

Appendix 2

Comments raised in consultation on PR6a

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief	ABA response
London Oxford Airport	Along with PR6b and PR7a, 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.	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
SSE (ref back to 29.1.2019)	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

St Andrews Church Oxford	<p>Location of the primary school - Agrees with 6.6 of the DB that the local centre and primary school should be in close proximity to one another. Concerned, though, that the location indicated in Fig 1 does not follow through on this principle. The primary school is located too far north on the site. St Andrews questions whether there are errors in Figures 7 or 8 for the location of local centres and schools is wrong. The school and community building should be co-located but further south. Rather than (6.6) determining the school location solely by ref. to OCC school design requirements, the optimal location should be a response to a wider set of factors that may start with OCC education aspirations but must respond to community building, urban design and healthy place shaping principles.</p>	<p>Figure 8 shows the requirement of the adopted planning policy for the site, represented schematically in Fig 7. Neither of these figures is in error. Figure 1 does follow through on the principles set out in para 6.6 by locating the two uses in close proximity to one another. A central location would be preferable purely from an urban design perspective, but unfortunately the constraints presented by the site's changing levels, the archaeology and the extent of the developable area in the central location mean that a central location for these uses is not achievable without harming the archaeological remains or encroaching into the Green Belt. The northern location is not constrained in these ways and is also where the adopted planning policy shows the local centre to be located.</p>	None	n/a
St Andrews Church Oxford	<p>Agrees that the local centre should provide a local hub for retail, employment, community services and social interaction. One option would be to co-locate the school and community building on a single plot. This would enable the largest space in the building to be a shared facility to be used as both a school hall and a community meeting space. Such a shared space would strengthen links between the school and the wider community and would maximise opportunities for community and faith groups to establish and thrive.</p>	<p>Co-location would be an optimal outcome. However, if this would require a greater area of land then it adds weight to the northern location for these uses. The central location is constrained by the archaeology, the alignment of the green infrastructure corridor and the levels changes within the site.</p>	None	n/a
St Andrews Church Oxford	<p>The DB promotion of healthy place shaping should go beyond expressing the principle in physical terms and set out the expectations of the steps required from the outset to engender a strong sense of community spirit and building a healthy community. Seeks confirmation that the Council will draw on its Healthy Bicester experience to create exemplary partnerships to support PR6a and other PR developments. One option to confirm this principle would be to require the developers to make available a community house in the first phase of building and to fund a full-time community liaison officer for the site. Another option would be to support the creation of a Community Trust with a suitable endowment. This is necessary to help build community spirit, including helping new residents settle into their new surroundings and facilitating social interaction between residents and local community groups.</p>	<p>Section 6.2 of the development brief sets out the detailed requirements for healthy place shaping. Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the community infrastructure required at the site</p>	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).	The Local Plan policy requirements for biodiversity are set out at parts 11-13 of the policy	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. It may be that the BIA and BIMF may lead to areas needing to be protected to meet the requirements of Policy PR6a 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.	This is of course very relevant, but will be a matter for the assessment of the planning application and goes beyond the remit of the Development Brief	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	<p>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.</p>	<p>We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>n/a</p>
BBOWT	<p>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.</p>	<p>We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>n/a</p>
BBOWT	<p>Given that there would be very little green space provided at PR6b, BBOWT considers the 19ha provision at PR6a to be inadequate. In order to compensate for the scale of development at PR6a and PR6b there should be a large nature reserve provided of at least 50ha, e.g. as part of the proposed extension to Cutteslowe Park, by extending the red line boundary of the site. This would be 40-50% of the total area, with comparable examples at Salt Cross Garden Village (West Oxon), NW Bicester, Aylesbury Garden Town</p>	<p>The PR6a site covers an area of 48ha so what is requested here would amount to approx. a doubling of the size of the site and, as the response suggests, would require a change to the red line boundary of the site. This goes beyond the remit of the Development Brief and is something which would have been assessed at the time of the formulation of the policy.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>n/a</p>
BBOWT	<p>Supports the proposal on page 53 re farmland bird compensation; the suggested nature reserve, if managed positively for farmland birds, might go some way towards mitigating the loss of farmland birds which will inevitably be displaced by the development.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>n/a</p>
BBOWT	<p>There is an opportunity to create a bee line / pollinator highway which could join up with BBOWT's Wild Oxford work in central Oxford</p>	<p>This is noted, but it is not considered necessary to add to what the Brief already says with regard to biodiversity</p>	<p>None</p>	
BBOWT	<p>The PR6a site could provide the best zone for high quality meadow creation with perennials and annuals with sections ploughed or rotovated each year.</p>	<p>Noted, though it is not considered necessary to amend the Development Brief - this will be captured as part of the planning application assessment.</p>	<p>None</p>	

BOWT	The hedgerows along the southern end of the western boundary with the Oxford Road include some broader woodland strips (with snowdrop) which would be good habitat / screening to retain.	Noted - it would be appropriate to amend the Brief accordingly	Text to be added to say that the hedgerows along the southern end of the site's western boundary with the Oxford Road include some broader woodland strips which would need to be retained in development of the site.	...and associated woodland strips.. Text added to first column, last bullet pf page 52.
BOWT	Further woodland could be planted by the school in stages to achieve a mixed age effect.	Noted - it would be appropriate to amend the Brief accordingly	Text to be added to say that there should be woodland planting within the green corridor where this does not compromise other objectives and requirements of the Development Brief	Text added to 3rd bullet, 2nd column page 49. "Woodland planting will be provided where this does not compromise other objectives and requirements of the Development Brief for the green infrastructure corridor."
Harbord Road Area Residents	The site is vulnerable to commuter parking, which is inevitable unless a controlled parking zone is put in place. We don't believe the aim to 'design out' commuter parking will be effective; the only way to deal with commuter parking is a CPZ.	Noted; the CPZ is outside of the scope of planning, but as with PR7a we are happy to add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."	Add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."	Text added to 6.4.6
Harbord Road Area Residents	Likely that the area will be used by visitors to Cutteslowe Park; if the new stadium at Stratfield Brake were to proceed then pose very significant parking issues for this site	Noted, though it is not possible to plan in the Development Brief for possible future eventualities	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	We support the location of the school to the northern end of the site, and a design where access to the school is by foot or bike but not by car. Pleased to see the southern location (as per the Local Plan requirement) not being pursued, as it would have led to children being dropped off at school in Cutteslowe Park and that this would have led to increased traffic in Harbord Road, which already takes all the traffic for the Oxford Direct Services Depot which is located in the park (including heavy vehicles). Adding to this traffic and putting children in this environment would be unwise because it would add to the risk of schoolchildren who travel from the Harbord Rd area to schools in Oxford City, as well as those travelling to the new school in Cherwell.	Noted	None	

Harbord Road Area Residents	Understands there is an area of NERC Act S41 habitat (traditional orchard) and a pond adjacent to the St Frideswide's farmhouse and that the orchard may be subject to "improvement". The orchard is an important foraging area for the local badger population. It is therefore important that the 'improvement' work done on the orchard is not to the disadvantage of the badgers, including during construction work	Noted - text to be added to the Brief accordingly, though it is noted that the orchard is outside of the site and therefore (a) work should not be carried out where that relates to proposals within the site, (b) any such works would be subject to wildlife regulations e.g. the Wildlife Act 1981 and (c.) is outside of the remit of this Development Brief	Text to be added to say that "the orchard is an important foraging area for the local badger population. It is therefore important that the 'improvement' work done on the orchard is not to the disadvantage of the badgers, including during construction work"	Text added to second bullet, page 23
Harbord Road Area Residents	The development would result in loss of habitat for several bird species which are in decline nationally, but known to be present in good numbers and to breed in the area. It is important that mitigation measures are started and planned. The birds need a buffer between human populations and areas of human traffic so that they are less disturbed by our activities.	This point is noted. It will be an important consideration for the planning application. Text may be added to the Development Brief but the substance of the matter is outside of the scope of the Development Brief	Text could be added to say that "mitigation measures will be required to ensure that the development does not harm bird species in the vicinity, including a buffer between human populations and areas of human traffic"	Text added to second column, page 49
Harbord Road Area Residents	Supports the proposal on page 21 which mentions retention of agricultural land in south-eastern corner	Noted	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	Barn owls are known to nest in the old farm buildings at St Frideswide Farm, which feed very largely on field voles, which in turn live in rough grassland. Neither owls or voles usually survive in areas of tidy and regularly mown grass and rarely make use of residential gardens	Noted	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	Notes on page 3 the statement about enhancing the rough grassland habitat for the benefit of Barn Owls; hopes this identified opportunity will be taken forward because without it this development is very likely to contribute to the further loss of the Barn Owls' habitat. Supports the idea of building a Barn Owl nesting tower to provide an alternative and safe nesting site	Noted	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	Welcomes the statement on page 31 regarding the retention of the east-west views over the Cherwell Valley - we hope that this will be achieved so that all those travelling along the Oxford Road continue to be able to enjoy these special views.	Noted	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	Notes the reference on page 35 to thinning out the tree corridor and removing ground vegetation. It is very clear that the trees, undergrowth and ground vegetation form a wildlife corridor. Policy PR6a, 12(d) requires the protection of existing wildlife corridors; it would not be satisfactory to have green areas that peter out and are dead ends.	Noted - text to be added to the Brief	Text to be added after "...ground vegetation removed" say "except where this would result in harm to existing wildlife corridors")	Text added to page 35

Harbord Road Area Residents	To avoid impacts on wildlife and to reduce light pollution we hope it will be possible to avoid any lighting on the north-south green link particularly on the eastern edge of the development which is adjacent to the Green Belt.	Noted - it would be appropriate to amend the Brief accordingly	Text to be added to say that the lighting of the north-south green link will need to be appropriately designed so as not to cause light pollution or result in harm to wildlife	Text added to second bullet, page 53..."In particular, the lighting of the north-south green link will need to be appropriately designed so as not to cause light pollution or result in harm to wildlife."
Harbord Road Area Residents	Policy PR6a 21 requires retention of agricultural land in perpetuity - would like the words "in perpetuity" from the policy to be added at page 49 of the development brief in relation to retention of the agricultural land	The requirements of the policy take precedence but the words "in perpetuity" could be added for the avoidance of doubt.	After the third bullet point at 6.5, the words "in perpetuity" to be added after 'agricultural use'	Text added
Harbord Road Area Residents	Welcomes the extension of Cutteslowe Park and the creation of wildlife habitats. However, the retained agricultural land was included in Policy PR6a in response to early concerns that the first iteration of the policy would have led to the loss of extensive views across the Cherwell Valley from Cutteslowe Park; so it is very important that the woodland buffer (which is welcomed) does not affect these views and would like this to be reflected in the Development Brief	We note the comments made; it is considered that the Brief contains sufficient text in this regard.	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	Haven't seen anything in the Development Brief to explain how the extension to Cutteslowe Park will be integrated into the existing park in a way that makes it welcoming to the existing community and visitors to the park. The hedge between Cutteslowe Park and PR6a could possibly benefit from improvement and more sensitive management but would not like to see it removed because of its importance as food source, roost and nesting site. Also requests that the access points into the park are kept to a minimum (ideally one; maximum of two) and their location is given careful thought	It would be appropriate to amend the text of the Development Brief in this regard	In the 6th bullet point on page 52 replace "as far as possible" with "unless any loss is robustly justified"	Text amended on page 52
Harbord Road Area Residents	There is much local concern regarding the discharge of effluent into waterways as a result of Thames Water's lack of capacity to cope with existing sewage levels. This does not seem to be addressed in the Development Brief. Policy PR6a requirement 17 gives little assurance that the drainage network is able to cope with the foul drainage.	The concern is noted, though it relates to matters of principle, which other than location go beyond the scope of the Development Brief. And the requirements of Policy PR6a take precedence in any event	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	Policy PR6a requirement 12(i) for long-term wildlife management and maintenance does not seem to be addressed in the Development Brief	This is something which is required by Policy PR6a and would be secured through planning conditions and planning obligations of any permission given	None	

Harbord Road Area Residents	Notes the intention to have play areas that are overlooked for security reasons, but they should also be large enough to: have good lines of sight for parents; provide a range of activities; and be places that people want to visit. It is important that areas for older children/teenagers are incorporated but we have not seen any mention of this in the Development Brief	These types of things would be required, whether or not there were Development Briefs for the site, i.e. there are applicable Local Plan policies and existing supplementary planning guidance, which the Development Briefs cannot stray from.	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	Appears to be no provision for additional health facilities e.g. GP surgery; this seems unwise given that existing GP practices are already under pressure and the population of the area is set to expand substantially.	At page 181 of the LPPR, Appendix 4 states that there may be a requirement for a GP surgery at PR6a, and this is also mentioned at (4) of Policy PR6a	Page 30 - add reference at the 5th bullet to health care provision.	Reference to health care provision added to page 30, 5th bullet
Harbord Road Area Residents	If any changes are made to the Development Brief we ask that a 'tracked-changes' version be made available to make it possible for stakeholders to identify the changes.	We did this for PR7a and will do the same for PR6a	None	Changes are highlighted in red.
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Make as many of the properties south facing as possible, to maximise the natural light and reduce the need for extra heating	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Locate the highest building behind (to the north of) the lower south facing ones. This will maximise the sunlight and warmth from the sun for all the residences, making more comfortable homes for all	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	Make rooves south facing, to offer a platform for solar and PV panels to produce electricity for future residents, cutting heating costs.	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	The land promoter's plans reflect a more accurate picture of the access, roads and practical usage of the space [than CDC's plans]	Those producing the Development Brief and those formulating the proposals on behalf of the landowner are all having to balance competing considerations, and may give different weight to different requirements and variables. The Council is aware that the land promoter's proposals differ from what is shown in the Development Brief. The land promoter will need to justify their proposals esp where they deviate from policy requirements or what is shown in the final Development Brief	None	n/a

Gosford & Water Eaton PC	4.2.1 - "urban extension of... Oxford" implies that CDC are abandoning the Water Eaton half of our parish to Oxford City Council which is an alarming prospect becoming Oxford's Gateway rather than remaining part of Cherwell district. This has boundary commission, taxation and political implications so this text should be re-phrased.	The site has been released from the Green Belt only in order to meet Oxford's unmet housing need. Policy PR6a sets out that the development will be an urban extension to Oxford city. Administrative boundaries are not a material consideration for planning proposals.	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	"Higher density" lacks clear definition and if this refers to higher than other places in the proposed developments then definitions need to be clearer. The term "mixed use" is also not entirely clearly defined - what does it mean? The plans appear to eliminate the "existing farmhouse" which should be labelled Pipal Cottage & Pipal Barns	Higher density will be achieved through a combination of dwellinghouse typologies and heights of buildings. Later sections of the Development Brief, e.g. Figure 15, set out the requirements in terms of heights of buildings. Mixed use means more than one land use in a given location. Consideration will be given as to whether this warrants explanation in the Development Brief. Page 21 of the Development Brief (5th bullet point under 4.2.2) states "opportunity to consider incorporating the existing farmhouse within the new development"	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	We applaud the encouragement of public transport, walking and cycling but in reality most dwellings will have cars. There does not appear to be adequate parking provided for three storey apartments. "Reduced levels of parking" does not sound like a real answer to necessary parking for residents and their guests.	We note the points made, but this is a development principle arrived at through careful consideration as well as discussion with OCC, and reflects the approaches taken within Oxford.	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	Glad that the policy allows for refinement regarding the location of the primary school. It clearly needs to be in the middle of the PR6a development and as central as possible for PR6b access, not on the northern boundary of PR6a as currently shown	If there were no site constraints, the central location would be preferred. However, one has to take into account site constraints as well as place making principles and without encroaching into the green belt or harming archaeological remains it is not possible to deliver the central location. The central location has no ability to expand in the future. The site shown in the Development Brief is in the flattest part of the northern area of the site, in a location discussed with the OCC Education team	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	4.2.2 "Appropriate building heights" is stated as an opportunity. We do not support any development of 4 or 5 storeys on this site, which would clearly be overdevelopment and not in keeping with the heritage or character of the area. This concern also applies to 6.3.1. Three storey buildings are an accepted feature of the plan but care needs to be taken not to obscure light reaching existing dwellings given the topography of the landscape coupled with three storey buildings.	We note the comments made. The 2nd bullet point states that "the majority of the area is to be 3 storeys. 4 to 5 storey buildings will be appropriate only in key locations such [as] movement nodes, corners or vista stops in the western part of the character area where particular emphasis is required. To the east the scale is to be 3 storeys fronting the primary street." Having given the matter detailed consideration, the Council considers this to be the most appropriate design response.	None	

