

Appendix 2

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief	Response
London Oxford Airport	Along with PR6a and PR6b, the site is located under the flight path to/from LOA and therefore subject to noise associated with arriving/departing aircraft. The development of these sites will introduce new receptors into a potentially noisy environment. In accordance with 'agent of change' principles, the existing airport use must not be prejudiced by this. As a matter of principle OASL would prefer that these sites were not developed for noise sensitive uses like residential.	We note the point made, particularly in relation to the agent of change principle. The sites have been allocated in the Local Plan for residential development.	None	n/a
London Oxford Airport	The onus must be on the developer(s) of these sites to ensure that suitable noise conditions are created for future occupiers that accounts for the existing noise constraints associated with aircraft movements. Future planning applications should be informed by thorough noise survey and assessment work with appropriate mitigation embedded into the scheme(s) from the outset in terms of design and building specification. This should account for the full extent of aircraft movements allowed by the s106 agreement (not just the current level of activity).	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
London Oxford Airport	We recommend that the planning permission(s) for the development of these sites are subject to s.106 obligations requiring the developer(s) to formally notify future purchasers in writing of the existence of flight paths that cross the sites. This is necessary (in line with agent of change principles) in order to avoid the risk of the airport use being prejudiced in the future. We recommend that the draft briefs are updated to account for this and recommend early applicant consultation with OASL as part of pre-application discussions.	There is a need for consistency across the development briefs; those for PR7b and PR9 didn't include this. Nevertheless, we note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
SSE	Refers us back to submissions they made in 2019 during the local plan policy formation	SSE's comments have been weighed in the formulation of the LPPR.	None	n/a
BBOWT	The scale of development (across all six sites) will inevitably have a major impact in terms of vehicles and vehicle movements. If the Council is minded to proceed with the allocation of these sites for development then there are several aspects which will need to be required of developers to minimise the impact on wildlife	The principle of development has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	n/a
BBOWT	The large scale of development should be matched by large-scale habitat restoration and enhancement (paras 175 and 179 of the NPPF).	Part 10-12 of Policy PR7a sets out the detailed biodiversity requirements for the site	None	n/a
BBOWT	Welcomes the requirement for a Biodiversity Impact Assessment to be submitted as part of the planning application and a supporting Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan	Noted	None	n/a

BBOWT	Concerned that despite mitigation measures there may still be significant light pollution arising from the developments, both static lighting as well as lights from vehicles. There is an opportunity to consider lighting strategically to make this area an exemplar in terms of minimising light pollution in terms of the type of lighting used, how much is used and where it is used, as well as design of routes to avoid light pollution into wildlife-rich areas of the sites. A key principle will be to keep dark corridors where bats are using lines of trees and hedgerows as flight paths. Lighting will have to be managed carefully to ensure it is of low spill variety.	These comments are noted and it will be an important consideration for planning application proposals	None	n/a
BBOWT	In order to provide the requisite wildlife benefits, to achieve the biodiversity net gain, there should not be public access across the entire area of green infrastructure. Zoning, and a 'hierarchy' of access levels of the combination of all green areas should be carefully planned, including consideration of main paths/cycle routes/desire lines. There should be informal recreation along a network of paths and openly accessible spaces included within a mosaic of areas that are closed off by appropriate use of hedgerows, screens, fences and ditches. Broad zones might help keep some larger restricted access nature conservation blocks 'quiet' rather than fragmenting areas too much - would be simpler for residents and visitors to understand and will allow wildlife to thrive and be observed from paths, in areas defined as 'nature reserves' with interpretation to the public to explain their value	We note the points made. The Partial Review identifies other sites where nature conservation is the priority but for PR7a the allocation is for formal sports and green infrastructure. It may be that the BIA and BIMP may lead to areas needing to be protected to meet the requirements of Policy PR7a but this information has not been available to inform preparation of the brief, and would need to be determined at the planning application stage.	None	n/a
BBOWT	It is important that details are provided for how green infrastructure will be managed in the long term (i.e. forever). Once developed it can be reasonably assumed that the developed land will have buildings on forever. Therefore the GI should be retained forever and with an endowment fund to pay for its management forever.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
BBOWT	The GI including wildlife habitats should be managed forever and proposals should recognise this. Long term management plans and effective, sensitive management will be needed for the site. Ideally, there would be a funded officer role to coordinate and oversee this, which could be alongside or sharing a role as a community engagement officer; this role could be delivered by an officer in an external organisation with appropriate experience.	Noted	None	n/a
BBOWT	The wording "The scheme is to include provision of in-built bird and bat boxes, wildlife connectivity between gardens and the provision of designated green walls and roofs where appropriate/viable" should be amended to: "A scheme for the provision of exemplary biodiversity in the built environment, including street trees with large canopies, wildflower road verges, wildlife connectivity between gardens, provision of designated green walls and roofs, and bird and bat boxes integrated into buildings." The order is important and the current order suggests that bird and bat boxes are more important than wildlife connectivity. The reality is that the provision of natural wildlife habitat, including within the built environment, is much more valuable for wildlife than bird and bat boxes.	The point is very much noted, including the order of the sentence	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Page 50 amended.

BBOWT	The development should be exemplary in terms of integrating biodiversity features. The Development Brief should require the development to maximise the provision of green rooves and install solar panels on rooves which are not green rooves. Wildlife connectivity between gardens can be achieved by allowing gaps in fencing and walls for hedgehogs and other small animals to roam. This can be used to raise community awareness of wildlife.	These points are very much noted. With regard to green rooves, they are mentioned at Section 6.0 ("The scheme is to include provision of in-built bird and bat boxes, wildlife connectivity between gardens and the provision of designated green walls and roofs where viable") and further text is not considered necessary	None	n/a
BBOWT	Expects that wildlife-rich areas will be protected during construction and afterwards/during occupation. This will require long-term monitoring and sensitive management to a plan with developer-funded oversight. We welcome the requirement to retain mature trees and manage these sensitively.	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
BBOWT	Any future planning application would need to be judged robustly against the biodiversity and green space elements of the Cherwell Local Plan and the NPPF. The impact on protected species, designated sites and any Species and Habitats of Principal Importance for Conservation in England (as listed under Section 41 of NERC Act (2006)) that may be affected will need to be assessed in relation to any planning applications on these sites. A full suite of habitat and species surveys should be carried out. The species surveys should address priority and notable species in addition to protected species. Surveys should include breeding bird surveys and, on the arable land, surveys for arable plants.	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
BBOWT	Off-site compensation should be provided for farmland birds where these are impacted (and on-site compensation where this is possible – substantial nature reserves areas with zoning to control public access would be needed in this case since many of these species are not suited to built-up areas or disturbance by people, dogs and cats) to ensure that populations are maintained in line with the above quoted legislation. Such compensation is commonly required within Cherwell District, as evidenced for example by the NW Bicester Eco-Town development.	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
BBOWT	We are very concerned that there is no natural green space proposed for this development, as all of it will be formal sports facilities and informal parkland. Even if our suggested 50ha nature reserve at site 6a were to be implemented this would not be easily accessible for residents of site 7a. Therefore, an area of c. 16ha of green space should be provided at site 7a, some of which should be natural green space managed for wildlife.	The site is 32ha; the Local Plan policy for the site states that residential development will comprise 21ha and the remaining 11ha will be for provision of "formal sports facilities for the development and for the wider community and green infrastructure within the Green Belt". In this context it will not be possible to provide an area of 16ha of green space within the site.	None	n/a

