

# **Cherwell District Council**

## **Planning Committee**

**8 September 2022**

### **Development Brief for Local Plan Partial Review site PR6a – Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford**

#### **Report of Assistant Director - Planning and Development**

This report is public.

#### **Purpose of report**

To seek the Planning Committee's approval of the Development Brief for Local Plan Part 1 Review allocated site PR6a – Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford.

#### **1.0 Recommendations**

The meeting is recommended:

- 1.1 To approve the Development Brief for site PR6a (Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford) of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Partial Review, presented at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 1.2 To authorise the Assistant Director - Planning and Development to publish the Development Brief subject to any necessary presentational or other minor corrections in consultation with the Chairman.

#### **2.0 Introduction**

- 2.1 The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Housing Need was adopted on 7 September 2020, effectively as a supplement or addendum to the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, and forms part of the statutory Development Plan for the district.
- 2.2 The Partial Review Plan provides a vision for how Oxford's unmet housing needs will be met within Cherwell, which seeks to respond to the key issues faced by Oxford in providing new homes, in addressing the unaffordability of housing, in supporting economic growth and in dealing with its land supply constraints.
- 2.3 The Partial Review Plan allocates land to deliver 4400 houses across six sites:
  1. Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford (policy PR6a) - Gosford and Water Eaton Parish

2. Land West of Oxford Road, North Oxford (policy PR6b) - Gosford and Water Eaton Parish
3. Land at South East Kidlington (policy PR7a) - Gosford and Water Eaton Parish
4. Land at Stratfield Farm Kidlington (policy PR7b) - Kidlington Parish
5. Land East of the A44 at Begbroke/Yarnton (policy PR8) - Yarnton and Begbroke Parishes (small area in Kidlington Parish)
6. Land West of the A44 at Yarnton (policy PR9) - Yarnton and Begbroke Parishes

- 2.4 For each of the six sites, the Local Plan policy includes a requirement for the application to *“be supported by, and prepared in accordance with, a comprehensive Development Brief for the entire site to be jointly prepared and agreed in advance between the appointed representative(s) of the landowner(s) and Cherwell District Council”*. It further states, *“The Development Brief shall be prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council”*.
- 2.5 The development brief will then be a material consideration in the determination of any future planning applications for the site to which it relates. They will inform developers in progressing their proposals and this committee in determining future planning applications.
- 2.6 Further to the Partial Review Plan’s requirement, Development Briefs are being prepared for each of the six sites. The first two, relating to sites PR7b and PR9, were approved by Planning Committee in December 2021 and the third was approved by Planning Committee in June 2022. The fourth, here presented, relates to site PR6a.
- 2.7 Design consultants appointed by the Council have prepared the brief working with officers and with the benefit of input from technical consultees, stakeholders (including Oxford City Council) and public consultation. This report presents the proposed, final brief for approval and in doing so explains how it meets the objectives and policy requirements of the Partial Review Plan.
- 2.8 The Development Brief has been the subject of public consultation, for six weeks from 26 January to 8 March 2022. This report summarises the representations received and explains what changes have been made in response.

### **3.0 Report Details**

- 3.1 Policy PR6a of the Partial Review of the Local Plan relates to land to the north of Oxford city and the suburb of Cutteslowe. The site is bounded by farmland to the east leading to the Cherwell River, Oxford fringe and Cutteslowe Park to the south and Oxford Parkway station and the Park & Ride to the north. St Frideswides Farmhouse, a Grade II\* listed building lies to the east. The site, 48ha in total, is almost entirely farmland, with some hedgerows and trees. A farmhouse is located in the north western corner of the site, comprising a large house and several outbuildings/barns. Higher land in the centre of the site contains the ploughed remains of Anglo-Saxon round barrows.
- 3.2 The site is allocated for 690 homes on 25 hectares of land, of which 50% is required to be affordable housing. There are policy requirements for a primary school on 2.2 hectares of land with two forms of entry, a local centre on 0.5 hectares of land, formal sports, provision of play areas and allotments to adopted standards within the

developable area, an extension to Cutteslowe Park on 11 hectares of land, a green infrastructure corridor on 8 hectares of land, and 3 hectares of land for agricultural use

- 3.3 The Development Brief sets out its background, purpose and status, its structure and the community involvement that has taken place (Chapter 1); the strategic vision and context, the role of the site, its economic relationships and movement corridors (Chapter 2); the planning policy context, spatial context and the site's attributes (Chapter 3); a site appraisal including opportunities and requirements (Chapter 4); the vision and objectives for the site (Chapter 5); then the development principles (Chapter 6); and closes with a section on delivery and monitoring (Chapter 7).
- 3.4 Preparation of the Development Brief included review of baseline information and the planning policy context, preparation and agreement of the scope for the Brief, identification of opportunities and constraints, workshops to establish the vision, the principles concerning movement, water management, landscape, biodiversity, heritage and archaeology, and subsequent workshops and one to one engagements with technical consultees including the preparation of parameter plans, review of early drafts of the Brief and discussion with the site promoters.
- 3.5 The vision for Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford, set out in Chapter 5 of the Brief, is as follows:

*'The Land east of Oxford Road will become a contemporary urban extension and gateway to Oxford City with its own local centre fronting Oxford Road, that is fully integrated and connected with existing neighbourhoods to the south and the new neighbourhood to the west on site PR6b. A high-quality, publicly accessible corridor of green infrastructure at the eastern edge of the site will provide a soft edge to the Cherwell Valley and appropriate setting to the Grade II\* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse, and will connect with east-west green corridors towards the Oxford Road and PR6b. Opportunities for sustainable travel into Oxford will be maximised by the provision of high quality walking and cycling routes connecting into the surrounding street and public right of way network, including direct delivery of high quality cycle lanes on Oxford Road and connecting to Cutteslowe Park as well as direct delivery of a southbound bus lane on Oxford Road.'*