Gosford & Water Eaton PC	We support the "substantial green buffer" and "well defined urban edge" to the east but the details of this are incredibly vague. Could a dog park be incorporated into the green corridor? Open green space surrounding St Frideswide Farm is welcome as are treatment of the non-designated heritage assets	Consideration will be given to whether details can be appropriately added in relation to the design of the green buffer beyond what is set out at Section 6.5 of the Brief. The green corridor is a linear space but text could be added in appropriate places to mention "there is opportunity for the provision of a dog park either within the green corridor or the green space in the south-eastern part of the site"	text could be added in appropriate places to mention "there is opportunity for the provision of a dog park either within the green corridor or the green space in the south-eastern part of the site"	Text added to 6.4, page 49.
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	The opportunity of "incorporating the existing farmhouse within the new development" is not in the landowners and their agents' masterplan so we suggest you remove it from the development brief.	Page 21 of the Development Brief (5th bullet point under 4.2.2) states "opportunity to consider incorporating the existing farmhouse within the new development". It will be noted that Pipal Cottage does not feature in any of the proposals from Figure 12 onwards	None	n/a
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	We welcome the commitment to a "well defined edge and active frontage" on the Oxford Road. We suggest you consult with the transportation consultants who have developed, tested and consulted with the parish council on their detailed plans which look sensible.	We have been in regular discussion with the land promoter team including their transport consultants	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	4.2.3 Views and sightlines - your development brief has a number of contradictory requirements concerning sightlines and views and needs revisiting. We welcome preserving the ridgelines and views across the site.	It is not clear as to where these apparent contradictions lie. The Development Brief is consistent through from Section 5 onwards, e.g. Figure 15 shows retained long distance views and none of the proposals contradict Figure 15.	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	4.2.4 Landscape Character: GWEPC supports all the points in this section e.g. regarding the agricultural land to the south and the preservation of hedgerows across the site. But your plan has removed several hedgerows and trees which should be put back into the brief. Again as per the landowner's plans. We support the green link to Cutteslowe Park, Sustainable Urban Drainage (which will certainly need to be deployed to avoid the areas that regularly flood) and the proposed biodiversity gains in the site.	Noted. The intention is for hedgerow removal to be minimal. The hedgerow in the northern part of the site adjacent to the site's eastern boundary will be added into the development framework, as well as the hedgerow which would bisect the new green space/park in the south-eastern part of the site	Except where it would compromise the purposes of the green corridor (in which case a replacement hedgerow will be added), the hedgerow in the northern part of the site adjacent to the site's eastern boundary will be added into the development framework, as well as the hedgerow which would bisect the new green space/park in the south-eastern part of the site	Figures amended; existing hedgerows added (with gaps cycle routes etc where necessary)

Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>4.2.5 Movement and access: We support the principles outlined in the Development Brief concerning roads and access but the Development Brief maps are lacking detail and suggest you review the transportation link work undertaken by the landowners and their agents which the parish council broadly supports. Lack of adequate parking for residents of the new development remains a major concern for us.</p>	<p>We note the comments regarding adequacy of parking provision. The level of detail in the Development Brief is considered appropriate and in line with that for other Development Briefs. The land promoter's comments indicate they would prefer less detail in the Brief.</p>	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>Section 6 - the local centre should be in the southern mixed use area as per the land promoter's plans, not the northern section as there are existing buildings there which seem to have disappeared on your plan. No mention is made regarding parking for shoppers at the local centre, only "reduced levels of parking" for residents which seems unrealistic.</p>	<p>The Local Plan proposals map shows the local centre in the northern part of the site. There is much sense in the local centre and the primary school being adjacent to each other, and that is reflected in the Development Brief. As explained elsewhere, based on current evidence the central part of the site is not able to accommodate the school without conflicting with Green Belt policy or harming archaeology and so it needs to be located elsewhere - the only other position which works for the school's requirements is that which is shown in the Brief, and which happens to be in the vicinity of where the Local Plan proposals map shows the local centre.</p>	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>6.3.2 Valley View character area: the parking arrangements look insufficient for the housing density in this area. Details about the green corridor are missing</p>	<p>The level of parking provision is not specified here. The aim of the Brief in this section is to set the parking typologies, which will be a combination of on-street, to the sides of dwellings or accessed from the rear, with parking to the front of properties precluded. The green corridor is not part of this character area - it is discussed separately at Section 6.5.</p>	None	

Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>6.4.1 General principles – these are quite vague. Please look at the landowner’s plans which are detailed and thought through. The parish council agrees with the principles regarding access points to the site: one to the north and two from the west side of the site. Page 44-45 regarding the carriage way plus bike and footways: we would like the footways to be away from the main Oxford road and alternative bike routes through the site. Namely, Oxford road highway route (on road for commuting cyclists); recreational route beside the green corridor and a sub-urban route through the estate that joins up with the A40 Cutteslowe bike bridge route. Locating the school in the middle of the development rather than to the north to make use of these cycle and footways.</p>	<p>The intention is that the general principles at 6.4.1 inform the movement and access strategy that follows in the remainder of Section 6.4, and inform the land promoter’s proposals, who would prefer the Development Brief to be less prescriptive. We would agree with regard to the location of the cycleways and have discussed this with the land promoter - the development brief will be amended in this regard. The northern location of the school makes use of the cycle and footways through the site in the same way that the central location would.</p>	<p>The figures on page 37 will be amended to show the cycleways further into the site away from the Oxford Road frontage.</p>	<p>Bottom section amended; cycleway moved out of tree corridor</p>
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>6.4.5 Walking and Cycling – The parish council supports the green link and the east-west high quality walking and cycling links which would be vehicle free – ideally leading to the school site.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>6.4.6 Parking – why is the parking taking a lead from Oxford City’s guidelines and only a “regard” to Cherwell’s Residential Design Guide? Shouldn’t it be the other way round as this development is 100% in Cherwell District? Unallocated street parking will be required by residents in addition to dedicated on plot parking and if absolutely necessary rear courtyard parking. Absolute clarity about parking capacity is required and details of car to resident numbers articulated as the current plan seem woefully short of parking areas for the level of proposed development density.</p>	<p>The rationale is that the housing is meeting Oxford’s unmet need, i.e. providing for Oxford’s needs rather than Cherwell’s, so the primacy of Oxford City parking standards is considered appropriate here. We agree with regard to the need for unallocated street parking, and this is reflected on page 47.</p>	<p>None</p>	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>6.5.1 Play and sports – as the parish council currently manages the playgrounds in our parish and we would want to be fully consulted on the location and type of play areas in this new development. The brief is agreeing the location of the school would have direct bearing on the location of the play areas Two local play areas and One local Equipped Area for Play (5 pieces of equipment); and another combined with a multi-use game area one combined play area might be about right for the topography: but the population density is not at all clear given three storey apartments, mixed use housing above shops, terraced, semi-detached and detached homes are all mentioned in the Development Brief, so more detail is needed in this respect.</p>	<p>It is considered that the level of detail is appropriate for the Development Brief</p>	<p>None</p>	

Gosford & Water Eaton PC	6.5.2 Blue infrastructure – the plans are vague and not much to disagree with but this is an essential part of the brief given local flooding history, current environment agency pools present.	We agree that it is an integral part of the Brief	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	6.6 Community Infrastructure – the allocation of land/space is defined but the locations needs more clarification once the school location is confirmed. Hopefully central to the PR6a site and better situated for the whole PR6b plus PR6a site would be better than the current plan maps indicate.	Noted. The location of the school is discussed elsewhere.	None	
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	
SSMNF	Together with 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	<p>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. There is particular concern about the future of land to the east of PR6A and we believe there is an opportunity to declare this area a wetland/natural habitat/sanctuary area up to the banks of the Cherwell River. It is important to people of North Oxford that this opportunity is not missed. Moreover, there is a need to make a significant, specific and tangible commitment to increase biodiversity.</p>	Noted	None	n/a
SSMNF	<p>Development of the PR sites will have significant implications for our area:</p> <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, particularly down the Banbury Road and in Summertown Centre, be managed? How will residents cross safely across the Banbury Road between PR6A and PR6B? What traffic calming measures will be introduced along the Banbury Road? 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 	<p>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</p>	None	n/a
SSMNF	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	None	

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
SSMNF	The brief contains some design ideas that SSMNF supports such as the new Primary School, a new local centre, and an extension to Cutteslowe Park. The question is as ever the detailed delivery of these and other commitments when applications are negotiated and viability arguments are brought into play.	Noted	None	
Hodge Jones & Allen (St Frideswide)	The access to St Frideswide's Farmhouse is via a farm track, approx. 1/4 mile long, which traverses between two fields from the main road, and ends with a left turn to SFF where there is a copse of trees and car parking for about five cars. In none of the proposals I have seen so far are there any drawings to suggest how access will be maintained to the house during and after the development. I assume from the plans available to date that the current track will disappear. I note that the development may take up to 7 years to complete. I assume therefore that there will be a temporary track constructed until a permanent road is laid. I wish to know exactly what is intended for the access to the house during and after the development and what route it will take. It must of course be in all ways equivalent to the current track, and it should be maintained (as now) by Christ Church. I have not been consulted on this.	This is a very important point and will be a relevant consideration at the time of the planning application but is not something that the Development Brief would include	None	

Hodge Jones & Allen (St Frideswide)	<p>There is nothing specific in the Development Brief about St Frideswide's Farmhouse and how the effects of the development (both in heritage and residential amenity terms) will be ameliorated. The development would completely transform (if not destroy) the quiet rural character and setting of the house. Understands that it was an exceptional decision to allow housing on Green Belt land, but as a result there is even more need for the development to be undertaken carefully and sensitively so as to respect the setting of the house and the amenity of its occupants. I have not been consulted on this (by the developer). I am concerned that the uninterrupted view in front of the house will be interfered with and there will be much pedestrian traffic from the large number of people living on the estate. It is essential that there is a substantial buffer of land between the house and this development. This needs to be designed with landscaping, walls and mature trees (for privacy and noise reduction). The design of such a buffer is crucial and complex and it would be fair for me to have professional help to comment on the design at the expense of the developer. Requests that the LPA requires the developer to produce specific proposals to address these issues.</p>	<p>Very much noted; however, the principle of development is set by the planning policy for the site. What the Development Brief is: note St Frideswide in Section 3.2 (site context), Figure 9, Section 4.1 and Fig 10 (site constraints), identifies in Fig 10 the high sensitivity of views from within the site towards St Frideswide Farmhouse, states at 4.2.2 that a substantial green buffer will be needed and an open space around the heritage asset(s), capture the above in the development principles at Section 6.3 and 6.3.2 and provides for retained long distance views (Figure 15). It is considered that the Development Brief is appropriately detailed in this regard, and that the specific proposals required to address these issues will need to form part of the planning application</p>	None	
Mark Fransham	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	None	n/a
Mark Fransham	<p>The proposed cycle route to Cutteslowe Park is potentially an excellent addition to the area, but must be seen as a leisure route as must the canal to the west. Fast, priority, segregated and direct routes for cyclists and pedestrians on the Kidlington-Summertown-Oxford route are essential</p>	Noted	None	
Mark Fransham	<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>	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.	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; The destruction of green space, natural habitats and recreational facilities	This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR	None	n/a
Greenway Oxon (golf)	The potential problems of commuter parking are likely to require a controlled parking zone at the very outset of the development and on a 7 day basis because of the proximity of Cutteslowe Park; there will be significant potential problems were the stadium proposal at Stratfield Brake to go ahead	Noted; the CPZ is outside of the scope of planning, but as with PR7a we are happy to add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."	Add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."	Text added to 6.4.6
Greenway Oxon (golf)	For both traffic and public health reasons, access to the primary school should be primarily by foot or on cycle, with the 'school run' being positively discouraged. Given the presence of the Oxford City depot at the Park, the northern school site is preferred. It would be good to see some detailing of the proposals for wildlife habitat (and management) and associated with the school	Noted and agreed. Detailed proposals for wildlife habitat will be required with the planning application. Policy PR6a sets out the requirement for a Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan and this will be one of the key matters for the planning application	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	There is significant biodiversity on the 6a site. The orchard habitat adjacent to the existing farmhouse will need to be carefully conserved. We are aware of comments made in previous consultations by the Oxford Ornithological Society, which is rightly concerned about loss of habitat for declining species, and it is essential that mitigation can be achieved. As with 6b, there will need to be a balance between retaining a wildlife corridor along the Oxford Road, keeping much of the existing vegetation, yet retaining rural views out. It is also important to retain open views out of the site over the remaining Green Belt areas to the Cherwell Valley.	Noted and agreed. The retention of key views is picked up in the Development Brief.	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	The extension to Cutteslowe Park should cater for the existing local community as well as visitor.	Noted; agreed	None	