BBOWT	In order to provide the substantial benefits for wildlife that will be needed to achieve a net gain in biodiversity that is focused primarily on site then there should not be public access across the entire area of the green infrastructure but instead there should be informal recreation along a network of paths and openly accessible spaces included within a mosaic of areas that are closed off by appropriate use of hedgerows, screens, fencing and ditches.	This is noted above	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Place the taller buildings to the north of the lower (south facing) buildings to increase the light and warmth from sunlight to all properties. This applies to the proposed properties on the north side of PR7a the side as well as to those on the south side, near the Kidlington roundabout.	Having regard to the layout shown at Figure 15 this should be achievable in certain places across the site, but it would not seem appropriate to make this a stipulation given the potential impact on dwelling numbers and other development principles	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Use the south facing rooves, over the living areas of the properties for electricity generating panels to assist with lowering the heating costs for these properties.	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Suggest an entrance into the cemetery from inside the housing estate to facilitate safer passage for cyclists and walkers.	This seems sensible and could/should be added to the Development Brief	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Fig 17 and other diagrams amended to show connection into cycleway on eastern side. Text at 6.4.3 amended to reference proposed connection.
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Where that play area is, on the Water Eaton lane side, its very wet and boggy, not sure this area will be able to house a play area.	Noted	Move the northern red asterisk more northward/north-westward towards the new walking/cycling route	Figure 13 and others amended to show play area to the north of the area at risk of flooding.
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Do not plant the proposed larger trees and hedges at the south of the housing, these will only block sunlight and warmth. These can be planted on the sides of the busy roads to help reduce the noise and pollution.	This seems sensible and could/should be added to the Development Brief		5th bullet point on page 50 amended to include reference to planting larger trees where overshadowing will not impact on properties. The text already notes that smaller trees should be planted where overshadowing needs to be minimised. Also, due to the relocation of the proposed allotments, the proposed new hedgerow is no longer to the south of properties.

Gosford & Water Eaton PC	The formal sports facilities MUST NOT take over the whole of the area set aside for public parkland. This leisure area must remain for use for all residents, not only for sports lovers.	The 11ha for non-resi is to be provided for formal sports facilities and green infrastructure, i.e. within the 11ha area both elements will need to be provided. At page 47, it is stated that 4ha of the 11ha will be formal sports facilities, with the other 7ha comprising an enhanced area of woodland, new woodland planting and informal public parkland	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	The development brief envisages some housing of 2-3 storeys and some of 2-2.5 storeys. Housing backing onto Water Eaton Lane and Beagles Close properties should be limited to no more than 2 storeys or at the very most 2 2 ½ storeys. The character of the housing on Water Eaton Lane and Beagles Close is 2 storey. There are no 3 storey houses. There are a few properties with rooflights set into their roofs but these properties are only 2 storey in overall height because any extra living space is in the roof space.	The development backing onto Beagles Close would not exceed 2-2.5 storeys. At the moment there is a 2-3 storey block in the centre of the site which backs onto Water Eaton Lane. There is generally more than sufficient separation distance to properties on Water Eaton Lane to make 3 storey development acceptable in some instances. Where the development block is deeper, and the Water Eaton Lane residential properties shallower, there would be more justification for the heights to be restricted to 2-2.5 storeys	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Figure 15 amended to show 2-2.5 storeys immediately adjacent to Water Eaton Lane. Text at 6.3.2 4th bullet amended to reference 2-2.5 storeys adjacent to Water Eaton Lane where existing plots are shallower.
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	On page 19 of the development brief under '4.2.2 Heritage and Townscape Character', it states that 'development should be sensitive to the historic development pattern of Water Eaton Lane' and that design should 'consider appropriate building heights and character relating to the existing residential character of the surrounding area.' Therefore, housing backing onto or overlooking properties on Water Eaton Lane and Beagles Close should be limited to no more than 2 storeys (even if it has rooflights) or, at the absolute maximum, 2.5 storeys. Also, developers must be held rigorously to any limits set. No semantic wriggling to squeeze in an extra half storey should be allowed. Please press for these limits on height for buildings in the new development. A 3 storey building overlooking our houses and gardens would lead to considerable loss of privacy and amenity.	As per above. An appropriate solution for this development block may be to permit 3 storeys fronting the spine road through the site and limit the height to 2-2.5 storeys on rear elevations / elevations facing Water Eaton Lane	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Amended, as above
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	The new housing on PR7a should be set as far back away from the boundaries of existing housing on Water Eaton Lane and Beagles Close as possible and certainly to be of greater distance than the minimum required. Some of the new housing is shown as right up against the boundaries of the last five properties at the southern end of Water Eaton Lane and some of the properties on Beagles Close. The housing backing onto the properties at the end of Water Eaton Lane is envisaged to be 2-3 storeys, that by Beagles Close 2-2.5. The existing houses and gardens at the southern end of Water Eaton Lane and some of the properties on Beagles Close are going to be uncomfortably overlooked, losing privacy, quiet, light, pleasing views and amenity.	Separation distances are required to be at least 22 metres. It would be appropriate to seek greater distances given the extent of the change that neighbours would experience, and where there is a difference in height between proposed buildings and the neighbours (e.g. 4 additional metres per storey difference), but in some instances it may not be possible to insist on greater distances.	None	n/a

