maintain a 2m wide provision for pedestrians on any side of the carriageway fronted by properties.'	Agree, provided a caveat is added that this does not appear to the secondary streets in the vicinity of the listed building complex	Amend as per column 1 but importantly with caveat relating to the requirement for bespoke design solutions in the vicinity of the listed building complex
Oxfordshire County Council	The County Council intends to deliver bus and cycling improvements at Kidlington Roundabout. The developer will need to liaise with the County Council's delivery team accordingly.	Noted	None
Oxfordshire County Council	There is no mention of adhering to LTN 1/20 standards within the planned development. Walking and cycling provisions must be in keeping with the principles throughout the development.	Noted, but this is a new document which post-dates the first drafts of the Development Brief. Their advice here seems to conflict with previous advice on 6.4.5 re width of access	None
Oxfordshire County Council	Para 1.2.1 Please change this bullet to read: 'to raise the standard of design and to create exemplary places which are functional, beautiful, promote health and wellbeing and which engender a sense of community'.	Agree	Amend para accordingly
Oxfordshire County Council	Para 4.2.1 Please add the following sentence: 'It is important to ensure effective connectivity between the development and	Agree	Add para

	existing community that supports active travel and reduces severance.'		
Oxfordshire County Council	Para 6.2 Consider including reference to the positive impacts on mental health. In order to ensure that the design of major developments maximises the opportunity to promote health and wellbeing, the Future Oxfordshire Partnership has developed and approved the use of a Health Impact Assessment toolkit to assess the health impacts of significant developments. Given the size of this development, the Council would expect a Health Impact Assessment to be conducted of this site to ensure that it maximises opportunities for a health enabling environment, in accordance with government's advice and national best practice.	This is intended, and inherent, and indeed the HIA is referred to in Section 6 and listed under 7.1	Section 6.2 updated to reflect the publication of the toolkit in 2021. Text consistent with 7a/6a/6b
Oxfordshire County Council	Para 6.3 This section should include a principle on green space and how it will encourage walking and cycling, biodiversity and community use.	Ditto	New bullet to section 6.3 added ' Green spaces within the site should be connected with the street layout to encourage walking and cycling and community uses, where appropriate to biodiversity objectives.

Oxfordshire County Council	Para 6.3.2 Cycle parking must be easily accessible, ideally at house frontages, to promote active travel.	This might not always be possible, but principle agreed	Text added to section 6.4.6 parking. 'It is to be easily accessible to promote active travel (ideally at the property frontage) recognising that bespoke solutions may be required in response to the site constraints and the character of individual streets.'
Oxfordshire County Council	Para 6.4.5 Reference should be made to the fact that cycling routes should support connectivity. The draft Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan (LCWIP) for Kidlington should be referred to.	This is intended, and inherent, but could be made more explicit	Reference to LCWIP added to section 6.4.5
Oxfordshire County Council	Para 6.5 The benefits of planting larger trees outweigh the overshadowing effect on gardens and windows mentioned here. In order to adapt to future changes in climate and mitigate some of the most extreme effects, large trees have been proven to significantly reduce air temperatures during hot weather and provide a natural shelter from the sun.	The two things are not mutually exclusive - larger trees should also be planted but in locations (for which there will be multiple opportunities across the site) where they will not overshadow windows	Section 6.5 amended to refer to larger trees in public open spaces and on-site boundaries.
Cllr Middleton	Would like the Council to hold developers to a high standard of sustainable development	This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
Cllr Middleton	The Council should make sure biodiversity enhancements are	This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment	None

	applied and maintained long term	than to the scope of the Development Brief	
Cllr Middleton	Seems to be a lack of health and educations provision provided for both development briefs	These matters have been worked through in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council and others to ensure that the developments provide for the additional infrastructure required	None
Cllr Middleton	Consideration into the effect on local roads the development and closure of Sandy Lane will have on traffic. Pedestrian crossing are vital pieces of infrastructure and should respond to the local need.	These matters have been worked through in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council Highways and, as far as it is applicable, reflected in the Development Brief. Beyond that, this would relate more to the planning application than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
Cllr Middleton	Recommendation to set up a local forum consisting of councillors and residents to give back feedback to the LPA and developers.	Noted	None
Dr Fajtl and Dr Abu	Development of PR7b would impact on the outlook and light of 368 Oxford Road	This relates to the principle of development and not to the Development Brief itself	None
Dr Fajtl and Dr Abu	The existing hedgerow along the boundary should be retained	The Development Brief sets out that existing hedgerows are to be retained	None
Dr Fajtl and Dr Abu	The space adjacent to the boundary should be back gardens	The Development Brief sets out that there would be no building frontages adjacent to the northern site boundary. The matter of ensuring satisfactory separation	None

		distances between existing and proposed dwellings is appropriately picked up at the planning application stage having regard to the Council's adopted guidance on such matters	
David Lock Associates for OUD	Given the interrelationships between the Partial Review sites, subject to the series of Development Briefs currently being prepared, it is imperative that the planning submissions, and planning permissions, are prepared, structured and consented in a way that ensures compatible and complementary development in terms of both design and delivery.	Noted	None
David Lock Associates for OUD	Section 7.2 should also reference the need to secure the co-ordination of design or delivery elements that are common across the PR sites	CDC officers agree and these changes to be made, with minor amendments to the 2 nd of the 4 bullet points	<p>Addition of two new bullets after the first bullet of 7.2, to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where land, services or infrastructure within the site is designed to serve wider CLPPR developments, planning applications will demonstrate how this can be co-ordinated and delivered effectively through site master-planning and S106 agreements. • Any infrastructure links or open space networks that are

		<p>common to more than one CLPPR development site will either be constructed to the site boundary or in such a way as to facilitate connection, where required, between development sites and with access to residents/public provided so as to avoid a 'ransom' position being established which prejudices effective delivery of this common infrastructure.</p> <p>Two additional bullets added after bullet three of section 7.2, and that the current bullet four is amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Obligations are to be secured via a planning agreement, entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Consistent with national planning policy and practice guidance and the Cherwell Developer Contributions SPD (February 2018), the allocation of S106 costs required to serve the development is to be agreed with the applicant to secure appropriate financial contributions and/or in-kind works under a direct delivery obligation. Subject to statutory tests, these
--	--	--

			<p>shall provide for “on site” and/or “offsite” facilities and infrastructure as required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In preparing a draft Head of Terms, it is recommended that proposals applicants should have regard to matters including the LPPR Infrastructure schedule. Where facilities and infrastructure are required to be provided on land outside the site, these are to be secured by way of proportionate planning obligations and/or through the pooling of contributions as appropriate, in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended.
Huw Mellor for Manor Oak Homes	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
Sport England	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
Highways England	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
Historic England	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
Thames Water	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None

Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
---	---	-----	------