Greenway Oxon (golf)	Please ensure the County Council takes particular care in designing cycle provision . There has been a number of accidents locally – including the very recent fatality at the P&R junction.	Very much noted - this will need to be captured in the planning application submission	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	Although Thames Water might say in mitigation that the (in our view unnecessary) pace and scale of growth locally has put immense pressure on sewage treatment facilities and networks, it is important that they give cast iron assurances on adequacy before any development commences .	Noted and agreed; this will be an important material consideration for the planning application	None	
Savills (land promoter)	The Development Brief should take account of and acknowledge the work undertaken by the landowner to inform the proposals, e.g. a vision and principles have been discussed with the Council and have been subject of public consultation by the landowner. There is no need, therefore, for the Development Brief to set out a further vision and objectives.	The landowner will appreciate the role of the Development Brief in the planning process, and the importance of the brief in setting vision and objectives.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	The extent and detailed nature of much of the document reads more as a Design Code, with a lot of repetition from the Local Plan that is not needed. The Development Brief is too detailed for this stage of the process and could stifle a successful development coming forward, e.g. in referring to the exact type of access junction when this has not yet been determined. The development brief would benefit from being reduced in size and limited to setting out high level principles i.e. to provide a brief for the site. Detail will come through in the planning application process.	We would disagree. Most other commenters consider the Brief not detailed enough and it is notable that the land promoter considers it too detailed. The Development Brief strikes the appropriate balance, setting sufficient parameters to enable a successful development to be delivered, whilst allowing flexibility in respect of the details. Development Briefs are defined as documents that provide information on the type of development, the design thereof and layout constraints relating to a particular site; A development brief allows stakeholders and residents to influence the design of a development from the outset. It sets the parameters for a development in order to guide future planning applications and includes: an explanation of how the site meets national and local policies and guidance. a development brief: ‘...sets out the vision for a development. It is grounded firmly in the economic, social, environmental and planning context. Apart from its aspirational qualities, the brief must include site constraints and opportunities, infrastructure including energy and transport access and planning policies. It should also set out the proposed uses, densities and other design requirements.’	None	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>The landowner accepts that the location of the primary school is caveated in the development brief as being subject to detailed assessment. However, the location and orientation of the school shown in the DB is fundamentally wrong and takes no account of the wider place making principles that have been discussed and consulted on. The school is a key element of the development and should be at the heart of it. The local plan location is too remote but so is the northern location, poorly related to the majority of the residential properties at PR6a and remote in relation to future residents of PR6b. Its orientation results in development parcels that are highly constrained and a poor relationship to areas of open space. It also has no ability to expand in the future.</p>	<p>The school is indeed a key element of the development. If there were no site constraints, the central location would be preferred. However, one has to take into account site constraints as well as place making principles and without encroaching into the green belt or harming archaeological remains it is not possible to deliver the central location. The central location has no ability to expand in the future.</p>	No change	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>The proposed location for the school sits over an overland surface water flow route that could be used for sustainable drainage and habitat creation if the school was not located where shown</p>	<p>It is not envisaged that the school would be built over the overland surface water route, but adapted in shape and layout to respect this sustainable drainage feature</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>The current proposed location of the school in the northern part of the site, whilst serving to increase the perceived greenspace (i.e. playing fields etc) from longer views from the east, would also restrict the opportunity to create a sensitive edge to the north-eastern boundary. A centrally located school, as proposed by ChCh, would assist in creating a layering effect of landscaping within the site to reduce the perceived massing of built form within the western areas of the site in views from the east. Also affects a high quality tree that would need to be removed.</p>	<p>We would disagree. Indeed, this is a limitation of the central location, which would require encroachment into the Green Belt and/or reduction in the width/provision of the green corridor</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>The DB sets out a confused approach to the Oxford Road frontage. In some places it refers to retention of the trees, hedges and scrub along the road edge but in other places it refers to creating an active frontage and/or removal of the lower level vegetation. In addition to referencing the Local Centre having visibility from the Oxford Road. The landowner is working closely with the owners of site PR6b to provide a joined up approach to the Oxford Road and provide safe cycling routes. It is clear that there will need to be removal of sections of the existing vegetation to allow the access junctions to be constructed. Depending on the highway requirements within the road corridor some widening may also be needed. In addition, a large proportion of the existing vegetation on both sides of the road is of low quality and will need to be better managed and supplemented with new planting to provide a long term benefit.</p>	<p>Highways requirements need to be balanced against protection of trees (both for ecological and arboricultural reasons) and tree loss avoided where at all possible. If there are transport solutions which avoid tree loss they should be pursued.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>The provision of a formal avenue of trees on Oxford Road is contrary to the pre-app advice which has been provided by OCC to ChCh and the need to consider retention of rural character of routes into the city. As drafted, the requirements of the draft DB for the Oxford Road frontage would make it difficult to retain the rural character of the road.</p>	<p>Removal of trees to facilitate multiple traffic lanes would not retain the rural character of the road.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>With 3-5 storey development on either side of the road, even if set back behind the existing or new planting the character and appearance of the Oxford Road will change. This should be reflected in the DB.</p>	<p>It is not clear as to what change is sought here. The Development Brief is quite clear, e.g. at Section 6.3, that the character and appearance of the Oxford Road will change.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Inside front cover - the landowner does not want its logo included in the document and does not support the contents of all of the text and plans in the draft development brief, nor is it appropriate for the consultees listed in 1.4 to have their logos displayed.</p>	<p>Noted, though it is considered important and appropriate that there is consistency across the Development Briefs; the land promoter has inputted to this Development Brief</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Page 1 - the landowner has not jointly prepared the development brief - this distinction should be made in this paragraph and elsewhere in the document. 1.1 (Page 3) 6th para - incorrect to state that the development brief has been jointly prepared with the landowners(s), who instead is a consultee. The text should be amended to remove reference to the landowner having prepared this DB.</p>	<p>We do not consider this necessary - the other Development Briefs have the same text as currently shown here</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	Site location, fifth sentence - the date of the round barrows should be amended to reflect their confirmed Anglo-Saxon date.	Noted	In the paragraph headed Site Location on page 1 "Bronze Age (potentially Iron Age)" to be replaced with "Anglo-Saxon"	Already changed in previous version. Exec summary has now been changed though.
Savills (land promoter)	The vision statement is overly long and is more akin to a set of development objectives than a vision. The landowner requests the wording is simplified to provide an overarching vision for the proposed development (proposes its own wording is used). If the current vision is retained, then the landowner questions the reference to a 'contemporary' urban extension in terms of its design and seeks greater flexibility on choice of design style, e.g. in case a more traditional design approach is preferred; the landowner is not certain that the local centre should 'front' onto Oxford Road - it could have some visibility from the Oxford Road but should face into the site to create an area that is suitable for sitting out and conversation between residents.	In the same way that the school should serve both PR6a and PR6b, so should the local centre. As such, its visibility from Oxford Road is important. The vision statement on page 1 is considered appropriate, necessary and of similar length and focus as the vision statements for other Development Briefs	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Vision - 3rd sentence - the text should be amended by replacing the word 'maximised' with the word 'optimised' and Second Paragraph, Bullet 7: Add reference to the 3 hectares of agricultural land being 'retained'.	The change of word in the vision would weaken the vision and change the emphasis. The omission of the word 'retained' is noted and will be amended	Page 1, 7th bullet, the word "retained" to be added after "land"	Retained added to Page 1 and Page 25

Savills (land promoter)	<p>Figure 1 identifies two parcels of land for a 'mixed use' development, extending to about 2.5ha, whereas Policy PR6a requires the provision of a local centre on 0.5ha of land. The development brief should clarify what is meant by 'mixed use' compared to the 'local centre' policy requirement. The provision of allotments should be relocated and placed in more than one location where they integrate with the Green Infrastructure corridor and provide greater accessibility for residents of PR6a. (Also applies to Figs 12 and 13)</p>	<p>These areas have been shown indicatively, for discussion as to the best location. It is not envisaged that all of this mixed use land would remain in the final development brief, which would need to reflect the policy requirements for the site. Section 6.3.1 of the Development Brief states that "within the local centre, buildings will have a vertical mix of uses for example; ground floor retail and residential or office above. Front doors to upper floor uses are to be integrated into the active street frontage, rather than accessed via the rear." Mixed use is intended to mean that there will be residential use as well as local centre uses. It is evident, though, that 'mixed use' in Figure 1 may be misleading, so it will be replaced by the words "broad location for local centre". It is considered most appropriate (and efficient) for the allotments to be grouped together. Allotments in the location shown will help retain a sense of openness to the setting of St Frideswide's Farmhouse and will be next to the green corridor whilst being within the developable area as required by Policy PR6a. This location is within 800m of all parts of the site as required by Policy BSC11. It is not appropriate for the allotments to be sited in the green infrastructure corridor and there are different reasons (including space efficiency) for them not being dispersed around the site.</p>	Figure 1 - change 'mixed use' to "broad location for local centre"	Figure 1, 13 and 15 key and amended from 'mixed use' to 'broad location for local centre'. Changes made to accompanying text at p57, second para; P57, development principles, second bullet; and P35 second column, 3rd bullet.
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Drainage Attenuation Features: The attenuation features shown should be prefixed in the Legend as being 'indicative locations'. Indeed, additional attenuation features could be required on site in different locations.</p>	This is already indicated in the Legend	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>The plan shows five indicative play areas, two with smaller stars and three with larger stars. Do these represent the policy requirements for LAPs and LEAPs and if not, what is that requirement and how do the stars relate to it? We note that all of the play areas are indicatively shown within the residential area. The land promoter proposes that play spaces will be provided throughout the site and in the green spaces.</p>	<p>Larger stars represent LEAPs and the smaller stars represent LAPs. The stars are intended to show indicative locations. Figure 1 shows the play spaces spread throughout the site. Policy PR6a requires the play areas and allotments to be provided within the developable area, so if the land promoter does propose them in the green spaces this will conflict with policy and will not be supported.</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>A new public walking and cycling corridor is shown through the green infrastructure corridor, which is in accordance with the LPPR policy. However, this does not provide a direct route from the Oxford urban area to the Park and Ride/Oxford Parkway, due to the location of the access point. A further 'new public walking and cycling corridor' should therefore be shown through the centre of the site; and a further route along the Oxford Road.</p>	<p>It didn't seem necessary for a separate walking and cycling route to be shown in yellow on the plans through the centre of the development as the primary street is required to have cycle routes and pavements, as is Oxford Road. However, we understand Savills is keen to see walking/cycling routes more clearly shown and, given there would be a footpath and cycle way in this location anyway, we would be happy to show the walking and cycling route through the centre of the site, in addition to - but not at the expense of - the one through the green infrastructure corridor and providing this central walking & cycling route does not impinge on either the green infrastructure corridor, the archaeological remains or other land uses</p>	<p>Figures 13, 15, 21 - add a walking & cycling route through the site from the northern vehicular egress point, along the main road through the site, between the LEAP and the allotments, down to the southern LEAP and connecting to the walking & cycling route already shown; and add that this additional walking & cycling route is included with the provisos that it does not impinge on the green infrastructure corridor, result in harm to archaeological remains or require other land uses to be moved such that they would encroach into the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Figures 1, 13,15,19, 21 amended. Central walking/cycling route in yellow added as described. New bullet added to 6.4.5 "An additional north-south walking and cycling route may be provided in the centre of the site (on the proviso that this does not impinge on the green infrastructure corridor, result in harm to archaeological remains or require other land uses to be moved such that they would encroach into the Green Belt)."</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Land South West of St Frideswide Farm, which is located immediately to the south of the PR6a site in Oxford City (i.e. the site which is promoted by Croudace for 134 dwellings), benefits from a resolution to grant full planning permission by OCC (Application Ref. 21/01449/FUL). To add helpful context to Figure 1, the approved site layout plan should be added in grey.</p>	<p>Noted - the appropriate figures should be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development</p>	<p>The appropriate figures will be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development</p>	<p>Basic version of layout added to baseplan of all drawings. Label 'consented scheme' added</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>The DB should take into account that land comprising Pipal Cottage (which is identified within the PR6a site allocation boundary) will be excluded from the planning application site area. However, land comprising the barns next to the cottage will be included in the planning application. 3.2.3, bullet 1 - Confirmation should be given that the farmhouse is called Pipal Cottage.</p>	<p>Noted - the appropriate figures will be amended to reflect this nuance, and 3.2.3 will be amended accordingly</p>	<p>The appropriate figures will be amended to show Pipal Cottage excluded from the development area but include land comprising the barns next to the cottage. Section 3.2.3, bullet 1 will be amended to replace "the farmhouse" with "Pipal Cottage"</p>	<p>Figures amended to exclude cottage but include barns in developable area (retained cottage shown on base). Section 3.2.3 amended.</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Primary Access: The access proposals are subject to ongoing discussion with OXCC Highways. While it is anticipated that the access would be the primary access junction it is not necessary to determine whether either the northern or southern junction would be the Primary / Secondary junction. The word 'Primary' should be removed from the Figure.</p>	<p>Further to detailed discussion with OCC, we would disagree</p>	<p>None</p>	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>Secondary Access: The access proposals are subject to ongoing discussion and modelling with OXCC Highways. The type of junction should not be identified as 'left in left out' as this restricts opportunities to deliver a strategic approach to access. The references to 'Secondary' and 'left in left out' should be removed. The '**' notation in the Legend should also be amended to state 'Type of junction subject to Traffic Modelling'.</p>	<p>CDC and OCC's aim is to minimise impact to the free flow of traffic on Oxford Road. It is also intended that there will be vehicular access onto the road to the north of the site that serves the park and ride. The '** notation is appropriately caveated</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Vehicular Egress Point Only: Subject to further modelling, it is not anticipated that a third access point is necessary to support PR6a based on the work undertaken to date. Notwithstanding this it is not necessary to dictate that the access should be 'egress only' or 'left out' only. The access could be used for agricultural access to retained farmland to the east, which it currently serves. This reference in the Legend should be amended to state 'Ancillary access point**'.</p>	<p>This has been subject of detailed discussion with OCC.</p>	No change	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>1.2.1 Purpose (page 5) - No reference is made to Point 10 (a) to (h) of Policy PR6a which sets out what the draft DB should include. These points should be identified in this sub-section of the Brief. Bullet 3: There are a small number of areas where the Brief increases uncertainty through inconsistencies with the Local Plan policies. For example, in relation to how the Oxford Road frontage should be treated, where the primary school should be located. Further explanation of these would be helpful. Third Paragraph: Reference should also be made to the Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide (also applies to 5.1, 2nd para)</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to repeat verbatim point 10(a) to (h) of Policy PR6a. We would disagree that the changes from the LPPR proposals map create uncertainty. The changes that are made constitute minor variations arising from evidence that has become available since the Plan's adoption. The Oxfordshire Street Design Guide isn't referenced in the Development Briefs for PR7b and PR9, so the effect of agreeing the change will be that parking has to be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide in the case of PR6a but not in the case of PR7b or PR9. And, whether or not is mentioned in the Development Briefs, the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide is/will be a material consideration in the assessment of proposals at PR7b and PR9 despite it not being mentioned in the Development Briefs for those sites, just as it will for proposals at PR7a.</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	1.4.1 Community Engagement (page 6) - landowner questions the inclusion of this paragraph once the Development Brief is adopted. Also requests that CDC provides clarification as to whether the draft DB has been informed by the results of the community engagement exercises which have been undertaken to date by the land promoter, which has included Enquiry by Design, public consultation and Design Review Panel?	1.4.1 - Agreed - the text will be amended as appropriate. The community engagement exercises undertaken by the land promoter stand independent of the Development Brief process being undertaken by the Council	Section 1.4.1 to be amended in line with the Briefs for PR7a, PR7b, PR9 to say: Public consultation on the Draft Development Brief took place between xxx and xxx. Comments received have informed the final Development Brief. "	Section 1.4.1 updated
Savills (land promoter)	Aerial View of Site PR6a (Page 7) For consistency, the land described on the aerial photograph as 'North Oxford Golf Club' should be changed to 'PR6b'.	Agreed	The appropriate text to be amended	Figure amended
Savills (land promoter)	Figure 4 - There are inconsistencies in the figures and with other figures in the draft DB in terms of where the primary school is located. As stated in the land promoter's comments in relation to Figure 1, the school should be located centrally but that the caveat should be retained. Land South West of St Frideswide Farm (i.e. the site which is promoted by Croudace for 134 dwellings) should be included in these figures as being 'Proposed growth in adjoining local authorities'.	Figure 4 does not show the primary school and is not intended to. Figure 3 shows the primary school, but the location reflects the LPPR proposals map, as is the case for PR8. Fig 3 is caveated as being "for illustrative purposes only". The location of the school is discussed elsewhere in this spreadsheet.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	3.1.1 - Bullets 5 and 6: there is overlap with these areas, they are not separate areas – this should be clarified in the DB. Bullet 7: Add reference to the 3 hectares of agricultural land being 'retained'.	Bullets 5 and 6 reflect the Policy PR6a requirements. The landowner may wish to propose their amalgamation, but the policy lists them separately. Bullet 7 will be amended accordingly	Page 14, 7th bullet, the word "retained" to be added after "land"	Text changed
Savills (land promoter)	3.1.2 - First Paragraph, Third Sentence: the land promoter notes that PR6a and PR6b are in separate landownerships and that separate planning applications for each site will be submitted. In view of this, the word 'may' should be changed to 'will'. Second Paragraph, Third Sentence: Add 'a' to 'combined neighbourhood'.	This point is understood, but it is not considered essential for 'may' to be changed to 'will'. In the third sentence of the penultimate para on page 14 the word "a" will be added before "combined".	In the third sentence of the penultimate para on page 14 the word "a" will be added before "combined".	Text changed
Savills (land promoter)	3.2.1 - Bullet 2: Clarification should be given to confirm that that part of the site which is within the Green Belt relates only to part of the land within the Green Infrastructure corridor on the eastern edge of the proposal.	This is correct - words to be added to clarify this.	Section 3.2.1, 2nd bullet - after "Oxford Green Belt" add new sentence "This Green Belt land is to be the Green Corridor as shown in Fig 8"	Text of 3.2.1 changed to "This Green Belt land is indicated on Figure 9 and will become part of the proposed Green Corridor shown on figure 8."