Gosford & Water Eaton PC	The planners should bear in mind that release of the green belt has given the developers of the PR7a site and other similar sites a substantial windfall and that such developers should therefore be required to mitigate the ill effects that will be imposed on the owners of existing properties.	Noted	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	It must be noted that this development is in Gosford and Water Eaton Parish not Kidlington Parish.	Noted	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	The land designated as green infrastructure must be maintained as a public open space separate from the formal sports provision to maintain the green gap between Oxford and Gosford/Kidlington.	Noted	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Retention of all existing hedgerows and trees is vital to retain existing green infrastructure	Noted	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Careful consideration must be given to the development phase and its affect on adjacent houses	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Play area specification must include provision for maintenance. The design of the sports provision must be agreed with the parish council.	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Forum (SSMNF)	Wishes to register a request to be consulted on the progress of the development briefs and any development proposals at every stage	Noted	None	n/a
SSMNF	Together with PR6a and PR6b the site comprises a gateway into Oxford and is of great importance that their development reflects this importance and takes the opportunity to provide a genuinely 21st century development in terms of high quality design and low carbon development	Noted	None	n/a
SSMNF	It is thus disappointing that these briefs do not suggest this level of imaginative planning and do not reflect contemporary public concerns about quality of development and design, climate change and sustainability/ regeneration including a commitment to passive house standards, and best practice in traffic calmed safe neighbourhoods. Rather, they reflect a piecemeal approach, and lack of holistic vision.	The objectives of the Development Brief include to provide comprehensive development of the site, to require high quality design, and to require traffic calmed safe neighbourhoods. Each Development Brief sets out a vision for the respective site.	None	n/a

SSMNF	Nor do the briefs suggest the ambition made possible by the very large increase in land value that will arise from the development of these three greenfield sites. This uplift to landowners and developers gives Cherwell District Council significant leverage to secure an exceptional development, but this ambition does not appear to be recognized in the three development briefs. Nor is there any recognition of the need to have an overage scheme in place to allow for increases in planning gains as land values and houses prices rise over the long timescales of these developments.	It is important that there is consistency across the six development briefs, and the briefs for PR7b and PR9 don't include text in this regard. In addition, Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites	None	n/a
SSMNF	Furthermore, the proximity of the sites to each other strongly suggests to the Forum that there should be an overarching planning framework to ensure the sites are developed in coordination with clear timescales, phasing, and infrastructure provision (for example traffic, public transport, cycling and pedestrian planning) to secure an integrated approach	Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites	None	n/a
SSMNF	The development of these sites and others in the Kidlington area will significantly reduce the size and quality of the Green Belt and therefore it is of great importance that new development provides adequate compensation in terms of development quality and environmental protection in and around these sites to reflect the scale of this loss. Moreover, there is a need to make a significant, specific and tangible commitment to increase biodiversity.	Noted	None	n/a
SSMNF	Development of the PR sites will have significant implications for our area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The loss of high quality Green Belt •The implications of increased demand for public services (such as GPs, pharmacies, schools, libraries, social care, policing) in Summertown and North Oxford – who is to provide/fund these additional services? •The implications for water and sewage provision given the appalling overflows currently taking place •The lack of clarity about exactly who the new housing will be for? For example what does 'affordable' housing mean? How much housing will there be for the elderly and disabled and for those with special housing needs? Is the housing goes to be at passive house standards or above? •How will the increase in traffic through our neighbourhood? What safety by design measures are to be taken for pedestrians and cyclists? •The precise impact of development on landscape, trees, biodiversity, and public access particularly to the east of PR6A is unclear. Any changes to landscape and trees should be strictly phased and evolutionary, mitigating any damage to the environment 	Loss of Green Belt - The principle of development has been established through the adoption. Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements across the PR sites; these would be funded by the site developers. Housing - 50% must be Affordable Housing; green belt land has been released for housing on the basis of meeting Oxford's unmet need; Policy BSC4 of the Local Plan requires an appropriate housing mix and provision on sites of this size for extra care, and encourages the provision of specialist housing for older and/or disabled people and those with mental health needs. Impacts re traffic, trees, biodiversity, etc. - this will be a matter for the planning application assessment	None	n/a

SSMNF	We note there is much in the development briefs about sustainability but little about the mechanism that will ensure high design standards of sustainability, and high levels of service provision that these Gateway sites deserve. Leaving it to section 106 agreements alone is highly risky. The danger is that the failures of the Oxford North scheme, which the Forum objected to due to loss of affordable housing provision, will be repeated again with the community losing out due to the use of 'viability' arguments when planning applications are submitted – unless the terms of the planning briefs are as precise and exacting as they need to be.	Section 106 agreements will take precedence over and have more weight than the development brief. Development of the site will be required to conform to the LPPR requirements. The development briefs are intended to guide landowners/developers as to how the site(s) should be developed.	None	n/a
SSMNF	We believe there is an opportunity to create an innovative delivery mechanism - a public/ private partnership to deliver these schemes and capture land value, comprising opportunities for community land trusts and community participation in protecting and managing the environment.	Noted	None	n/a
SSMNF	There is opportunity for CDC to promote a community self-build scheme for the PR sites as they have so successfully at Graven Hill in Bicester	There is no planning policy requirement for the provision of self-build as part of the development	None	n/a
Mark Fransham	Emphasises the importance of seizing the opportunity to dramatically improve cycling and walking provision for the Kidlington-Summertown-Oxford route. References the 8th Feb 2022 fatality. Would like to see the development briefs adopt a 'Vision Zero' approach to reduce pedestrian and cycling deaths to zero. Central to this is the provision of segregated routes, separating pedestrians from cyclists from motor vehicles, reduction in speeds and safe road design, and must be design for the convenience of pedestrians and cyclists, deprioritising the convenience and speed of motor vehicles	The objectives of segregating traffic are captured in the development brief. It will be a matter for the planning application assessment to ensure these objectives have been met with the proposed development	None	n/a
Mark Fransham	Fast, priority, segregated and direct routes for cyclists and pedestrians on the Kidlington-Summertown-Oxford route are essential	Noted	None	n/a
Mark Fransham	Would like to see the development briefs incorporate a complete redesign of the Kidlington roundabout. The current sketches for a redesigned roundabout are car-centred and unfit for purpose, designed like a motorway junction and regular site of accidents. 11th Feb 2022 a car came off Kidlington roundabout and hit a tree; on 8th March 2022 a HGV hit a car.	Very much noted, but this is beyond the remit of the development brief as it falls outside the site. The development brief is not able to require more than the Local Plan policy	None	n/a