Savills (land promoter)	3.2.4 - Bullet 4: The southern Footpath 229/8/10 does not cross land between Oxford Road (Banbury Road) and the site boundary. Amend text to state: Two public rights of way cross the site providing access to the wider countryside to the east of the site. The northern most public right of way (Bridleway 229/9/30 links almost directly to a footpath running east-west across Land West of Oxford Road (PR6b). The southern footpath (229/8/10) provides a route from the western boundary of the site, eastwards.	Noted and agreed, other than the last sentence as proposed would seem superfluous as the revised para already says that the footpath provides access to land to the east of the site.	3.2.4, 4th bullet to be amended to read: "Two public rights of way cross the site, one from Oxford Road, providing access to the wider countryside to the east of the site. The northern most public right of way (Bridleway 229/9/30) links almost directly to a footpath running east-west across Land West of Oxford Road (PR6b)."	Text of 3.2.4 amended
Savills (land promoter)	3.2.4 - Bullet 6: Amend to state: There are three existing vehicle access points to the site, two via Oxford Road and the third via the Park & Ride access road facility. In addition, there is an additional vehicular access onto Oxford Road which serves Pipal Cottage.	Noted	3.2.4, 6th bullet, add the sentence "In addition, there is a vehicular access onto Oxford Road which serves Pipal Cottage."	Text of 3.2.4 amended
Savills (land promoter)	3.2.5 - Bullet 2: Amend to state - Land is allocated within the Oxford Local Plan 2016-2036 on the southern boundary of the site. Land South West Of St Frideswide Farm (allocation SP24) is promoted by Croudace for 134 dwellings and benefits from a resolution to grant full planning permission by OCC (Application Ref. 21/01449/FUL). The proposed development will be accessed via Oxford Road (allocation SP24). Bullet 3: Add reference to Oxford North having the benefit of planning permission (OCC Application Ref. 18/02065/OUTFUL). Bullet 4: Refer to the aggregate rail depot being operated by Hanson Aggregates.	Noted - bullets 2 and 3 to be amended accordingly. The change to bullet 4 is not necessary.	3.2.5, 2nd bullet to be amended to read: "Land is allocated within the Oxford Local Plan 2016-2036 on the southern boundary of the site. Land South West Of St Frideswide Farm (allocation SP24) is promoted by Croudace for 134 dwellings and benefits from a resolution to grant full planning permission by OCC (Application Ref. 21/01449/FUL). The proposed development will be accessed via Oxford Road (allocation SP24)." The third bullet to be amended to refer to the planning permission 18/02065.	Text of 3.2.5 amended
Savills (land promoter)	Figure 9: Site Context (Page 18) & 4.1 - Bullet 2, Target note 2 & Figure 10: Medieval Features: Recommend that the southern feature is amended or removed. It presently covers the barns associated with the listed farmhouse. None are medieval. If this symbol is intended to represent the location of the deserted medieval village or moated site, it should be moved further eastwards, approximately to where the 'St' of St Frideswide is located on each plan.	Noted. The appropriate change will be made.	The relevant figures and text to be amended accordingly.	Figures 9 & 10 amended by moving southern asterisk eastwards to the 'St'

Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.1 - Bullet 6, Target Note 6: The post-medieval milestone on Oxford Road appears no longer to be extant. Confirmation is required that this feature is still in place, otherwise this reference should be removed from the DB.</p>	Neither CDC or OCC has information to the contrary, so the Development Brief will be retained as drafted here	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.1 - Bullet 7, Target Note 7 / Figure 10: A 'High Sensitivity Viewpoint' is marked in the central field; however, this is identified on private land and not from any PRoW within the site. This viewpoint should therefore be removed from Figure 10. This is not followed through on to Figure 11, other than the reference to an 'important connection'. Importantly though, the desire to include views from new public realm to the landscape to the east is included within the DB.</p>	We note the point made but because views to and from listed buildings are important to its significance irrespective of the status of the land from which those views may be derived Figure 10 will not be amended	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.1 - Bullet 11, Target Note 11: To reflect the difference in levels found across the site and the presence of both Flood Zone 3 and also Flood Zone 2, it is requested that this target note is amended to provide greater clarification. This target note should be amended to state: "Although the site falls predominantly within Flood Zone 1 (low probability), site slopes significantly to the east and includes land within Flood Zone 2 and the eastern part of the site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is unsuitable for built development. These areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 are approximately 10 metres lower in elevation when compared to the areas identified for residential development, as shown in the Local Plan Review".</p>	Noted. The text will be amended accordingly	Section 4.1, bullet 11 to be amended as per Savills wording.	Section 4.1 amended.
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.1 - Bullet 12: It is inaccurate to state that flood risk corridors cross the site in several locations. Instead, the bullet point should state "Flood risk mapping indicates that there are localised surface water flow paths at low, medium and high risk of flooding."</p>	Noted. The text will be amended accordingly	Section 4.1, bullet 12 to be amended as per Savills wording.	Section 4.1 amended.
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.1 - Bullet 18: The site is currently undeveloped, in private ownership and not accessed by public roads. In view of this, it is not considered that the site is vulnerable to commuter parking by non-residents. This bullet point should therefore be deleted.</p>	Noted. The words "Once developed" to be added at the start of the sentence and the word "is" should be replaced by "would be"	The words "Once developed" to be added at the start of the sentence and the word "is" should be replaced by "would be"	Section 4.1 amended.
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.2.1 Place Shaping (Page 21) Bullet 3: We note bullet three and confirm that the local centre and primary school should respond to residents' needs, rather than those using the P&R or Oxford Road.</p>	No change required to the text of bullet 3.	None	

Savills (land promoter)	Bullet 4: This point suggests that the location of the P&R / primary school is not fixed in the Local Plan Partial Review. It would be better therefore to remove this numbered circle from the opportunities plan as it suggests a location at the northern end of the site for both of these uses.	Noted - instead, though, an additional circled number 1 will be added where the school is shown in the Local Plan proposals map	an additional circled number 1 will be added where the school is shown in the Local Plan proposals map	Southern '1' added to figure 11
Savills (land promoter)	4.2.2 Heritage and Townscape Character (Page 21) Bullet 5, Target Note 4: Amend to state 'Opportunity to consider incorporating the existing farmhouse (Pipal Cottage) and/or barns within the new development' (subject to landownership and suitability of the barns for reuse and retention).	It would be appropriate to add the words "(Pipal Cottage) and/or barns" prior to 'within the new development' but the phrase "Opportunity to consider" mean that the other words in brackets are not needed.	4.2.2, bullet 5 - add the words "(Pipal Cottage) and/or barns" prior to 'within the new development'	Text of 4.2.2 bullet 5 amended
Savills (land promoter)	4.2.3 Views and Sightlines (Page 21) Target Note 7 suggests that ridgelines on the site should be explored to create views towards Islip Church and the countryside. To date, this has been covered off in general terms, stating that the proposed development should promote views out to the wider landscape to the east. Islip Church is located about 3km from the site and views of it can and should be factored in as part of the street alignment. Figure 11 (Site Opportunities) does illustrate opportunities to retain views east from the PRoWs through the site.	Noted	None	
Savills (land promoter)	4.2.4 Landscape Character (Page 21) Bullet 1, Target Note 8: The retained agricultural land, if included as part of the proposals and subject to an agreed change of land management, could include the introduction of suitable habitat for farmland birds. This matter is for ongoing consideration with the tenant farmer. Mitigation for farmland birds (i.e. habitat within POS and hedgerow buffer zones) will be explored throughout the site too.	Noted	None	
Savills (land promoter)	4.2.4 - Bullet 2 (Page 23): Given that the details of the habitat mix have not yet been confirmed as part of development process, this bullet should include the words 'where appropriate' to allow flexibility.	Since the bullet point begins "Opportunity to retain..." it is considered that the words "wherever possible" are appropriate and sufficient	None	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>Figure 11: Site Opportunities (Page 22) The 'important node' shown on this plan should be moved to the intersection between the junction on Oxford Road and the PRoW crossing the site. This position is where a movement node is created and it is the type of node which has often traditionally formed the centre of villages or market towns. Pipal Cottage and Barns are hidden by the number 4 target note reference icon. The annotation of St Frideswide Farmhouse on the plan is not well-related to the actual building shown on the plan. Suggest an arrow is used to point to the building itself.</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary or appropriate to move the 'important node'. It is noted that Pipal Cottage and Barns are hidden by the number 4 but if the latter was moved then other identified deficiencies would be true of the number 4. The annotation of St Frideswide is away from the actual building in order that it is not over other information, but it is a sensible idea to use to arrow to point to the building itself.</p>	<p>Figure 11 - Add an arrow to connect the words 'St Frideswide Farmhouse' to the building itself between the numbers 2 and 7.</p>	<p>Arrow to Fig 11 added</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.2.5 Movement and Access (Page 23) Bullet 1: Remove wording linked to Park and Ride because the opportunities are limited due to a number of constraints, including land ownership. Repword the bullet point to state that 'Opportunities for new vehicle accesses from Oxford Road, in a co-ordinated manner between sites PR6a and PR6b. Amend: Relocate Target 10 to proposed access points, i.e. in the vicinity of St Frideswide Farm access and north of Water Eaton Estate Access road.</p>	<p>The opportunity exists - land ownership is not an insurmountable constraint. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to amend the wording.</p>	<p>None</p>	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.2.5 - Bullet 1, Second Sentence (Page 24): Change 'districts' to 'district'.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Page 24, first bullet - change "districts" to "district"</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>4.2.5 - Bullet 3 (Page 24): The land promoter acknowledges the need to integrate its proposed development with adjoining development (including PR6b and the Croudace scheme), it is not considered appropriate for this text to make reference to 'an onwards link to Oxford North' as this is not for the PR6a developers to achieve.</p>	<p>Noted, but the development of the site has the potential to enable or disable these connections to be made. The text will be amended accordingly</p>	<p>Page 24, third bullet - amend to "Opportunity to integrate the site layout with adjacent development sites including PR6b, and to enable connections with movement links outside the site including an onwards link to the Oxford North site via high quality crossing of Oxford Road and the rail line."</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Bullet 6: The land promoter requests clarification as to what is meant by this bullet. In particular, what are the parking and enforcement issues which are associated with this site location; and what opportunities exist to address such issues (e.g. Controlled Parking Zones)?</p>	<p>See other comments made in these consultation responses. Although noting that CPZs are outside of the scope of planning, as with PR7a we are happy to add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site.</p>	<p>Add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."</p>	<p>Text amended</p>

Savills (land promoter)	4.2.5 - Bullet 7 (Page 24): a southbound bus lane provision already exists. Amend to state 'Opportunity to build on the public transport corridor by improving the southbound bus lane on Oxford Road'.	Agreed	Text to be amended accordingly.	Text of 4.2.5 amended
Savills (land promoter)	5.1 - First/Second/Third Paragraphs (Page 27): The land promoter requests that the requirement for Sites PR6a and PR6b to be planned comprehensively should be removed from the DB. The development of both sites will instead be guided by their respective Local Plan Partial Review policies and DBs. In terms of those elements of the PR6a development which are intended for use by the residents/occupiers of both the PR6a and PR6b sites, reference should also be made to the co-location centrally within PR6a of the local centre and primary school. In terms of the Oxford Road frontages shared with both PR6a and PR6b, one vehicular access should be located within the vicinity of the existing St Frideswide Farm access, with a second point of access, provided to the north of the Water Eaton Estate access.	We note the comments but for the two sites to be planned comprehensively is a key component of an acceptable development and of good urban design. It would water down the essence of the development brief and weaken the outcome, not least from a highways perspective; in short it would be inappropriate to remove this requirement	None	
Savills (land promoter)	6.1 Sustainable construction and energy efficiency (Page 29) Second Paragraph: In the second sentence reference is made to support being given to the use of recycled materials. At this early stage in the planning process it is uncertain as to how much recycled material could realistically be used. However, the landowner will promote the use of sustainably sourced materials (i.e. locally sourced, recycled where possible, holding Environmental Product Declarations and responsible sourcing certification, for example). The second sentence should be amended to state that 'The use of sustainably sourced materials in the construction of the development and consideration of the Circular Economy is supported'.	Noted and understood, but to amend the Brief in this way would be water down the objective. The text does say "supported" rather than "required"	None	
Savills (land promoter)	6.1 - Fourth Paragraph: To ensure that relevant guidance is complied with in relation to the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging, this sentence should be amended to state that "Electric vehicle charging is to be provided in accordance with the most recently adopted policy at the time of the planning application being determined".	This is the meaning of the text as currently drafted but there is no harm in it being amended - the additional words would give added emphasis.	6.1 to be amended accordingly	Text of 6.1 amended

Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.2 Healthy Place Shaping (Page 30)</p> <p>Third Paragraph, Bullet 4: For clarity and consistency, references to 'pocket parks' should be changed to 'green spaces'.</p> <p>Third Paragraph, Bullet 6: Clarification is required as to what is meant by 'the early provision of health promoting infrastructure' (i.e. does this mean green spaces and community facilities?)</p> <p>Third Paragraph, Bullet 9: It is unclear what is meant by 'avoiding reliance on lift access to upper floors? The proposals will need to comply with Building Regulations in relation to access requirements. This bullet should be removed.</p>	<p>Bullet 4 - agreed; Bullet 6 - those will form part of infrastructure that promotes health; Bullet 9 - it would not be appropriate to remove this bullet but the words 'avoiding reliance on lift access to upper floors' will be clarified.</p>	<p>6.2, 4th bullet - amend "pocket parks" to "green spaces"; 9th bullet - amend "avoiding reliance on lift access to upper floors." to "locating wheelchair accessible dwellings at ground floor level unless exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated."</p>	Text of 6.2 amended
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.3 Character and layout (Page 31)</p> <p>First Paragraph: Reference is made to a 'visible and distinctive frontage to Oxford Road'. However, as shown on Figure 12 (Development Framework) existing trees along the Oxford Road frontage are to be retained where possible. The Development Framework plan also requires new avenue planting along the Oxford Road. It, therefore, appears that there are different, competing elements stated in the draft DB. The land promoter requests that amendments are made to the DB in order to clarify what is required for the Oxford Road frontage. E.g. are there to be some gaps in the existing green frontage, where new planting will be provided, creating a setting (rather than hiding) new development – and new development will also be visible from the entrances to the site?</p>	<p>Visible and distinctive frontage' is not incompatible with retained trees / new planting, which, as suggested, will create a setting for the strong built frontage behind. That said, it may be that other parts of the Development Brief need to be amended for consistency and to recognise that not all existing trees and hedgerows will be kept along the Oxford Road frontage.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Development Principles, Bullet 4: The location of the local centre has been raised with CDC as part of preapplication discussions. The location of the local centre should be in a central position within PR6a alongside Oxford Road so that it can serve the residents of PR6a and PR6b. The proposed location of the local centre is not intended to encourage passing vehicular traffic (i.e. to enter the PR6a site) but rather to 'accommodate' it.</p>	<p>Noted. It is generally agreed that the local centre should be adjacent to the school. A central location has benefits; however, for different reasons the evidence to date shows that the school would have to be in the northern location broadly where shown in the draft Development Brief. The Local Plan proposals map shows the local centre in the north-west corner of the site; this has been adjusted in the draft Brief and flexibility added as to its final location but it remains important for it to be sited adjacent to the school. We don't consider it appropriate or necessary to amend the text of the Brief in relation to encouraging passing trade.</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 4: With regard to the reference that the primary school should be in the northern part of the site, please refer to the comments made in relation to Figure 1 (Development Framework). As previously stated, the land promoter considers that the school is most appropriately sited in a central location.	The location of the school is discussed elsewhere and for different reasons the evidence to date shows that it would have to be in the northern location broadly where shown in the draft Development Brief.		
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 9: Re-phrase to state that green spaces etc should be overlooked by homes for passive surveillance.	Comment noted. The words "of those spaces" will be added to the text as drafted.	Page 31, 9th bullet, add "of those spaces" after surveillance at the end of the sentence.	Text of page 31 amended
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 11: Repword to state that the affordable housing tenure mix will be agreed with CDC, in consultation with OCC, and make provision for tenures which take account of prevailing Local Plan policies and approved guidance (including in relation to First Homes).	It is important, given the affordable housing is to meet Oxford's unmet need, that the bullet point here specifies Oxford City Council policy rather than be more generic as suggested. It is also important to state that there is a preference for social rent tenure.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 13: The Brief needs to be clearer on the issue of opening up some new views from Oxford Road into the site, and retaining existing planting (a requirement elsewhere in the DB), which will retain the restrictive views into the site from Oxford Road. This guidance also needs to balance the need for possible tree and vegetation removal to enable the new vehicular accesses into the site. As stated in relation to the First Paragraph of Section 6.3, the DB needs to be amended in order to provide clear and coordinated guidance which shapes the character and landscape of the Oxford Road corridor. The text guidance in this Bullet appears to be at odds with other guidance included in the draft DB.	There isn't the inconsistency suggested by Savills. The provision of the cycleway will likely require some selective removal of vegetation, and it is recognised the provision of new vehicular accesses will likely also require the same.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Fig 15 - The Croudace scheme should be shown in outline on the plan (like the PR6b development blocks).	Noted - the appropriate figures should be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development	The appropriate figures will be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development	Changed - as above
Savills (land promoter)	Fig 15 - The area shown below is identified in Figure 1 (Development Framework) as 'residential'. Requests that a development perimeter block is identified in this location. (extract of Figure 15 shown)	This is shown as the location for the allotments. It is also an important long distance view to retain and an important space for the setting of the listed building to the east of the site.	None	

Savills (land promoter)	6.3.1 Oxford Road eastern frontage character area (Page 35) Development Principles, Bullet 1 indicates that properties fronting Oxford Road are to be visible from the road set back behind a tree corridor, with some trees 'thinned out' and ground vegetation removed. Whilst this text does clarify the DB's approach in relation to retention of trees, elsewhere in the DB there is a requirement to retain existing trees and hedgerows. While the Development Framework (Figure 1) indicates the desire to retain tree and vegetation on the frontage, it would be useful for CDC to acknowledge acceptance that delivering an active frontage, vehicular accesses, strategic cycling route, formal contemporary avenue of trees and local centre fronting on to Oxford Road will result in some loss to habitat on this frontage and significantly change its present character.	There isn't the inconsistency suggested by Savills. The first bullet at 6.3.1 also refers to thinning out / removal of some vegetation and refers to retention of the better quality trees. The text at 6.3.1 therefore reflects what is shown in Figure 1 which requires certain groups of trees to be retained "where possible"	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 2: the land promoter notes that appropriate building heights will be reviewed as part of its Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (including landscape wireline work), which will be submitted with its outline planning application for the development of PR6a.	The Development Brief is clear as to what heights of buildings will be considered appropriate, though it is acknowledged that LVIA work may require shorter buildings in some areas of the site.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 3: The desire for a continuous line of housing is inconsistent with the aim to maintain and open up views across the landscape.	We would disagree. If a frontage is not required to be continuous, lots of little gaps appear in development layouts. What is intended here is that other than for roads, footpaths or SuDS features leading from Oxford Road, the frontage will be continuous.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 5: Clarification should be given that it is Pipal Cottage which is being referred to here.	Agreed	The text will be amended accordingly	Text of 6.3.1 amended
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 6: This Bullet clarifies some of the previous points made in relation to the local centre.	Noted	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 9: Amend to read "Further pedestrian and cycle access points will be provided with the primary vehicular junction and in the vicinity of the Park & Ride junction at the northern end of the site"	It may be appropriate to add the words "or as close as possible to" before "the Park & Ride junction" but otherwise the bullet point will remain as drafted.	Page 35, 9th bullet - Add the words "or as close as possible to" before "the Park & Ride junction"	Text of page 35 amended

Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 10: Remove wording requiring a vehicle egress point onto the Park and Ride junction. The opportunities to achieve this are limited due to a number of constraints, including land ownership. In addition, please amend the final sentence to clarify that this restriction on direct vehicular access onto Oxford Road is only applicable to new dwellings.	The vehicular egress point onto the park and ride junction forms part of the strategy discussed in detail with the County Council and should remain. We agree in relation to the final sentence.	Page 35, 10th bullet - Add the words "Other than for Pipal Cottage" at the start of the last sentence.	Text of page 35 amended
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 11: Comment on parking is too restrictive and not necessary in this location of the document. ChCh has been advised by OXCC that rear parking courts are to be avoided. ChCh requests confirmation that this approach has been agreed with OXCC. Amend text: Reduced levels of parking are to be provided, with parking for apartments and townhouses generally located to the rear of properties in small parking courts or rear garages, serving a maximum of 6 properties. Garages in the street elevation are not permitted. Access roads parallel to the Oxford Road providing frontage access and assisting with active frontages to the properties facing Oxford Road should also be considered. Parking can be sympathetically integrated into this type of layout and will assist in achieving an additional setting and set-back for noise purposes	We would disagree. This requirement applies to the Oxford Road eastern frontage character area. In this area of the site neither frontage parking or side-of-house parking will be acceptable. The words ", neither will frontage parking or side-of-house parking be permitted" to be added at the end of the bullet point.	Page 35, 11th bullet - Add the words ", neither will frontage parking or side-of-house parking be permitted" at the end of the bullet point.	Text of page 35 amended
Savills (land promoter)	Figure 17: This figure shows the wholesale removal of vegetation under trees and the cycle way aligned through the existing vegetation and under tree canopy. The orientation of the cycle way through the vegetation in this way does not allow much provision for the retention of the woodland habitat on the Oxford Road frontage. Amend: Change plan to plot the cycle route to avoid existing vegetation, where possible. Figure 17: The 8-10m shown in front of the local centre is an arrangement that could allow shared street vehicular access in addition to pedestrian and cycle access to these frontages and would seem to work well.	We would agree with regard to the location of the cycleways and have discussed this with the land promoter - the development brief will be amended in this regard. The northern location of the school makes use of the cycle and footways through the site in the same way that the central location would.	The figures on page 37 will be amended to show the cycleways further into the site away from the Oxford Road frontage.	Figure 17 section. Cycleway moved to within 8-10m area. Middle tree is put back to the east of Oxford Road that was removed. Tree was put back to the west of Oxford Road.
Savills (land promoter)	Figure 17: The land promoter is not certain that the local centre should 'front' onto Oxford Road. The land promoter envisages that the local centre potentially having visibility from the Oxford Road, but facing into the site to create an area that is suitable for sitting out and conversation between residents. This figure should be amended in relation to the way in which it shows local centre frontage and public realm/local centre spill out.	It is not considered that these should be mutually exclusive - it could do both	None	

Savills (land promoter)	Figure 17 is indicative only and as set out in the title is 'subject to final design by OCC.' The exact alignment will be subject to the outcomes of the traffic modelling and access strategy.	Noted	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Figures 16 and 17: Add text setting out that: Cross sections including the provision of cycle lanes and footways are indicative only, subject to the design of the masterplan. Variations to the cross sections should be allowed, so long as they respond to delivering high quality walking and cycling infrastructure in line with LTN1/20 principles.	The text for Figure 17 notes that it is indicative. Whether variations will be allowed is a matter for the planning application.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	6.3.2 Valley View character area (Page 38) Development Principles, Bullet 4: This principle is unclear. From the western edge of this character area it will not be possible towards St Frideswide Farm and the countryside? Development Principles, Bullet 5: Delete "Parking to the front of properties is to be avoided" as it is not necessary to be specific in this regards.	We would disagree on both counts	None	
Savills (land promoter)	6.3.2 - Southern Area, Bullet 1 (Page 38): The land promoter considers it is appropriate to reflect the more linear grid of the Victorian street pattern in Oxford adjoining the southern part of this area (and linking with the Croudace scheme), with higher density terraces giving way to the more loose pattern of development described in the brief that responds to the proximity of the St Frideswide Farmhouse. Southern Area, Bullet 1 (Page 40): The land promoter requests further clarification as to what is meant by this bullet.	We note this comment and the text may be amended accordingly	Page 38, 1st bullet under Southern area, text to be amended to reflect Savills' submission	Text of 6.3.2 amended to read "The grain of the development is expected to be looser in the area adjacent to St Frideswide Farmhouse with a greater proportion of larger plots and houses, within an efficient overall layout. Appropriate housing typologies include semi-detached, short runs of terrace and occasional detached properties. Further south, higher density terraces will be appropriate reflecting the more linear grid of the Victorian street pattern in Oxford to the south of this area and the adjacent Oxford City site proposals."
Savills (land promoter)	6.3.2 - Northern Area, Bullet 2 (Page 38): Amend: Reference to an existing woodland corridor should be deleted as this is not present in this location. Also, based on baseline noise assessment work undertaken on behalf of the landowner, it is also noted that noise constraints are not present in relation to the frontage near the P&R. Northern Area, Bullet 3 (Page 38): This bullet refers to 'semi'-continuous, whereas Bullet 2 states 'near'-continuous. Amend to address the inconsistency.	It may be outside the site, but there does appear to be a woodland corridor in the location referred to. The "semi-" will be amended to "near-" in the interests of consistency.	6.3.2, 3rd bullet - "semi-" to be amended to "near-"	Text amended

Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.1 General Principles (Page 41) Third Paragraph: Change Cherwell Residential Design Guide to Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide.</p>	<p>The Cherwell Residential Design Guide should take primacy. The Oxfordshire Street Design Guide isn't referenced in the Development Briefs for PR7b and PR9, so the effect of agreeing the change will be that parking has to be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide in the case of PR6a but not in the case of PR7b or PR9. And, whether or not is mentioned in the Development Briefs, the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide is/will be a material consideration in the assessment of proposals at PR7b and PR9 despite it not being mentioned in the Development Briefs for those sites, just as it will for proposals at PR7a.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.2 Vehicle Access (Page 41) Development Principles, Bullet 2: As identified above It is not necessary to define the junction type. Amend to read: A secondary access point is to be located in the northern part of the site. This is to take the form of a priority new left-in, left-out junction onto Oxford Road with pedestrian, cycle and bus priority across the frontage. The location of the junction is to be agreed with OXCC, with an indicative location shown on figure 18. It is not essential for this junction to be directly aligned with the secondary access to PR6b.</p>	<p>We would disagree with regard to the main junction. The proposed edits are not considered necessary.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.2 - Development Principles, Bullet 3: It is not necessary to define the junction as left out only. Amend to read: A third junction could be provided at the northern end of the site onto the Park & Ride access road arm. This is to be a left-out only design which will allow vehicles to then turn right at the signals. This is to be unsignalized and must allow for bus and ped/cycle priority across the junction. Development Principles, Bullet 3 (Page 42): Amend second sentence to read: "This access is to be rerouted, potentially via the proposed northern access junction, or existing field gate in vicinity to Park and Ride, with details to be agreed with OCC". Add: Agricultural access required to serve land and properties to the east of the allocation will be designed into the proposed masterplan, following agreement with OXCC.</p>	<p>We would disagree and consider the text as drafted to be appropriate</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.4 Street hierarchy and typologies (Page 43) Development Principles, Bullet 1: Reference should be made to the Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide rather than the Cherwell Residential Design Guide.</p>	<p>As per above, we would disagree. The Cherwell Residential Design Guide takes primacy.</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 3: Comment on parking is too restrictive and not necessary in this location of the document --Amend: Parking is to be provided on street, to the side or rear of properties. Front drive parking is not permitted.	The development brief should not be watered down in this way. It is appropriate and necessary to preclude all front drive parking.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 4: Amend Road width to allow for bus provision The street should have a carriageway of between 4.8 – 6.5 m varying to accommodate coaches associated with the school, street trees, opportunities for on-street parking and pinch points for speed control (which should also be reflected in the building line).	Agreed; text to be amended accordingly; Savills will recognise that in the central part of the site - particularly if they proceed with a central location for the school - a carriageway at the thinnest end of that range will be required	Page 43, 4th bullet under Development principles - amend 5.5m to 6.5m; 7th bullet - amend 'designend' to "designed"	Text of P43 changed and figure 18 label changed to -6.5m
Savills (land promoter)	Development Principles, Bullet 7: The last part of the sentence relating to “which are designed to accommodate large farm vehicles” should be deleted as it is not intended for farm vehicles to use the primary street.	Noted - text to be amended accordingly	See left	Whole sentence deleted, as width of street increased to 6.5m.
Savills (land promoter)	Figure 18: B-B – typical primary street cross section (Page 43) Amend Carriageway width – this should be from 4.8m to 6.5m to allow for future bus access / bus access to the primary school. Add text setting out that: Cross sections including the provision of cycle lanes and footways are indicative only, subject to the design of the masterplan. Variations to the cross sections should be allowed, so long as they respond to delivering high quality walking and cycling infrastructure in line with LTN1/20 principles.	Agreed, with some modifications to what is proposed, recognising the constraints that may exist in parts of the site	Page 43, Figure 18 - Add text on page 43 to state: "Cross sections including the provision of cycle lanes and footways are indicative only and subject to detailed modelling. Variations to the cross sections may be permissible where they respond to delivering high quality walking and cycling infrastructure in line with LTN1/20 principles, or where site constraints may dictate, for example in the central part of the site.	Text added to 6.4.4 intro. Figure 18 label amended.

Savills (land promoter)	<p>Amend figure 19 in line with comments below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number, location and type of crossing points shown is too prescriptive and does not allow for flexibility in the design of the corridor as a whole. Defining these now could prejudice a better overall design solution. 2. Primary Street: This could be extended further south. 3. Pedestrian and cycle crossing point adjacent to P&R access to be amended to be 'potential Pedestrian and cycle crossing point*' (subject to detail design and modelling). 4. Pedestrian and cycle crossing point opposite secondary access to be relocated to be closer to east west PRow routes. * (subject to detail design and modelling). 5. Secondary access: Type of junction should not be identified as 'left in left out' can be left with the ** stating 'Type of junction subject to Traffic Modelling'. 6. Vehicular egress point only - not necessary to dictate that the access should be left out only – May be necessary for agricultural access. Amend to state 'Ancillary access point**.' 7. Proposed Bus Stops: Add location subject to detail design. 	(1), (3), (5) and (6) - We disagree. (2) We have reviewed this but do not consider it necessary. It will be for the applicant to justify a greater width here. (4) Noted.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.4 Street hierarchy and typologies (Page 45) References should be made to the Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide rather than the Cherwell Residential Design Guide. Development Principles, Bullet 2 (Page 45): The first sentence should be amended to reflect the fact that the secondary streets will be low speed / flow environments, as a result they don't need separate cycleways.</p>	<p>In respect of the Design Guides, see earlier comments. In respect of secondary streets we would agree and will add text for emphasis.</p>	<p>Page 45 - add text after "urban blocks" - ". Secondary streets will be low speed / flow environments and will not require separate cycleways."</p>	Text added to page 45
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.5 - Development Principles, Bullet 1: Amend second sentence by replacing the reference to 'Detailed designs' with 'Preliminary designs' to take account of the fact that the design does not need to be detailed at the preapp stage.</p>	<p>We would disagree with the proposed change but consider the text may be amended to provide flexibility.</p>	<p>6.4.5, 1st bullet - Amend from "through the pre-application process..." to "with OCC and CDC's Development Management Teams prior to the submission of a planning application".</p>	Tex of 6.4.5 amended

Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.5 - North-South Green Link: Add additional paragraph in respect to North South Link, as facilities within the emerging masterplan are likely to reduce the reliance on a cycle route designed to adoptable standards through the green corridor. This new paragraph could read as follows: "Should an additional North-South link be provided between Cutteslowe Park and Oxford Parkway Railway Station/Park & Ride and link with the wider public rights of way network running east-west, the status of the North-South link could be downgraded, so as not to have to be designed to OCC's adoptable standards. Notwithstanding this the green link should be designed to accommodate leisure cyclists, wheelchair users or pedestrians".</p>	<p>This evidence is not available to CDC; and the North-South cycle way is a key element of infrastructure to the PR6a development. It would not be appropriate to effectively remove the North-South cycle way from the development.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.5 - East West Links, Bullet 1: Add 'Subject to ecology studies' to the start of the first sentence. East-West Links, Bullet 2: For clarification, this point should mention that the second east-west PRoW runs to Frideswide Farm. East-West Links, Bullet 3: Amend: Suggest this bullet is amended to read "new publicly accessible routes are to be provided across the parkland to connect with existing public rights of way and into Cutteslowe Park". In addition, the reference to bridleway provision should not be included in the Brief in relation to East-West Links. The introduction of horses into the parkland and Cutteslowe Park is unlikely to be compatible with or acceptable to users.</p>	<p>Bullet 1 - this seems a sensible addition. Bullet 2 - the respondent appears to be referring to a different route to that which the Brief refers. Bullet 3 - the point is noted and the text will be amended as necessary.</p>	<p>6.4.5 east-west links, 1st bullet - Add "Subject to ecology studies," prior to the existing text. 3rd bullet - Amend text to "New public walking routes are to be provided across the parkland to connect with existing footpaths and into Cutteslowe Park."</p>	Text of 6.4.5 amended
Savills (land promoter)	<p>East West Links, Bullet 5: The text is too prescriptive in terms of the number of direct formal crossing points. Furthermore a crossing to the north is not a requirement of PR6a, as the P&R and Station is on the same side as the site. Three formal controlled crossings is likely to create additional delay for public transport and cyclists and potentially be at odds with OCC aspirations for the Oxford Road corridor.</p>	<p>Having worked up these proposals with OCC (who share the respondent's aims not to create delay for public transport and cyclists), CDC does not believe this text is too prescriptive.</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.6 Parking (Page 47) First Paragraph: The land promoter is developing a bespoke parking standard, designed to address parking demand now and in the future, with the aim of reducing car dependence across the site. It is however not appropriate to apply Oxford City parking standards across the whole of the site. Amend First Paragraph: "Car parking provision and design will be in line with the OXCC's emerging guidance, whilst having regard to Oxford City parking standards, the Cherwell Residential Design Guide SPD, OXCC's Street Design Guide, as well as the good practice recommendations in Manual for Streets. Adequate parking for visitors and car clubs should be designed into the site layout".</p>	<p>We note the comments and would be interested to read more of the bespoke parking standard referred to. However, it is not considered appropriate to refer to guidance or standards which have not yet been adopted.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.4.7 Emergency access and refuse collection (Page 48) Reference should be made to the Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide List of Documents (Page 48): Delete reference to Policy ESD16 (Oxford Canal) because this is not directly relevant to the proposed development of Site PR6a. Add reference to the Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide.</p>	<p>We note the comment regarding reference to the OCC Street Design Guide; however, the list of documents is comprised of Development Plan documents and the Cherwell Residential Design Guide. We agree in relation to Policy ESD16.</p>	Page 48, list of documents, delete "Policy ESD16: The Oxford Canal"	Page 48 amended
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.5 Green infrastructure (Page 49) First Paragraph, Bullets 2 and 3: Clarify that the areas specified overlap. Development Principles, Bullet 2: Hairstreak is one word. Development Principles, Bullet 3: The landowner notes the requirement for hedgerow planting along to the east of the residential area (i.e. along the Green Belt boundary). Whilst the key here will be to define a new defensible boundary to the Green Belt, and a new hedgerow may be effective, the landscape strategy should allow flexibility for the edge to be defined by new POS and additional tree planting where appropriate.</p>	<p>As per above, Policy PR6a lists them separately and so it is appropriate to list them separately here. Development Principles, bullet 2 - noted. Bullet 3 - noted; we would disagree with the suggested flexibility but agree that adding reference to trees is appropriate.</p>	Page 49, Development Principles, 2nd bullet - change Hair Streak to "Hairstreak". 3rd bullet - add after "hedgerow line" the words "which may include tree planting"	Text of 6.5 amended
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.5 - Development Principles, Bullet 5: The requirement for a woodland landscape buffer to be created between the parkland and the adjacent retained agricultural land, like the requirement for hedgerow planting along the Green Belt boundary above, is rather prescriptive and the principles should allow for greater flexibility of landscape planting in this area.</p>	<p>While we note these comments, we consider the level of detail in the Development Brief strikes an appropriate balance, and has been arrived at after careful consideration regarding the relationship of the development with retained Green Belt land.</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>Development Principles (Page 52, Bullet 1): Typo, Anglo Saxon.</p> <p>Development Principles (Page 52, Bullet 3): Allotment provision should be dispersed across the site to maximise accessibility for all residents.</p> <p>Development Principles (Page 52, Bullet 5): It may not be appropriate to remove all vegetation in order to deliver visibility into the site as this could compromise the delivery of biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Development Principles (Page 53, Bullet 1): Reference is made to 'where additional funding is made available'. It would be helpful to know where this source of funding could come from.</p>	<p>Typo noted - text to be amended. 5th bullet - noted - text to be clarified.</p>	<p>Page 52, first bullet - amend Anglo Sa to read "Anglo Saxon"; 5th bullet - after the word removed add "(subject to the requirement for biodiversity net gain)"</p>	<p>Tex of p52 amended</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Fig 21. The Croudace scheme should be shown in outline on the plan (like the PR6b development blocks).</p> <p>The area shown below is identified in Figure 1 (Development Framework) as 'residential'. Please refer to comments made in relation to this Figure, in particular the request that a development perimeter block is identified in this location.</p> <p>This figure does not include a green corridor that would accommodate the diversion of the existing overland surface water flow route displaced by the school.</p>	<p>Noted - the appropriate figures should be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development. In relation to the allotments, see earlier comments. The green corridor is shown so it is unclear as to what this comment relates.</p>	<p>The appropriate figures will be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development</p>	<p>Croudace layout added to plans</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.5.2 Blue infrastructure (Page 55)</p> <p>Development Principles, Bullet 2: Drainage attenuation features are shown on Figure 21 not 19.</p> <p>Typo, the words 'area and' are missing from bullet point which should read "...the residential developable area and outside.. " (replace 'outside' with these words).</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Page 55, 2nd bullet - change 'figure 19' to "figures 15 and 21". "Oxfordshire County Council Drainage Team" to be amended to "lead local flood authority".</p> <p>Page 56, 2nd bullet - change "outside and outside" to "area and outside"</p>	<p>Text of 55 as per OCC comment below and 56 amended</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.5.3 Green Belt (Page 56)</p> <p>Second Paragraph: Clarification is required as to what is meant in terms of enhancements to the setting of St Frideswide Farmhouse?</p>	<p>It is considered that the words after 'open space' are not necessary and can be removed</p>	<p>Page 56, 2nd para under Green Belt - remove the words "including enhancements to the setting of St Frideswide Farmhouse".</p>	<p>Text deleted from 6.5.2</p>

Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.6 Community infrastructure (Page 57) Second/Third Paragraphs: As stated in the land promoter's response to Figure 1: Development Framework (Page 2), the location of the proposed Primary School should be changed to a more central location. The proposed location for the school in the draft DB is poorly related in relation to the majority of the residential properties at PR6a and remote in relation to the future residents of PR6b. In terms of the issues which would be associated with the siting of the proposed school in this location, the land promoter notes that it sits over an existing surface water overland flow route that could be used for sustainable drainage and habitat creation if the school was elsewhere; and it affects a high quality tree that would need to be removed. Please refer to a separate note which has been produced on behalf of the landowner which supports and provide the rationale for the siting of the proposed primary school in a central location within PR6a.</p>	<p>The Local Plan proposals map shows the local centre in the northern part of the site. There is much sense in the local centre and the primary school being adjacent to each other, and that is reflected in the Development Brief. As explained elsewhere, based on current evidence the central part of the site is not able to accommodate the school without conflicting with Green Belt policy or harming archaeology and so it needs to be located elsewhere - the only other position which works for the school's requirements is that which is shown in the Brief, and which happens to be in the vicinity of where the Local Plan proposals map shows the local centre. The location shown is indicative and the Council's intention is that the school site layout will be refined to allow for the retention and use of the surface water overland flow route.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.6 - Design Principles, Bullet 3, Sub-Bullet 5: Based on discussions held between the land promoter and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) it is understood that the provision of healthcare facilities on site is not required. Design Principles, Bullet 5: Reference to how the local centre is accessed by vehicles is a detailed matter which should not form part of the DB.</p>	<p>We note the comment in relation to bullet 3, sub-bullet 5. CDC will need to discuss with the CCG as to the context and specifics. Appendix 4 of the LPPR Plan requires the provision of health care facilities at PR6a.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.6 - Primary School (Page 58): Please refer to the land promoter's comments in relation to Figure 1 and in Savills supporting note (See Appendix 1) Primary School (Page 58, Bullet 3): A 50db LAeq limit at the school site boundary would be achieved if the school is provided in the central location. List of Documents (Page 58): An accurate list of OXCC document references with dates / sources etc should be provided.</p>	<p>Primary school location - discussed elsewhere. Bullet 3 - noted, but noise isn't a constraint for either of the two locations.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>6.7 Heritage and archaeology (Page 59) First Paragraph: The requirement for Listed Building Consent should be removed. This paragraph relates to the barns at St Frideswide Farm. All of these buildings are located outside the PR6a site and will not form part of the proposals, so no LBC is required.</p>	<p>Noted. The Development Brief text here is relevant to the curtilage listed wall located at / on the site's boundary.</p>	None	

Savills (land promoter)	6.7 - Development Principles, Bullet 1: The land promoter questions the reference to the open aspect to the farmhouse setting. The Green Infrastructure corridor will be undeveloped, but will have the addition of landscape planting for ecological and landscape mitigation and enhancements. The CDC Conservation Officer has also specifically requested increased planting around the farmhouse to increase screening.	Noted	None	
Savills (land promoter)	6.7 - Development Principles, Bullet 5: The requirement is not normal for an outline planning application. It has been agreed that archaeology beyond the barrows can be mitigated by excavation, the scope of which can be agreed in further detail with the OXCC Archaeologist, but this is not normally agreed until post-consent.	Disagreed. If the work is required prior to the determination of the application it could not be left to a Reserved Matters application. Such work is required either prior to the determination of the application or pursuant to the requirements of (a) condition(s) of an outline permission. Bullet 5 remains correct as drafted unless the County Council archaeology team advises otherwise.	None	
Savills (land promoter)	6.7 - List of Documents (Page 59): Under the Local Plan there is reference to 'saved policy', we question if these words should be included here. The reference to Policy C21 of the Local Plan 1996 should be removed from the list because the allocation site does not include any listed buildings or listed buildings which will be re-used as part of the proposed development at PR6a.	The inclusion of the words 'Saved policies' is correct, but Saved Policy C21 is not necessary to include here.	Page 59, list of policies - C21 to be removed.	Page 59 list amended
Savills (land promoter)	6.8 Utilities and infrastructure Development Principles, Bullet 3: References to addressing any potential noise pollution have already been addressed in Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2. The requirements in Section 6.8 therefore duplicate what has previously been said and should be deleted from here.	Agreed	Page 60, 3rd bullet to be removed	P60 30 bullet deleted
Savills (land promoter)	7.1 Information to accompany planning applications (Page 61) Second Paragraph: This text should be revised to confirm that pre-application discussions are being held with CDC, OXCC, OCC and other stakeholders. This process commenced in March 2021.	Noted and welcomed, but not considered necessary to amend the text as it relates to the site rather than specific proposals or proposers	None	

Savills (land promoter)	<p>7.1 - Delivery and Phasing Plan: The provision of this Plan is better suited to the discharge of a planning condition attached to the grant of outline planning permission.</p> <p>Public right of way statement: The land promoter notes that all public rights of way will be retained and none diverted. As a result, it is not considered necessary to prepare and submit a PRoW Statement with the planning application for PR6a.</p>	<p>Noted. In relation to Delivery and Phasing this is a requirement of Policy PR6a and it will be for applicants to explain why may be deferred to a condition of any planning permission. In relation to PRoW, the statement would reflect this and be able to concentrate on how the PRoWs will be incorporated into the development</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>7.1 - Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Assessment (foul and surface water drainage) including Water Infrastructure Capacity: The land promoter notes that there is a requirement for an assessment of 'Water Infrastructure Capacity'. The land promoter's interpretation of this is that it relates to Thames Water's clean water supply which will be covered in the land promoter's Services and Utilities report which will be submitted with the application.</p>	<p>The Water Infrastructure Capacity assessment should form part of / inform the FRA and the Drainage Assessment</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Employment, Skills and Training Plan: The land promoter has requested clarification from CDC as part of its pre-app consultation as to whether the provision of this required with the submission of its planning application or whether it can be the subject of a planning condition.</p>	Noted	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Third Paragraph: The land promoter has received a Scoping Opinion from CDC, dated 9th June 2021 (CDC Ref. 21/01635/SCOP). As a result of the Scoping Opinion, the land promoter is undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment which takes into consideration the matters which CDC considers should be 'scoped in' This paragraph should therefore be amended to reflect this.</p>	Noted	Page 61 - the text will be amended accordingly	<p>7.1 text amended. "A Scoping Opinion was issued by CDC in July 2021 in relation to the requirement for Environmental Impact Assessment (CDC Ref.21/01635/SCOP). As a result, an Environmental Impact Assessment is to be prepared which takes into consideration the matters which have been 'scoped in' . "</p>
Savills (land promoter)	<p>Fourth Paragraph: The land promoter notes the requirements stated in this paragraph for detailed and reserved matters applications. In relation to a Services and Utilities Plan, the land promoter considers that this requirement is rare for such applications and should instead be removed from this list and be a requirement instead for a planning condition.</p> <p>This would allow time for service providers to input more meaningfully, especially if the onsite plots design are emerging and not part of detailed or reserved matters applications.</p>	<p>On-site plot design will need to form part of a detailed planning application or reserved matters application. In relation to the Services and Utilities Plan, it will be for applicants to explain why may be deferred to a condition of any planning permission.</p>	None	
Savills (land promoter)	<p>7.2 Securing comprehensive development (Page 61) Fourth Paragraph (Page 62): The provision of this Plan is better suited to the discharge of a planning condition attached to the grant of outline planning permission.</p>	As per above	None	

Savills (land promoter)	Appendix A - Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) Partial Review, the "LPPR": Delete reference to Policy PR12b (Sites Not Allocated in the Partial Review), this is not relevant to the delivery of PR6a.	Agreed	Page 63 - Reference to PR12b to be deleted	Appendix A amended
Savills (land promoter)	Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996: Delete reference to Policies TR11 (Oxford Canal), TR22 (Roads), C14 (Trees and Landscaping), C21 (Re-Use of Listed Buildings), C23 (Conservation Areas) and ENV10 (Hazardous Installations) as these are not relevant to the development and delivery of PR6a.	TR11 and TR22 - agreed. In respect of the other named policies it is considered important to retain these in the interests of consistency with other Development Briefs	Page 64 - Reference to Policies TR11 and TR22 to be deleted, as well as C29.	Appendix A amended
OCC	Although from a strategic point of view it would be better if the two sites on either side of Oxford Road, PR6a and PR6b, were developed together, it is acknowledged that the developers appear to have different timeframes for these. However, we expect the developers to work together to minimise disruption, particularly disruption to the road network, and seek that the development briefs provide for a comprehensive development of both sites.	Agreed	None	
OCC	There is another development site immediately adjoining PR6a, separated only by the District boundary with Oxford City. That site, known as the St Frideswide Farm allocation SP24, now has planning consent pursuant to 21/01449/FUL for a development of some 134 homes. To be up to date, mention of this adjoining consent should be included in this development brief and it should be shown on figures. Given the status of that, this development brief has to be written to ensure that the PR6a development complements that consented development.	Agreed - the appropriate figures should be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development	The appropriate figures will be updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development	As above.
OCC	There is also a point to note in that the development brief for PR6a covers the entire allocation, but the developers, as per the information available on their website, are intending to exclude from their application site the existing Pipal Cottage house site, which has its own road access, therefore leaving that in situ. The relationship of that existing development and the proximity to the road boundary of Pipal Cottage's boundary wall, are issues that are not addressed in the development brief, and it may be that the development brief should be amended.	We agree on the substantive issue, but Section 6.3.1 (6th bullet) covers this matter and it is not considered necessary to add further text in this regard.	None	

OCC	<p>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. 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 16 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, some of it for agriculture and the remainder as new green space and parkland. 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.	Other than in relation to land outside of the allocated boundary, which is outside the remit of the development brief, amend the text of Section 6.5.	New initial paragraph added to 6.5 'Some 16 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, some of it for agriculture and the remainder as new green space and parkland.'
OCC	<p>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 on under 5.1 on page 25 following the paragraph which details the requirements of Policy PR6a as follows:</p> <p>'A minimum of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings are required as part of the overall mix of the 690 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>Approximately 230m north of the allocation site there is a safeguarded aggregate rail depot under Policy M9 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. This is operated by Hanson. We appreciate that this is shown in Figure 9. It is also referenced in 3.2.5 of the development brief, and although it is good that it is mentioned, it should also be referenced in 4.1 under 'site constraints' and shown on Figure 10. Awareness of this constraint is necessary when designing development nearby.</p>	Noted	Add reference to aggregate rail depot to figure 10 and section 4.1.	Aggregate rail depot added to figure 10. New bullet added to 4.1 "The proximity of the site to the safeguarded aggregate rail depot to the north east of Oxford Parkway Station should be considered."