Mark Fransham	The development briefs should include unambiguous instructions that cycle paths have to be LTN1/20 compliant and that shared paths on this site are unacceptable; the north-south cycle and walking route cannot be a shared path; any new cycle/walking crossings cannot be shared. The existing Bicester Rd shared path must be converted into a LTN1/20 compliant cycleway with a separate footway; developing PR7a has to be conditional on safe, segregated, direct and priority access to Kidlington and Summertown for cyclists and pedestrians.	This is captured in the Development Brief, e.g. Page 32 / Figure 16.	None	n/a
David Peddy	This is an unwarranted intrusion into green belt land with damage to flora & fauna; valuable recreational facilities and creating congestion for which no provision is being made Housing will create unacceptable pressure on road, medical, hospital and school facilities	This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR	None	n/a
Patricia Newman	Two extra vehicular access points are proposed in the draft plan. There are already two access roads that open onto the Bicester road (Water Eaton Lane junction and the Cemetery entrance and exit). Adding two more vehicular access points along the Bicester Road will result in additional congestion along the Road. One extra access point rather than two would prevent extra congestion along the Road. Extra congestion will also be compounded by the extra bus stops to the North of Bicester road.	The last sentence relates to the principle of development. The overall amount of traffic generated by this development would be the same irrespective of whether there are one or two accesses. It is a better urban design and highway solution to have two accesses, and this is a requirement of the policy for the site	None	n/a
Patricia Newman	The extra traffic from the additional housing will increase the NO2 emissions along the Bicester road. The NO2 levels were previously above national standards and the NO2 emissions are not now currently monitored at the Watereaton junction, despite many large lorries and vehicles using the road as a "rat run" to avoid Peartree Roundabout. What measures will be in place to mitigate the increased NO2 levels along the Bicester road with increased car use? Will the NO2 levels be monitored?	This is noted, and will be a matter for the planning application	None	n/a
Patricia Newman	Also, the increased vehicle use along the Bicester road from the additional housing will add to the extra traffic from the additional housing at the PR6a and PR6b sites. There will also be additional traffic along the Oxford Road via the Kidlington Roundabout from the new homes proposed at Stratfield Break.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR	None	n/a
Patricia Newman	Will the council consider preventing lorries and large vehicles from using the Bicester Road? Currently, large transport vehicles frequently use the Bicester Road as a rat run rather than using Pear Tree Roundabout or the A 34.	This is noted, and will be a matter for the planning application	None	n/a

Patricia Newman	<p>The draft plan proposes a formal sports ground towards the roundabout and it includes a car park. How can this be environmentally sustainable when there is an existing train station, Park and Ride and bus service very close to the proposed site? A cycle park would be more appropriate to discourage car use.</p> <p>If the proposed Stratford Break proposals go ahead, there will be additional sports and parking facilities either side of Frieze Way.</p>	<p>Although alternative modes of transport will be encouraged and promoted, one can expect a proportion of uses to arrive by car. It would be better to accommodate car parking in a safe way rather than it become ad hoc through the residential part of the development and on surrounding roads.</p>	None	n/a
Patricia Newman	<p>The PR7a site currently has flooding issues at the Cemetery and in the field by Beagles Close.</p> <p>The site is also very close to the flood plain and river Cherwell. How carefully are the flood risk mitigation issues and drainage issues going to be implemented at a time of climate change/crisis, on a low-lying site that floods, and is close to the river? What responsibility will the council take to prevent flooding in this area?</p>	<p>This will be a matter for the planning application and, if and when applications are approved, for monitoring and enforcement.</p>	None	n/a
Patricia Newman	<p>Will there be a pedestrian link from the PR7a housing site to the proposed primary school on the PR6 site, to discourage car use for the school run?</p>	Yes	None	n/a
Patricia Newman	<p>What extra food and health care facilities will be provided for the proposed three new sites that will discourage car use?</p>	<p>Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites</p>	None	n/a
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	<p>There are numerous references throughout the development brief to there being existing allotment provision to the east of the cemetery. Those allotments no longer exist, were only ever temporary in nature, and were never authorised through any planning permission. They existed as a temporary use of the land supported by Kidlington Parish Council to occupy land acquired by the Parish Council for the purpose of an extension to the existing cemetery. Understands from conversations with Kidlington Parish Council that their success as an allotment site was limited due to the inadequacy of the soils present as a growing medium. The site has now ceased to be used as an allotment site. Please remove all references in the development brief to this land as allotments. The perceived benefit of locating new allotments adjacent to those allotments is misplaced.</p>	<p>The allotments did benefit from a temporary consent (ref. 12/00291/F). Policy PR7a requires the allotments to be provided within the developable area of the site. It would not be appropriate for the Development Brief to stray from this. However, noting the parish council's comment re waterlogging, consideration will be given to an alternative location within the developable area.</p>	<p>The allotments to be relocated towards the southern edge of the developable area</p>	<p>References to existing allotments changed throughout to former allotments; figure 13 and others amended to indicate allotments to the north of the sports pitches; residential development shown on land to the south of the existing allotments; text of report at sections 6.3.1, 6.4.2, 6.4.6, 6.5 changed to reflect new proposed location for allotments.</p>

Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	<p>The allotments should be located within the Green Belt in the land to the south of the site. There is a much more logical and coherent design solution in locating the proposed allotments within the land to the South of the site, in the Green Belt, adjacent to the other outdoor recreational uses proposed in the form of playing pitches. Here allotment holders will be able to gain access and make use of the community clubhouse building and, for example, it may also be appropriate to accommodate both a water supply and any necessary equipment building for the management of the allotments in conjunction with the clubhouse. Moreover, being located here would enable allotment holders to benefit from the shared use of the proposed car park related to the other community uses, representing a more sustainable and efficient use of land, than creating 2 separate carpark areas in the site which could not benefit from shared use. Para 149 of the NPPF confirms that allotments are an appropriate use in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Policy PR7a requires the allotments to be provided within the developable area of the site. It would not be appropriate for the Development Brief to stray from this. However, noting the parish council's comment re waterlogging, consideration will be given to an alternative location within the developable area.</p>	See above	Amended, as above
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	<p>The two landowners have worked closely to ensure their respective proposals are consistent with each other and meet the objectives of the development brief in providing a comprehensive redevelopment of the site. To this end, they have reached agreement that the cemetery extension land required by policy PR7a should be accommodated to the north of the existing cemetery within the land controlled by Hill. Barwood expect this to be confirmed in Hill's own response to this Brief. The development brief can be amended to remove any uncertainty as to the cemetery extension location</p>	<p>Hill has not submitted a response to the development brief. Officers have contacted them to seek clarification. Should they confirm as Barwood indicate, then the development brief could or should be amended to clarify that the cemetery expansion will be to the north of the existing cemetery and the allotment expansion will be to the south.</p>	<p>Amend the development brief to clarify that the cemetery expansion will be to the north of the existing cemetery and the allotment expansion will be to the south</p>	<p>Figure 13 and others amended to show cemetery expansion to the north of existing cemetery. Text throughout amended to reflect the northern location.</p>
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	<p>Agrees with the need identified at para 7.2 of the development brief that the site should be developed in a comprehensive manner to secure delivery of the policy PR7a requirements; the Brief establishes clear design and delivery parameters, but could go further in recognising and acknowledging that the site will be subject to two planning applications from each of the respective landowners. Barwood will be submitting an outline planning application in early 2022 and it is expected Hill will submit a full planning application later this year. The landowners are committed to delivering proportionate contributions in terms of planning gain commensurate with their own development areas. Whilst there is nothing within section 7.2 of the development brief which mitigates against such a planning application strategy, given the certainty that this is the strategy being followed at this time, it is considered that the Brief might be strengthened by a specific acknowledgement and acceptance of that approach.</p>	<p>It does not seem imperative to state that there will be two (or four) applications. The requirements of paragraph 7.2 will apply irrespective of the number of parcels, landowners and/or applications. Para 3.2.1 notes that there are two land promoters.</p>	None	n/a

Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	Policy PR7a 9(g) requires the site to deliver biodiversity net gain. Section 4.2.4 of the development brief sets out how this net gain might be achieved. Section 1.2.2 of the development brief confirms that the Brief's status will be a material consideration endorsed by Council Members but will not be a SPD nor will it introduce new planning policy. At this time the legal requirement for a 10% net gain is not yet in place and so the reference in the Brief to 10% should be removed. If it becomes mandated by the Act, prior to any application's determination, then it will need to be addressed in the context of that legislation at that time. At present, however, there is no legal or policy basis to support reference to the 10% figure in the Brief	The point is noted. However, the statements at para 47 are factual and do not in themselves stipulate a requirement.	None	n/a
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	Ref 7.1, the Brief references the need for submission of an EIA screening request at application stage. The Secretary of State has issued a screening opinion in relation to this site (Ref: PCU/EIASCRC3105/3282999) on the 11th October 2021 confirming that the proposal is not EIA development. The Brief should be updated to reflect this.	This is noted; the need for consistency across all of the development briefs needs to be balanced against the fact that in this instance the SoS has issued a screening opinion	Text to be added/amended to refer to the fact that the screening opinion has been issued, confirming that development of this site is not EIA development.	Section 7.1, page 59 amended to reflect the screening opinion.
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	The development brief has extended the playing pitch requirement established by the evidence of the playing pitch strategy presented to the LPPR examination. The evidence presented to the Hearings identified a pre-existing shortage of 1 AGP (Artificial Grass Pitch) in Kidlington, rising to 2 by 2031. Priority sites were identified for the delivery of the AGPs at Stratfield Brake and Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre. The requirement for Grass Pitches at PR7a, is between 1ha and 4ha dependent on whether those 2 No. AGP are provided in accordance with the identified priority locations. If the 2 No. AGP are provided the requirement at PR7a, is only for 1ha of Grass Pitch provision. The Development Brief (6.5.2) now proposes 4ha of playing pitches, including at least one artificial (AGP) pitch. This level of provision is not supported by Policy, nor by the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy as evidenced at the Examination into the Partial Review.	4 ha of pitch provision is the need identified in the Playing Pitch Strategy 2018. The strategy is currently being updated, with completion scheduled for November. There is no justification at the present time for the development brief to be amended	None	n/a

Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	<p>In determining the need for additional playing pitches, it is firstly necessary to understand what commitment there is to deliver the two AGPs identified by the Playing Pitch strategy for Stratfield Brake and the Leisure Centre. It is noted that the Partial Review Appendix 4 (point 65), establishes an expectation that all the PR sites will make a financial contribution to enhanced AGP provision at the Leisure Centre. If the AGP's are not being provided, then there is an expectation that PR7a will provide 4ha of grass playing pitches. However, this need will have arisen in part to address pre-existing deficiencies. It is not the responsibility of the developers of PR7a to meet existing sports pitch deficiencies, and whilst they are willing to make land available to address this need, the provision will need to be funded externally. It is also clear that provision on the PR7a site is in part, meeting needs arising from PR7b, and it will therefore be necessary for the Council to ensure that necessary and proportionate contributions from the PR7b site and indeed from Hill as developers of the northern part of PR7a, will be made available to aid delivery of onsite provision at PR7a.</p>	<p>The requirement is set out in the policy for the site and in Appendix 4 of the LPPR such that no change is necessary. Whilst the requirement exceeds the adopted standards for provision this is consistent with the approach to other Partial Review sites, with significant green infrastructure provision being required in part as compensatory improvements to the Green Belt (environmental, quality and accessibility) following Green Belt release. The provision on PR7a is also in part meeting the needs arising from the other PR sites - we agree that necessary and proportionate contributions will need to be sought</p>	None	n/a
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	<p>The Development Brief should either provide flexibility based around these options or justify a singular preferred option. However, there is no evidential basis to support the provision requirement as currently of 4ha of grass playing pitch incorporating 1 AGP. These observations were made to the draft Development Brief in 2020, and it is disappointing that the text remains unaltered with no additional explanation or evidential basis to justify its retention.</p>	See above	None	n/a
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	<p>6.4.2 - It is noted that the Development Principles indicate that an emergency access is not required for the site. However, recognising the different land ownerships, the Brief ought to acknowledge that the Barwood site, if it were to come forward in advance of the Hill land, would require a secondary emergency access point. Barwood propose such an access, at a point where there is a desire line for a combined Pedestrian/Cycle access to tie into the signalised crossing by the Sainsbury foodstore. Agreement has been reached between the parties for the precise setting out and location of the crossover of the Primary Street between the two land holdings. If it would be of assistance to the Council in finalising the Brief the detailed coordinates for the crossing point can be provided to its author, Alan Baxter Associates.</p>	Noted	None	n/a

Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	Section 6.5: Green Infrastructure Reference to street tree species (page 50) being 'agreed by OCC' should be amended to 'agreed by Cherwell District Council in consultation with OCC', to reflect that CDC are the determining authority for any planning application or Reserved Matters submission.	Agreed	Page 50, 4th bullet from the end, change "to be agreed with OCC" to "to be agreed by Cherwell District Council in consultation with OCC"	page 50, 4th bullet from the end, changed "to be agreed with occ" to "to be agreed by cherwell district council in consultation with occ"
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	It is not clear where the provision of Green Walls or Roofs is expected within the site. As a residential site, with all the example residential typologies referencing traditional construction with pitched roofs, it is unclear where the need for green walls or roofs would arise on site. It is suggested that this reference is removed.	It is considered that in the context of the green infrastructure requirements it is appropriate to encourage and aspire to the provision of green walls and roofs.	None	n/a
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	Section 6.5.2: Sports The reference to the sports clubhouse, could usefully identify the need for this to be for community use, and for the club room to have a joint community meeting room function. This would address a specific need of the Water Eaton and Gosford Parish Council to secure a permanent meeting room location in their Parish. This could also be referenced in section 6.6, under the heading of Community Infrastructure.	Noted. The adopted standards for sports provision require changing facilities to accompany pitch provision where appropriate. Some community use seems sensible provided it does not compete with the sports provision. The Partial Review Plan indicates all sites contributing to provision of formal sports facilities at PR7a.	Text to be amended accordingly, to identify that the sports pavilion may also be put to community use - and that the club room to have a joint community meeting room function - with the caveat that such use does not preclude the sports provision need from being met.	Text of section 6.5.2 and 6.6 amended.
Keith Fenwick (land promoter)	Section 6.5.3: Blue Infrastructure The requirement to retain existing water courses, other ditches and ponds, should include a 'wherever possible' caveat. There may be legitimate drainage engineering reasons for not retaining all features where they currently exist, in order to deliver a site wide sustainable drainage solution. It is not clear why there is a necessity for a 3m easement either side of existing drainage ditches. Dependent upon size of ditches, it may be acceptable for features such as shared drives, to sit within these zones.	The words 'wherever possible' would remove the teeth of the requirement. It may be appropriate instead to add the words "unless in particular instances it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that this is not possible" but there is also a need for consistency across the development briefs and no such caveat was added to the briefs for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	Cemetery extension - The cemetery extension is shown located to the north or south side of the existing site. We would have preferred that this be sited to the east and to have the cemetery open to the residential road passing north-south. This will give generally a more open aspect to the development. We are not convinced about having residential development backing onto the cemetery. If it cannot be on the east side of the existing cemetery we would prefer the north side, as we understand the drainage will be easier. If this is the case there will need to be adequate road crossing of the existing ditch provided by the developer.	There may be a more open aspect within the PR7a development if the cemetery was sited east of the existing site, but as experienced from the Bicester Road the converse is true. The layout for the site shows development facing the cemetery, separated from the cemetery by a new public walking & cycling route and a service road to new dwellings. In light of Barwoods' response to the consultation, and subject to Hill's confirmation, the cemetery expansion will be confirmed as being to the north	As per above	Amended, as above

Kidlington Parish Council	<p>We are concerned as to whether any investigation has been carried out to assess whether the chosen site for the cemetery was suitable for burials and would gain the approval of the Environment Agency. Bearing in mind the extensive problems with the existing cemetery site we would like to see a comprehensive drainage system implemented by the developer to drain the extension to the cemetery and be satisfied that the drainage to the existing site is not affected in anyway. Such drainage system should form part of the overall drainage strategy for the whole development. We will need to know how the cemetery will be laid out and the details of access arrangement.</p> <p>We are concerned how the site will be left e.g. turfed, levelled off or fully laid out. We are also concerned about the existing trees and access routes in relation to surrounding development and existing cemetery. KPC wish to be consulted on all these aspects.</p>	No such investigation has been carried out. Other comments here are duly noted.	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	<p>Drainage - We understand that the surface water drainage will incorporate sustainable drainage however we note the nature of green infrastructure, including the cemetery extension. We think it is necessary to emphasis the importance of effective drainage over the site, for example the need for specifics with the design of SUDS.</p> <p>From our experience in developing the cemetery site we understand that ground water levels in winter can be very high and we would like assurances that any proposal will be robust in dealing with drainage and avoid any impact on properties in Water Eaton Lane and Beagles Close.</p>	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	<p>Allotments - It should be noted that the temporary allotments at the rear of the cemetery site were abandoned due to waterlogging preventing many plots being cultivated. Detailed investigations will be required to establish the level of drainage required for any allotment site. The siting of allotments is shown by the cemetery. We would prefer that the allotments are integrated into the area near the sports pitches within the developable area.</p> <p>We would strongly object to any attempt by the developers to move the allotments out of the developable area and into the Green Belt, because this would reduce the attractions of the remaining Green Belt area, as a vital residue of the Kidlington gap.</p> <p>If they are to be sited close to the cemetery then it will be important that the allotments are properly screened from the cemetery and do not use the access to the cemetery as we do not want allotment holders passing through the cemetery. This has caused problems when the rear of the existing cemetery was used for temporary allotments.</p>	We would agree that the allotments should be in the developable area as required by Policy PR7a. We note the point re the temporary site east of the cemetery. It seems appropriate for the location of the allotments to be amended in line with the parish council's comments.	The allotments to be relocated towards the southern edge of the developable area	Amended, as above

Kidlington Parish Council	Connectivity - We want to see clear links between green spaces throughout the site, which shows clear connectivity for walkers, and cyclist to access the green ring proposed by Kidlington PC	Noted	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	Pedestrian Crossing of the Bicester Road - We were told that any additional crossing of the Bicester Road would be a normal Zebra crossing. Bearing in mind the speed with which traffic passes down Bicester Road we would want to see Pelican crossings only	Noted	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	Public Transport P6 - Good bus links into Kidlington. Please note this has changed with the reduction in services in recent months, major changes to the 2 service and the cessation of the 500 serving Woodstock and the Oxford Parkway Park and Ride	Noted	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	Green Ring P15 - Oxford Green Belt Way: we need greater clarity on the continuity of the green link around Kidlington through this site?	The concerns regarding connectivity are noted, and are addressed in the development brief	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	20mph P39 Page 39 indicates that there should be a maximum design speed of 20mph for roads – this should be linked into a wider proposal for 20mph speed limit in all primarily residential roads across Kidlington and GWE plus main road section between Yarnton Road and Lyne Road	Noted	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	Open Space and Sports Facilities P54 4 hectares of playing field for football are included in the brief. There is no reference to include an ATP . We feel that there is a need for an ATP and this may be a suitable location. This should refer to the sports this is to be directed towards and if the ATP to have floodlighting (normally the case to maximise hours of use). Is the pavilion to be provided by the developer?	Our communities infrastructure team advises there is no evidence of need for an ATP surface at the site. The requirement as set out in Appendix 4 of the LPPR is for 2x 3G football pitches and 1x cricket ground. CDC will project manage the construction of new pitches and pavilion in conjunction with local stakeholders.	None	n/a
Kidlington Parish Council	Affordable housing provision – only minimal reference in the text, which should give greater clarity. We consider that this should be emphasised in accordance with the principles set out in the Partial Review of the local plan	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a

OCC	<p>Green Belt - 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 development.</p> <p>In addition, if any land outside of the allocation is included in an application, that land would be Green Belt, therefore it would be appropriate to indicate in the development brief how that land should be used. We suggest a new initial paragraph at the start of 6.5 which is headed 'Green infrastructure' as follows:</p> <p>'Some 11 hectares of the land allocated and contained in this development brief is retained as Green Belt. Figure 9 shows the location of the Green Belt land. All the Green Belt land within the allocation will be used for Green Belt purposes, including sports pitches. All of the land to the east of the allocated site is Green Belt and if any of that is included in the development site, it will need to be identified for Green Belt purposes.'</p>	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.	The section early in the DB on green belt to be added to	Text of section 6.5 amended. Reference to land outside the allocated boundary has not been included as this is outside the remit of the development brief.
OCC	<p>Specialist Housing</p> <p>Policy BSC 4 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (adopted July 2015) requires housing sites such as this to 'provide a minimum of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings as part of the overall mix' and includes some flexibility on the requirement. Policy BSC 4 envisages Land Use Class C3 uses. The development brief should be amended to make it clear that provision for specialist housing is expected on this site. The County Council has a particular interest in affordable extra care housing, and it may be that the extra care dwellings on this site could be part of the affordable housing provided on this site.</p> <p>We suggest adding a new paragraph under 5.1 on page 23 following the paragraph which details the requirements of Policy PR7a as follows:</p> <p>'A minimum of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings are required as part of the overall mix of the 430 homes in accordance with Policy BSC 4 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1. Whether extra care dwellings are part of the affordable housing requirement on the site will be determined through the planning application process.'</p>	This is correct but not imperative for the development brief to state this under 5.1. It may be appropriate for para 7.1 to be amended, but is also important for there to be consistency across the briefs. The Local Plan policy requirement stands irrespective of whether it is reiterated in the development brief.	None	n/a
OCC	<p>Safeguarded Aggregate Rail Depot</p> <p>Adjacent to the allocation site, on the eastern side of the A34 and railway line, there is a safeguarded aggregate rail depot under Policy M9 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. This is operated by Hanson. The aggregate rail depot should be shown in Figure 9 and Figure 11 and it would also benefit from being included in Section 3.2.4 of the development brief and referenced in 4.1 under 'site constraints'.</p> <p>Although we expect that the depot is not a significant constraint for this site, given the closer noise from the A34, it should nevertheless be highlighted in the development brief.</p>	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Reference to aggregate rail depot added to figures 9 and 11, section 3.2.4 and 4.1.

OCC	<p>Digital Infrastructure</p> <p>We suggest adding a new paragraph under 6.8 'utilities and infrastructure' on page 58 to address the importance of digital infrastructure and need for full fibre installation at the build phase. 'Advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social wellbeing. Consideration should be given to the fact that any new homes or commercial premises planned to be built have 21st century digital infrastructure installed at the build phase. Developers should be required to engage with a telecommunications network provider to provide a full fibre connection to each residential/business premise. This will help mitigate environmental impacts of any proposed development as people will be better able to work from home, reducing unnecessary journeys. Moreover, digital infrastructure provides the backbone for building a low carbon economy.'</p>	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
OCC	<p>Oxford United Proposal at Stratfield Brake</p> <p>Since the production of this draft development brief, there has been a proposal put to Oxfordshire County Council as landowner by Oxford United to consider the potential to lease land at Stratfield Brake. Following a report to Oxfordshire County Council's Cabinet on 18th January 2022, a public consultation was held, and a further report prepared for Cabinet on 15th March 2022. As this response is being sent in advance of the Cabinet meeting, no decision has been made at the time of writing. We recommend this is brought to the attention of the Planning Committee when making a decision on this development brief, as it may be that text should be added to the development brief to reflect whatever decisions are made.</p> <p>Site PR7b adjoins Stratfield Brake and PR7a is very close across Kidlington Roundabout. The PR7a development brief should better identify the relationship of the proposed sports grounds on the PR7a site to the Stratfield Brake site and the proposed route for walking between the two locations. At the very least, the current pedestrian access into Stratfield Brake from the Kidlington Roundabout slip road should be identified on the figures.</p>	The development brief covers connectivity between the site and the existing facilities at Stratfield Brake	None	n/a

OCC	<p>Transport - The County Council has a range of existing documents which should be referred to such as our cycling and walking design standards and active healthy travel strategy and our November 2021 street design guide. We appreciate that reference has been included to the March 2021 Oxfordshire Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy in section 6.1. Forthcoming documents should also be referenced, such as the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.</p>	<p>It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs; the changes made to PR7b and PR9 briefs have been made to this development brief but in the interests of consistency further changes would not be made</p>	None	n/a
OCC	<p>Phasing - Developer contributions will be sought towards the delivery of various on-site measures and off-site highways mitigation schemes, including improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes and crossing facilities. Given that the site may come forward with two separate planning applications we seek specific inclusion of the following at the end of 3.1.1: ‘Development is to be phased in accordance with the timing of provision of supporting infrastructure and facilities.’</p>	Agreed	The development brief will be amended accordingly	3.1.1 text amended
OCC	<p>Pedestrian and cycle routes - Pedestrian and Cycle Routes We support the indications in the development brief of a comprehensive network of pedestrian and cycle routes. This is a matter that we expect to seek further detail on as part of the development process. There are good opportunities for active travel routes given the public right of way network, and potential for connections to facilities. Nearby facilities include the Sainsbury’s supermarket and local shops, Stratfield Brake and the Oxford Parkway railway station. However, as with PR7b, it is a site further from Kidlington centre than any other part of Kidlington, probably a half hour’s walk. The development of PR6a would be linked to the PR7a site via the public right of way network which includes pedestrian and cycle bridges over the railway and A34. The Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, which was approved in January 2022 following consultation which closed in November 2021, should be referred to in the development brief, along with the Oxford Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, approved in March 20205.</p>	Noted	None	n/a

OCC	<p>We seek amendment to the second bullet point under 4.2.5 as follows: ‘Opportunity to promote sustainable modes of transport and create a high quality walking and cycling network across the site and off site, responding to desire lines especially towards Oxford Parkway Station / Park & Ride, Oxford Road and Bicester Road bus stops, local shops, and connecting with Stratfield Brake and the PR7b/PR8 green link. Regard should be had to published guidance including the Oxford and Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans.’</p> <p>We seek an additional point at the end of 6.4.5: ‘Contribution towards enhancement of pedestrian and cycle links between the Kidlington roundabout and the Cutteslowe roundabout.’</p>	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text has been amended as requested.
OCC	<p>Bus Routes - The existing bus stops near the signalised pedestrian crossing are shown on Figure 9. There are also bus stops to the north of Water Eaton Lane. At this stage we have not identified a need for further bus stops or additional bus services. Consideration will be given to the need to improve bus stops as part of the development process.</p>	Noted	None	n/a
OCC	<p>Car Parking and Cycle Parking - Oxfordshire County Council’s parking standards are currently being updated and are likely to be adopted prior to determination of the planning application. It is expected these will lower the maximum car parking levels from the current parking standards and increase the cycle parking requirements. The parking study will also look at the need for controlled parking zones to avoid indiscriminate on-street parking.</p> <p>We seek that the text in 6.4.6 be amended as follows: ‘Car parking provision and design will be in line with the adopted OCC parking standards and low-car principles and therefore limited. Regard should be had to the Cherwell Residential Design Guide SPD Section 5.8 as well as the good practice recommendations in Manual for Streets. Cycle parking will need to be provided generously to encourage and facilitate cycle use. provision is to be in line with OCC’s adopted cycle parking standards.</p> <p>At the time of producing this development brief, Oxfordshire County Council’s standards for car parking and cycle parking are being reviewed. It is expected that the car parking requirements will be lower in this area than currently, and the cycle parking requirements higher. These revised standards are likely to be available when an application on this site is determined, and therefore will need to be followed. To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site.’</p>	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a