OCC	<p>Digital Infrastructure</p> <p>We suggest adding a new paragraph under 6.8 on page 60 to address the importance of digital infrastructure and need for full fibre installation at the build phase.</p> <p>'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>	<p>This is more akin to policy than to the scope of the development brief. In addition, it is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>n/a</p>
OCC	<p>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 not appropriate to refer to documents as yet unadopted. 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>	<p>None</p>	<p>n/a</p>
OCC	<p>The Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, which was approved in January 2022 following consultation which closed in November 20214, should be referred to in the development brief, along with the Oxford Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, approved in March 20205. We seek amendment to the second bullet point under 4.2.5 as follows:</p> <p>'Opportunity to integrate the site layout with adjacent development sites including PR6b and movement links outside the site including an onwards link to the Oxford North site via high quality crossing of Oxford Road and the rail line, and an onward link over the A40 via the existing bridge adjoining Cutteslowe Park. Regard should be had to published guidance including the Oxford and Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans.'</p>	<p>Happy to amend the bullet point as suggested</p>	<p>4.2.5, amend the 2nd bullet point to read: "Opportunity to integrate the site layout with adjacent development sites including PR6b and movement links outside the site including an onwards link to the Oxford North site via high quality crossing of Oxford Road and the rail line, and an onward link over the A40 via the existing bridge adjoining Cutteslowe Park. Regard should be had to published guidance including the Oxford and Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans."</p>	<p>4.2.5 5th bullet (to which this relates) amended in light of this comment and Savills comment above. Now reads "Opportunity to integrate the site layout with adjacent development sites including PR6b, and to enable connections with movement links outside the site including an onwards link to the Oxford North site via high quality crossing of Oxford Road and the rail line and an onward link over the A40 via the existing bridge adjoining Cutteslowe Park. Regard should be had to published guidance including the Oxford and Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans"</p>
OCC	<p>Bus Routes</p> <p>There are good existing bus services along the A4165 outside the site, and an existing southbound bus lane. Figure 19 shows a possible location of an additional bus stop near the centre of the site, which we support, subject to detailed assessment.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>	

OCC	<p>Car & cycle parking - We seek that the text in 6.4.6 be amended as follows: 'Car parking provision and design will be in line with the Oxford City parking standards low-car principles and therefore limited. having 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. Reflecting the site's accessibility to public transport and walking and cycling routes, there is an opportunity to provide a mobility hub, which could include provision of hire vehicles such as e-scooters and e-bicycles, micro transport, automated vehicle idling points potential AV, cargo bike storage and an electric car club, together with features such as locker and storage space enabling delivery consolidation, delivered in association with reduced limited car parking requirements across the site. 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>Noted; happy to amend the middle of the three paragraphs (other than the words 'which could' as this reduces the strength of the requirement or objective, and the change re car parking requirements, where effectively the proposed change uses a different word to say the same thing)</p>	<p>6.4.6, 2nd paragraph - Amend to read: "Reflecting the site's accessibility to public transport and walking and cycling routes, there is an opportunity to provide a mobility hub, including provision of hire vehicles such as e-scooters and e-bicycles, automated vehicle idling points, potential AV, cargo bike storage and an electric car club, together with features such as locker and storage space enabling delivery consolidation, delivered in association with reduced car parking requirements across the site."</p>	<p>Text if 6.4.6 amended</p>
OCC	<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>	<p>Noted; the CPZ is outside of the scope of planning, but as with PR7a we are happy to add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."</p>	<p>Add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."</p>	<p>Changed - as above</p>
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. We seek the following amendment to 6.3.1: 'Reduced levels of parking are to be provided, with parking for apartments and townhouses located to the rear of properties in small parking courts or rear garages serving a maximum of 6 properties to be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide.' We also seek amendment to 6.3.2: 'Parking will be provided on street (unallocated) and on-plot to the side of semi-detached and end of terrace, or accessed from the rear and will be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide. Parking to the front of properties is to be avoided.'</p>	<p>It is important that the Cherwell Residential Design Guide takes primacy, and that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>n/a</p>

OCC	<p>School Location - From a travel planning perspective, a central location for a school is preferable to the location shown in the draft development brief at the north of the site. A central location will reduce walking and cycling distances for residents of adjoining sites which will in turn make walking and cycling more attractive and reduce the potential for congestion and other disbenefits from people choosing to drop off and pick up children by car. We seek further discussion on this point.</p>	<p>We agree with the principles set out here. If the central part of the site had been less constrained and/or if there was greater flexibility on the layout of the school site then the central location could be achieved</p>	None	
OCC	<p>Vehicle Access Points We support the indications of road access points as shown on Figures 13 and 19 and described in 6.4.2. These show a single main signalised access point which is a junction serving both PR6a and PR6b. An additional access point onto the A4165 is shown, being left-in and left-out. A further left-out exit is provided for onto the signalised Park & Ride road. These are all clearly asterisked as being 'subject to highway testing'. The design of access points is a key issue that will require detailed consideration. Figure 17 which provides an indicative cross-section might be misleading given that the access points on the A4165 will likely require some additional road width. However, it is noted that the figure is referred to as being indicative only.</p>	Agreed	None	
OCC	<p>Size of Primary School Site It is a policy requirement for a primary school to be provided on this site. Throughout the document, reference is made to the school site being 2.2 hectares. The County Council's minimum requirement is for 2.22 hectares, provided that other requirements regarding shape are met, and a larger site will be needed if there is an irregular shape. Therefore please change all references to 2.2ha to 'a minimum of 2.22ha'.</p>	<p>We very much note this comment and would normally be happy to make such a change; however, Policy PR6a gives an area of 2.2 hectares and the Development Brief cannot amend policy</p>	None	

OCC	<p>Location of Primary School Site</p> <p>At this point in time, the County Council does not know whether the site shown in the development brief is the best site available to meet all the County standards. We appreciate that Figures 1 and 15 clearly asterisk that the 'School Site location subject to further detailed assessment' and there is reference in 6.3.2 which reads: 'The shape and location of the proposed school site is indicative and will be subject to further detailed assessment as part of the outline application process'. It is noted that the draft development brief is somewhat inconsistent in its references to the primary school location, which no doubt reflects the amendments which have been made through drafting since the allocation policy indicated a different location for the school, and it remains a possibility that the school site will be in a different location to that shown on the figures. While we are generally content that the development brief allows for an alternative location to come forward through the planning application process, it may be that the development brief needs to be even more clear that alternative locations are possible.</p>	<p>The location of the primary school has been discussed in detail with OCC. Modelling discussed between CDC, OCC and the land promoter has shown only two locations workable from OCC's perspective, the central location preferred by the land promoter and the northern location shown in the Development Brief. Unfortunately, given the constraints in the centre of the site and the lack of flexibility possible to the layout of the school site, the central location is not possible. There are no inconsistencies in the Development Brief with regard to the school location - the early chapters reflect the LPPR proposals map, whereas Fig 1 and Chapter 5 onwards show the northern location that will be required if there remains insufficient flexibility on the layout of the school site.</p>	None	
OCC	<p>Identifying an acceptable location of the primary school site will be subject to further detailed assessments. Whilst proving layouts have been undertaken on some of the sites suggested to us by the developer and the District Council, these layouts only illustrate that the site could house the school, they are not designed schemes. The school site (in whatever location) will need to follow and demonstrate that it meets all Oxfordshire County Council's requirements and criteria as set out in our checklists which we have provided to the District and developer: 'information and process required to assess the suitability of a school site', 'design criteria for primary school sites', and the 'education site checklist'. We appreciate that these are referenced in section 6.6. Until this work has been undertaken the location of the school site cannot be confirmed.</p>	<p>Agreed. As per above, unless there can be sufficient flexibility on the layout of the school site, the central location is not possible.</p>	None	

OCC	<p>Further, the locations of the school buildings on the site should not be identified in the development brief. We seek removal of the paragraph which indicates that school buildings should be on the western side of the school site as the County Council has not received any details in relation to noise, surface water, levels of surrounding streets, location of surrounding roads etc and until this information has been reviewed and interrogated then the location of any school building/site cannot be confirmed. It is noted that noise (as a consequence of the proximity to the railway, aggregate depot, main road and the Park and Ride), the location of the electricity pylons, and surface water/drainage in particular in the northern site could be a significant issue and will require further detailed interrogation.</p>	<p>Noted, but for various reasons set out in the Development Brief as a whole (e.g. Pages 27, 30, 31, 42, 43, 45), but primarily related to accessibility, the school buildings will need to be located on the western side of the school site. The northern site is not significantly closer to the railway than the central site; the northern site meet the OCC Education team's advice re distance to pylons.</p>	None	
OCC	<p>We seek the following corrections in 6.6: 'Education site checklist'. 'The shape and location of the proposed school site is on a indicative general location and will be subject to further detailed assessment as part of the outline application process.' 'The layout of the school site is to be guided by OCC with school classrooms facing due north and south in line with OCC guidance. If the site comes forward in the location indicated (and subject to detailed testing) this would result in site dimensions of approximately 130m by 171m but these dimensions are dependent on where the school frontage is located.' 'The school is to be located in a less steep part of the site. It is likely that some adjustment of levels will be required to meet maximum gradients for vehicular and pedestrian accesses of 1:21 from the adopted highway appropriate internal site levels to the boundary of the level school site. All level adjustments are to take place outside the school site.' 'Ideally the school buildings should be located in the western part of the school site to create frontage onto the primary street, with playing fields located to the east adjacent to the green corridor.'</p>	<p>Page 57, education checklist - we agree to add the word "site". Having reviewed the proposed change to the text on page 58 we do not consider that any of the changes is necessary.</p>	Page 57, add the word "site" between education and checklist	Page 57 and documents list changed

OCC	<p>Vehicle Access Points for School Site</p> <p>Three vehicle access points are required for the school site. At least one of these will also be the main pedestrian access. This is to maximise routes into the school from the surrounding road network for pupils arriving at the school; for emergency access; staff parking; service areas; future maintenance; extension work; long-term flexibility; development changes over time to the site and to ensure the operation of the school is not compromised during any works to the site.</p> <p>We appreciate that Figures 1, 15, 19 and 21 show three vehicle access points to the school location shown. However, we must note that not only has this site not been confirmed (as referred to earlier) but at this stage we do not know where the appropriate access point locations would be. This is a matter of detail that our Transport Development Control officers would consider with us when a proposed development is designed. As the matter of the school location is already addressed by the asterisk on Figure 1 and 15, we think that the Figure 19 (movement and access) asterisk in relation to 'school access' should state: 'The locations of three access points for the school are subject to highway testing'.</p>	Noted	Page 44 - in relation to the ** at the bottom right of the page, add the words "The locations of three access points for the school are subject to highway testing."	page 44 text amended
OCC	<p>Movement around the school site</p> <p>The movement plan in the vicinity of the school site will need to be clearly demonstrated and agreed with the County Council as Highway Authority. The County Council's Property design criteria for schools include requirements such as no dead end streets around schools so that there is no hazardous reversing of vehicles. We will also expect provision to be made for coach parking and for some pupils to be dropped off and picked up.</p>	Noted	None	
OCC	<p>Shading of school</p> <p>Any development over 2 storeys height close to the school has the potential to create shading, particularly in the winter months when sunlight is at a premium. We are concerned that the development brief indicates 3-5 storey houses or apartments and mixed use areas which will be more than 2 storeys in close proximity to the identified school location.</p> <p>It is an Oxfordshire County Council requirement that the school site shall be free from shading to ensure year-round use of the external teaching and play areas and sunlight/daylight to buildings. For clarity, no building shall be located higher than the 25 degree angle taken from the school boundary as stated within our checklist.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the height of buildings should reflect their setting and the creation of such overbearing structures, adjacent to a primary school, does not feel appropriate.</p> <p>We therefore seek changes to the figures denoting the development framework so that tall buildings are not identified close to the school site.</p>	We very much note this comment and would be happy to amend the text of the Development Brief in this regard (see below). It may be that car parking can be located on the school site so as to limit the impact of adjacent buildings, but detailed studies would be required to assess this.	See below	See below

OCC	<p>In addition, we seek the following text change in 6.3.1: ‘The majority of the area is to be 3 storeys. 4 to 5 storey buildings will be appropriate only in key locations such as movement nodes, corners or vista stops in the western part of the character area where particular emphasis is required. To the east the scale is to be 3 storeys fronting the primary street. However, such heights will not be appropriate close to the school where they would be considered overbearing, and all buildings close to the school will need to be within height limits which ensure that the school is free from shading that would affect buildings, external teaching areas and play areas.’</p>	<p>We will add a bullet point on page 35 under Development Principles to reflect these concerns/requirements.</p>	<p>Section 6.3.1, page 35, - add new bullet between #2 and #3, to state: "The school is to be free from shading that would affect buildings, external teaching areas and play areas. As a result, building heights adjacent to the school site may need to be reduced. The shading impact of adjacent development on the school site is to be demonstrated as part of the planning application."</p>	<p>New bullet added to 6.3.1</p>
OCC	<p>There is an incorrect reference to the ‘Oxfordshire County Council Drainage Team’ in 6.5.2. 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: ‘It is expected that the site will drain towards the eastern side of the site, reflecting the topography of the site, with drainage attenuation features broadly in the locations indicated on figure 19 and to be agreed in detail with Oxfordshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and with Cherwell District Council’s Drainage Team.’</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The development brief will be amended accordingly</p>	<p>Text of page 55 amended in light of this and comment from Savills above.</p>
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>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>	

OCC	<p>It is welcomed that outline measures for biodiversity are identified in the development briefs.</p> <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> <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> <p>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.</p>	Noted	None	
OCC	<p>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</p>	<p>It would not be appropriate to refer to emerging supplementary documents; in addition it is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	None	
OCC	<p>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.</p>	<p>It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	None	
OCC	<p>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.</p>	<p>It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	None	
OCC	<p>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.</p>	<p>It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	None	

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	
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 53	None	
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.	The text preceding the bullet point list states that the checklist provides "an indication of documents required at application stage" and so is not to be read as definitive	None	
OCC	Page 1 - Site Location - 'Iron Age' should be replaced with 'Anglo Saxon'	Noted	In the paragraph headed Site Location on page "Bronze Age (potentially Iron Age)" to be replaced with "Anglo-Saxon"	Amended throughout
OCC	Page 2 - 'Cuttslowe' to replaced with 'Cutteslowe' (same applies in Figures 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19 and 21)	Noted	The relevant figures and text to be amended accordingly.	Figures corrected
OCC	Figure 3 - make clear if this is proposed school location as per indicative plan in the LPPR or adjust to reflect Figure 1 (also applies to Figure 7)	Noted	Fig 3 to be amended to note that the locations for proposed local centres and schools reflect those set out in the LPPR.	Note added to figures 3 and section 2.1.5 consistent with PR7a wording
OCC	Figure 4 - update purple key to refer to 'Oxford City allocated sites' and include the St Frideswide Farm allocation (also applies to Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7)	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Key amended (done). Figures updated
OCC	Page 24, first bullet - add the county council to the districts and city council	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text amended
OCC	Page 37, Fig 17, legend, add 'Road' after 'Oxford'	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text amended
OCC	Page 44, Fig 19, the cross sections A-A and B-B are not shown in the legend		Do they need to be?	Section lines added to key. Refer to figures xxxx
OCC	Page 58, typo: "Reference should also be made to: Oxfordshire County Council design criteria for schools"	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text amended