OCC	<p>The brief should refer to the newly adopted Oxfordshire Street Design Guide. The document provides guidance relating to parking, including rear parking courts which OCC discourages.</p> <p>We seek amendment to 6.3.2 (repeated twice): ‘Parking is to be provided on street (unallocated) and on plot utilising a range of parking solutions in line with the guidance provided in the Cherwell Residential Design Guide and will be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide.’</p> <p>We seek amendment to 6.3.3: On-plot parking should generally be tucked to the side of properties to retain a sense of enclosure to the street and provide space for planted front gardens in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide. On plot parking to the front of properties is not permitted.</p>	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
OCC	<p>Vehicle Access Points - The development brief as shown on Figures 13 and 15 shows two access points onto the Bicester Road, which appear to be appropriate. The design of access points and speed restrictions on Bicester Road will require detailed consideration during the development process.</p>	Noted	None	n/a
OCC	<p>Education - No new school is anticipated on the PR7a or PR7b site. Parents of primary school children would most likely seek places at the Edward Feild Primary School, and we anticipate that funding for expansion of that will be required. Secondary school children would most likely seek places at Gosford Hill School.</p> <p>We expect that consideration will be given to how to best walk to the schools from this development site as part of the development process. Given that there is currently no through route between Bicester Road and Cromwell Way, pupils would currently need to walk north and cross the road for the primary school – and therefore we support the proposal for an additional pedestrian/cycle crossing at the northern end of the site. Pupils would either take that same route north to get to the secondary school or walk south and cross at the existing signalised pedestrian crossing to the footpath between Sainsbury’s and the A4260.</p>	Noted	None	n/a

OCC	<p>There is an incorrect reference to the 'Oxfordshire County Council Drainage Team' in 6.5.3. Oxfordshire County Council has a statutory role as Lead Local Flood Authority, while the Districts have other responsibilities for drainage. In addition, there is an incorrect reference to Figure 19, which is about movement and access and does not show drainage features. Therefore, please change the text as follows:</p> <p>'It is expected that the site will drain towards the east side of the site, reflecting the topography of the site, with drainage attenuation features broadly in the locations indicated on Fig. 20 and to be agreed in detail with Oxfordshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and with Cherwell District Council's Drainage Team.'</p>	Agreed	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text amended as requested
OCC	<p>It is noted that other figures for the development framework identify 'drainage attenuation features (indicative location)', and 'indicative SuDS feature'. At this stage, the location of SuDS and drainage attenuation has not been the subject of detailed consideration, therefore the figures are indeed only indicative. In line with paragraphs 160 and 161 of the NPPF, we will expect a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development, taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change.</p>	Noted	None	n/a
OCC	<p>Biodiversity - It is welcomed that outline measures for biodiversity are identified in the development briefs.</p> <p>We query the reference under 4.1 that 'Ecology reports are in the process of being updated and will be reported here when available' as it is not clear whether this change will be made before the development brief is finalised.</p>	Noted	None	n/a
OCC	<p>It is noted that the development briefs indicate that Biodiversity Impact Assessments (BIA) will be undertaken at application stage. However, the District Council may wish to consider the benefits of undertaking the BIA at this stage, to inform the development briefs, as is indicated in LPPR policies for these sites.</p>	Noted	None	n/a
OCC	<p>A Biodiversity Impact Assessment, including application of the Biodiversity Metric 3.0, provides a robust tool to understand the losses and gains to biodiversity associated with different designs and layouts. The information it provides can help inform design evolution, the extent of the site that will be needed to provide on-site biodiversity gains, as well as any need for off-site delivery of biodiversity net gains.</p>	Noted	None	n/a

OCC	Whilst Biodiversity Metric 3.0 would usually be informed by field survey of habitats within the development area, at earlier stages of a project where detailed survey data may not be available, it is possible to compile a dataset and use a range of assumptions to test the potential biodiversity losses and gains associated with different layouts. More detailed assessments would then be required to support the planning applications.	Noted	None	n/a
OCC	Innovation - Reference should be included in the development briefs to the County Council's Innovation Framework which will be finalised shortly following consultation as part of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
OCC	Although we have not prepared alternative text, we would welcome the District Council further considering the text in 6.1 'sustainable construction and energy efficiency'. For example this should reference smart energy solutions, battery storage and travel planning for construction which aims to use local materials to minimise the need for long-distance transportation of materials.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
OCC	The text in 6.3 'character and layout' insufficiently addresses future trends. There should be flexibility in the design to allow adaptation to changing needs over time. For example, reference could be made to the potential for connected and automated vehicles, and e-bike and e-scooter hire schemes.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
OCC	The text in 6.4.1 'movement and access – general principles' should include a general principle to cater for future modes of transport set to become mainstream.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a
OCC	The second paragraph in 6.4.6 'parking' should be amended as set out in our transport development control comments earlier, to reflect innovations.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	n/a

OCC	The text in 6.5 'green infrastructure' should refer to the potential for green roofs and green walls.	The development brief refers to these at page 50 (6.0 Development Principles)	None	n/a
OCC	The text in 7.1 sets out the information to accompany planning applications, but it is noted that the list is only an indication as requirements may change over time. For strategic scale developments such as these, an Innovation Plan may be needed.	Noted	None	n/a
OCC	Pages 7, 11 - make clear if this is the proposed school location as per indicative plan in the LPPR or adjust to reflect brief for PR6a	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Note added to Page 7 and 11 "The location of schools and local centres shown here as in the LPPR has, in some cases, been reviewed through the Development Brief process."
OCC	Pages 8, 9, 10, 11 - update purple key to refer to 'Oxford City allocated sites', also include the St Frideswide Farm site allocation	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Figures 4, 5, 6,7 key updated as requested and other OCC sites added to drawing