Jack Fursdon	Objects in principle to the development of the PR sites; land not in the Green Belt should be preferred and there are many brownfield sites in Oxford; the Council should look at buying land owned by Oxford University without having to provide all of the housing on them that is proposed	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Jack Fursdon	The Council's consultation only allows me to choose one development brief to comment on - the Council is trying to reduce the perceived dislike	This is a function of the Let's Talk website and not intentional on the part of the Council. Those responding to the Development Briefs email address could comment on however many they wished to.	None	
Jack Fursdon	The proposals would impact on local infrastructure (schools, health, roads), which is already at capacity	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Jack Fursdon	The housing will not be cheap enough for it to be genuinely affordable	This is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	
Bronwyn Cody	Objects to the principle of development; the site is valuable as a green space; Barton Park has already added plenty of additional housing for the Oxfordshire area.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Bronwyn Cody	All of the roads leading to this area are very busy roads at peak times and the added construction vehicles and inevitable road closures would be havoc. The inconvenience that this would cause would not only be for the years that the constructions are being built but also for years after when the population of this area increases with the housing.	Noted. This largely relates to the principle of development. The developers of the site will be required to manage construction traffic - such matters can and will be managed through planning conditions of any permission given	None	
Julia Middleton	Not enough work has been done to look at eco, modern designed housing, with a greater density on brown field sites within the city. The calculations for the numbers of houses is totally unjustified and will bring people into the area from London causing further congestion, especially with Oxford North going ahead.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Julia Middleton	The government states that it has a policy not to build on Green belt. I feel all the development is hypocritical.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Peter Wilks	Concerned about carbon emissions in the general area. With the potential destruction of trees versus these three developments combined with the St John College development, I suspect a dramatic increase in traffic and carbon emissions while the natural environment that would reduce carbon is being destroyed.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	

Peter Wilks	Concerned on the type of housing being built. What controls do you plan to have over another "brick city" being built or the "prison block" I refer to Bicester and the current build near Barton. Commonly known as the above.	This is something which the Development Brief seeks to address; Local Plan policies will require a locally distinctive character, and the Cherwell Residential Design Guide, Oxford City Council guidance and national planning policy guidance will also all be relevant.	None	
Peter Wilks	What are the plans to stop the houses both on this development and its sister across the road becoming "London housing"	This is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	
Ian Busby	Leave the golf course and green field alone	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Alex	I completely support the project in this area. I believe this project has to be continued and offer new houses along with the primary school. It will help develop the area.	Noted	None	
David Gimson	Very impressed by the skilled planning which has gone into this brief, evidently by a large and expert team. This is the right development in the right place. We are in a climate emergency. 40% of car journeys are under 2m, the average car is used only 3% of the time (RAC) and there is single occupancy in over 60% of journeys, so this development should be private-car free. Provision should be made for multiple car club or shared cars close to exits onto the main road, so that residents can access vehicles whenever they need, without the cost of car ownership. A car free environment, with carefully controlled access for deliveries etc., will increase the value of the housing built much more than the lack of private parking will diminish it. Unless we design to make car use more difficult, all the cycle tracks in the world won't prevent more congestion and pollution on the A34 and everywhere else. Please be bold: in well-connected urban areas like this one, private cars should be a thing of the past.	These comments are noted and reflected in the changes sought by OCC and in the parking strategies set out in the Development Brief and supported by the Cherwell Residential Guide	None	
Richard Knowles (and others)	The vision for biodiversity and amenity appears inadequate as currently set out. The yawning gap in the proposals is the failure to consider the potential biodiversity and amenity value of the land to the East of the site. The proposal for a tiny green corridor immediately east of the site is utterly inadequate and offers little or nothing to the local community. The whole area East of the site up to the River Cherwell should be included in the proposals for landscape and open space.	While we note these comments, the Development Brief can only relate to the site as defined by the red line boundary. The text as drafted is considered sufficient in this regard.	None	

Richard Knowles (and others)	<p>During the last 2 years of pandemic and intermittent lockdown the footpaths and bridleways which criss-cross this area have been enjoyed to a greater degree than we can recall in 50 years. However, the health and well-being benefits they offer could be hugely greater and permanent with a more imaginative and generous approach to this development. The very limited biodiversity offered by much of the area (largely arable monoculture) could be enormously enhanced with the Cherwell flood plain offering exciting country park opportunities. The area to the East of the Cherwell should be designated Water Eaton country park. it would be given over to grassland and mixed woodland.</p>	Noted	None	
Richard Knowles (and others)	<p>Surface drainage ponds would be developed as permanently wet scrapes, attracting wildlife. This would also offer water quality benefits as the on-line scrapes and reedbeds would act as filters. A long stretch of the neglected river Cherwell could be opened for recreational use: punts, canoes, angling, wild swimming, bird watching. At present much of the immediate river corridor is very overgrown and barely passable for canoes with no bankside paths. The immediate flood risk areas would continue to flood, but with the encouragement of reedbed and wetland habitat this would attract wintering waders in large numbers. Waste water treatment.</p>	Noted	None	
Richard Knowles (and others)	<p>Linking the development to the main Oxford network (which we presume is the proposal) has one enormous flaw: Thames Water's WWTW works at Grenoble Road is already grossly overloaded. We cannot support further development without clear prior investment by Thames Water (TWUL) to ensure that additional untreated sewage does not pour into the River Thames. We urge the Planning Authority to insist to TWUL on an upgrade of Oxford WWTW that will enable it to cope with current and projected volumes of wastewater. We are aware that much of Kidlington's wastewater is currently pumped to Cassington WWTW. This is also currently massively overloaded and needs a major upgrade.</p>	Noted	None	
Mark Hull	<p>Given that the area desperately needs more housing, especially affordable housing, and that this development will make millions of pounds of profit for Christ Church College, it is time the University put something back into the lives of Kidlington and north Oxford residents. The current proposal does far too little.</p>	This is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	

Andrew Siantonas	I strongly support the proposals for the north /south cycle -pedestrian route at the east edge of the development leading to Cutteslowe Park and the extension of the park. However, cycling is not currently permitted in Cutteslowe Park so arrangements need to be made with the relevant Oxford City Council department to enable cycling on suitable paths through the park. I have contacted Oxford City Council making these points to them.	Noted	None	
Fred Means	Why is there so little detail regarding the cycling routes? I would like to see a more detailed description of the standard being committed to. For example Segregated from both vehicles and pedestrians. Continuous with safe priority passage over crossing roads Wide enough to support 2 way cycling Committed budget for maintenance and cleaning.	It is considered that the detail in the Development Brief is sufficient for the purposes and remit of the Development Brief. Other policies, CDC and OCC, set out the requirements for surfacing, etc.	None	
Margaret Boggs	Cannot understand why this has been allowed to happen. So much green space given over, which goes against CDC's own policies, to preserve green belt. Is it because money talks, and as I have been told, there is some dodgy business with Tory councillors? I do hope not, I have always voted Tory and had faith in our councillors.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Katherine Whysall	What is the definition of a strategic green corridor? Corridor implies that development can occur the other side of the corridor.	Green corridors are strategically planned and delivered routes of protected natural green space, designed to enable the transit of wildlife and/or cyclists and pedestrians. In this instance it is a corridor between the built environment on one side and the Green Belt on the other	None	
Katherine Whysall	The proposed development is on the green belt. Does this proposed development suggest that the green belt is now null and void? 3.2.1 states that part of the site lies in the green belt. Surely all of the site lies in the green belt! Has the green belt changed if so when and we're the public consulted?	Other than the aforesaid green corridor, the site has been removed from the Green Belt through the adoption of the Local Plan Partial Review Plan, which was fully consulted upon, examined in a public inquiry and subsequently (and unsuccessfully) challenged in the high court	None	
Katherine Whysall	The primary school location is shown differently in different maps figure 1 and figure 7	Figure 1, and Figures 12 onwards, show the layout for the site as required by the Development Brief. Figure 7 shows the indicative locations as set out in the Local Plan proposals map. The policy allows for "minor variations in the location of specific uses...where evidence is available".	None	

Katherine Whysall	Where exactly is the NERC s41 plot and what is it for exactly?	The broadly rectangular parcel of land north of St Frideswide farmhouse with the word 'Orchard' written over it. Section 41 (41) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, which came into force on 1st October 2006, requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of habitats and species which are of principle importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England.	None	
Katherine Whysall	Oxford Local Plan 2016-2036 (SP24) -to south of PR6a — would that cut off the public right of way.	This is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	
Katherine Whysall	Figure 9 site context Section 6.2 —provide a local hub for the community through the creation of a primary school and adjacent local centre and green square —where? Not obvious on plan. Figure 15 shows local Centre but where is green square?	These will be located within the 'mixed use' area as shown in Figures 12 and 15.	None	
Katherine Whysall	Section 6.3. Details the frontage character area and the valley view character area but no section for The green corridor character area. Why?	The green corridor is character area is discussed separately at Section 6.5.	None	
Katherine Whysall	Says walking access to the main road. What about disabled people and old people? Say they are keeping trees on the frontage but getting rid of low lying vegetation to increase visibility into the site. Why??	Explained in the Development Brief and elsewhere in this table of responses to consultation comments	None	
Katherine Whysall	6.8 utilities and infrastructure. No mention made at all of sewage. This is a big problem as Oxford STW is already under capacity.	This is not within the scope of the Development Brief, but Policy PR6a places requirements and duties on the applicant and developer in this regard.	None	
Katherine Whysall	The plan mentions badgers and a butterfly as protected species. No mention of otters which are now making a comeback in Oxford. They are a protected local species too. This would support the proposal put forward that the river Cherwell near to the site should be part of a country park/wetlands reserve to the east and west of its banks.	Policy PR6a requires that any planning application for the site is supported by a Biodiversity Impact Assessment and by a Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan	None	

Mary Lunn	<p>All three sites were adjacent to/ flooded/ waterlogged in winter 20/21 for months and have been wet this year. I am concerned about drainage because housing and consequent made roads reduce drainage and capacity for holding water not only for the site(s) itself but also for adjacent land. Simply preserving current drainage/storage will clearly be insufficient in future years as well due to climate change. Although drainage is marked on the site(s) it is not clear how this will satisfy current/future problems of flooding.</p>	<p>Comments very much noted. Local Plan policies PR6a, ESD6 and ESD7 place requirements and duties on the applicant and developer in this regard.</p>	None	
Dominie Craddock	<p>Particularly concerned with the treatment of the historic Grade II* listed St Frideswide's Farmhouse and its curtilage. Surely the atmosphere of this important site with its medieval features must be maintained and not impinged upon by the development. A larger buffer zone preserving current sight-lines should be included in the plan. The Development Brief states that "A new hedgerow line will be required along the eastern boundary of the green corridor" (§6.5) -- this will be very important to screen the house and environs from the proposed new public walking and cycle routes extending to Cutteslowe Park. The Brief also refers to "enhancements to the setting of St Frideswide's Farmhouse" (§6.5.3) -- can we have some specifics please.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Development Brief sets out the requirements in this regard.</p>	None	
Sacha Craddock	<p>I sincerely hope that the astounding historical, cultural and visual integrity of St Frideswides Farm is preserved in full.</p>	Noted	None	
Suzanne Wilson-Higgins	<p>I am the landowner of Pipal Cottage, Water Eaton and would like the property boundaries to be clearly stated on the development brief and the name corrected. Christ Church own Pipal Barns so there are technically two properties rather than "farmhouse". The development brief indicates that 4-5 story building may be included and I am totally opposed to that as this is overdevelopment of this greenfield Greenbelt space in an effort to cram in as many saleable dwellings as possible.</p>	<p>This is picked up elsewhere in consultation comments.</p>	None	
Suzanne Wilson-Higgins	<p>Parking provision is wholly inadequate on the site for the number of people living in the 600+ dwellings. There are conflicting references to different types of parking and no indication of the number of people to car ratio on site. It is overly optimistic to think this is a residential area that will not require ample resident and guest parking on and off plot.</p>	<p>This is picked up elsewhere in consultation comments.</p>	None	

Suzanne Wilson-Higgins	I have concerns about obstruction of my light from the south with a 3 story dwelling or "mixed use local centre shops/housing) blocking my light as these would be elevated on the Jordan Hill slope.	We note these comments, and this will be an important material consideration in the assessment of planning application proposals	None	
Suzanne Wilson-Higgins	The school should be located in the centre of the site accessible from PR6a and PR6b on cycle/footpaths and east-west link not at the park & ride end where there could be a risk to children in a crowded area adjacent to public parking and transport links. Other indicative principles and opportunities are fine but lacking in detail.	This is picked up elsewhere in consultation comments.	None	
Suzanne Wilson-Higgins	For access and road design the CDC need to consult fully with Christ Church and their agents as their plans look more robust than CDC's.	Discussions with OCC have been taking place and have informed the Development Brief. The landowner's plans are still being formulated and will be submitted for scrutiny in due course; they may be supported or they may not, but they will need to be compliant with Local Plan policies, this Development Brief, and CDC and OCC guidance	None	
Igor Dyson	Unconditionally objects to the ambition to grow Oxon's population at the proposed scale, by building more homes on existing Green Belt. -Some proposals to improve some aspects of existing, transport & green infrastructure, are indeed most welcome; including sustainable transport for the existing population, planting more trees & hedges, & establishing corridors for wildlife. However, such improvements shouldn't be pretexts to delete more of our open countryside. By now, it's become clear that Oxford City wishes to de facto annex this area of Cherwell District, to grow Oxford City's economy at a scale which will further hurt Oxon's rural character.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Igor Dyson	The brief mentions developing a high-quality gateway to Oxford. Actually here, the existing character's already extraordinarily special, namely, the view east to Cherwell Valley & beyond to Otmoor Reserve. This is iconic, open countryside, & should be cherished as the envy & equal of any historic vista elsewhere.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	

Igor Dyson	I oppose creeping deletion of our Green Belt, to grow the population for employment in new, commercial areas. This is a profound & imposed surgery, on what residents feel is Oxon's fundamental character, namely, its relatively undeveloped, rural environment. We're being asked to accept destruction of what we've loved lifelong, namely, our childhood haunts & vistas being mutilated by thousands of new buildings. Southern England's been developed more than enough, so any national effort to grow the economy should focus on Northern England instead.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Christiaan Monden	The changes to the A4165 (Oxford Road) as set out in Development Brief are welcome and necessary, to ensure safe and convenient bike commuting from Kidlington and PR8/PR9 to Oxford city, as well as for reliable bus commutes. The indicative designs for the A4165 are a good step in the right direction but lack the required standards for the new junctions providing access to both sites. Will the new junctions be built according to CYCLOPS or Dutch roundabout standards as in Manchester or Cambridge? Anything less is not acceptable.	Noted, but this is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	
Christiaan Monden	The brief suggests the sites can be developed even if the A4165 is not redesigned. That would be incredibly irresponsible. It would lock in more than a thousand new homes in car-dependency and it increased traffic would make a dangerous road even more dangerous – it is a fatal road; a cyclist was killed here Feb 2022 – e. Redevelopment of the A4615 and its new junctions has to be an integral part of either site being developed. In fact, development has to be conditional on redeveloping the A4165 – a “key sustainable movement route”.	Noted, but this is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	
Christiaan Monden	The brief does not make clear how inclusive cycling and wheelchair use beyond the site and the brief has no serious attention at all to options for people using wheelchairs or mobility scooters. Like cyclists and pedestrians, they will be trapped in the new development.	In accord with its purpose, the Development Brief sets out requirements for the development, including enhanced walking and cycling routes. The detailed proposals will come forward as part of planning applications	None	
Christiaan Monden	Makes several suggestions for what the Development Brief should include, including design and widths of cycle ways, provision of small bike sheds in front gardens, improvements to the Parkway junction, speed limits on roads, and the need for improvements to existing cycleways being funded from PR7a	The Development Brief sets out requirements for the design of cycle ways; speed limits and improvements to junctions it outside the scope of the Development Brief; Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites; the location of bike sheds, which has to balance different competing considerations, will be a matter for the assessment of planning applications at the site	None	

Christiaan Monden	The Oxford Canal is inadequate as a cycling route; gives various reasons for this	Noted	None	
Aviril Gupta	Strongly objects to this housing development. Alternative sites should be looked at. Instead of developing housing here, what about a secondary school for Kidlington. Kidlington does not require this level of housing; there is sufficient housing development taking place already.	This relates to the principle of development	None	
Aviril Gupta	The proposals would impact on local infrastructure, which is already at capacity	This relates to the principle of development	None	
Aviril Gupta	Impact of traffic; congestion; construction work; impact on amenities of residents	These will be material considerations in the assessment of future planning application(s). No changes required to the Development Brief	None	