- 3.6 Each Partial Review policy sets out a detailed list of required elements for the Development Brief. There are common elements to each site, for example:
- a scheme and outline layout for the delivery of the required land uses and associated infrastructure,
  - protection and connection of existing public rights of way (where applicable) and an outline scheme for pedestrian and cycle access to the surrounding countryside,
  - outline measures for securing net biodiversity gains informed by a Biodiversity Impact Assessment, and
  - an outline scheme for vehicular access by the emergency services.
- 3.7 Policy PR6a sets out the following particular requirements for inclusion in the Development Brief:
- Two points of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways, primarily from Oxford Road

- An outline scheme for public vehicular, cycle, pedestrian and wheelchair connectivity within the site, to the built environment of Oxford, to Cutteslowe Park, to the allocated site to the west of Oxford Road (policy PR6b) enabling connection to Oxford City Council's allocated 'Northern Gateway' site, to Oxford Parkway and Water Eaton Park and Ride, and to existing or new points of connection off-site and to existing or potential public transport services, with required access to existing property via the site to be maintained
- Design principles which seek to deliver a connected and integrated extension to Oxford and which respond to the historic setting of the city
- The sites for the required school and the Local Centre

3.8 The Development Brief for PR6a sets the development framework for the site. The parameters for the brief are established by the Local Plan. The brief is intended to provide additional detail to help implement the Local Plan policy and guide the preparation and consideration of applications for planning permission. The brief comprises guidance and not new policy.

3.9 The Brief provides a scheme and outline layout for delivery of the required land uses and associated infrastructure. There is no material change in the extent of the residential area between the policy map for the site (page 91 of the Partial Review Plan) and the development framework plan (page 26 of the draft Development Brief). There is no change to the site area.

3.10 Following discussion with Oxfordshire County Council, the primary school has been relocated from the southern end of the site to a location north of the footpath which crosses the site from Oxford Road, and the local centre has been moved southward (though still north of the said footpath) so that the two uses are co-located in the interests of place making and good urban design. However, in common with all Partial Review site policies, Policy PR6a allows for the consideration of minor variations in the location of specific land uses where evidence is available. Officers consider this change to be acceptable as a minor variation from the policy requirement. The extent of the developable area has not changed and there is no encroachment into the Green Belt.

3.11 It is also to be noted that the area for the local centre is larger than that shown in the policy map for the site, but the intention is that (a) the area covered by the local centre is a mixed use, e.g. includes residential development at upper floors, and (b) it provides flexibility to the developer.

3.12 The Development Brief for PR6a provides an outline scheme for vehicular, cycle, pedestrian and wheelchair connectivity within the site, for pedestrian and cycle access to the surrounding countryside, and for vehicular access by the emergency services, which delivers on the requirements set out in the policy for the site. The movement and access network plan is shown at Figure 19 (page 44) and expounded in detail at Section 6.4.5 of the Brief (page 46).

3.13 The access strategy for the site has been worked in close collaboration with Oxfordshire County Council as local highway authority. The Brief identifies two vehicular access points to/from Oxford Road, and a third vehicular connection to the northern boundary of the site; and three separate pedestrian/cycle crossing points over the Oxford Road and one additional bus stop. The southern-most of the two vehicular access points onto Oxford Road would be the primary vehicular access point, with the more northern of the two being a left in left out junction. The vehicular

connection to the northern boundary is an egress only point, to provide drivers an alternative means of heading north.

- 3.14 The intention of CDC and OCC has been to limit vehicular entry and exit points onto Oxford Road to aid the smooth flow of traffic on Oxford Road for all modes of transport, in the interests of highway safety and the amenity of highway users. The initial proposal was therefore for two crossroad junctions on Oxford Road, i.e. to align with site PR6b. It became clear to CDC and OCC that the two landowners were proposing different access points for the northern access. Accordingly, the strategy set out in the Development Brief is a solution which seeks to respond to the landowners' proposals (i.e. allows for flexibility as to the location of the northern access for the respective landowners) but delivers a scheme which is appropriate and optimal in highway safety terms.
- 3.15 The Brief also sets out the requirement for five areas of play across the development – one combined local equipped area of play ('LEAP') / neighbourhood area of play / multi games area in the southern part of the developable area close to Cutteslowe Park Cricket Field, two LEAPs – one in the centre of the site just to the north east of the Croudace development and one to the northern end of the site, and two LAPs – one just to the south of the public right of way adjacent to the archaeological feature and the other in the southern part of the site just to the south of the other public right of way. The Brief also provides outline measures for securing net biodiversity gains, provides for the maintenance and enhancement of existing tree lines and hedgerows.
- 3.16 The Development Brief for PR6a sets the design principles for the site, which seek to deliver a connected and integrated extension to Oxford while being sensitive to the historic setting of the City.
- 3.17 The Brief sets out that the built form to the western side of the site, chiefly between Oxford Road and the primary street through the site, will be 3-5 storey houses or apartments. Section 6.3.1 clarifies that the majority of development in this part of the site will be 3 storeys, with 4 and 5 storey buildings being appropriate only in key locations such as movement nodes, corners or vista stops where particular emphasis is required, and that development facing east onto the primary street will be 3 storeys. The eastern part of the site and the development east of the Croudace development will be 2-3 storeys, with 3 storey townhouses and/or apartment buildings close to the primary street and 2-3 storey houses on larger plots overlooking the green corridor. The outline layout for the site sets out the positions of key frontages for buildings.
- 3.18 The Development Brief also sets out development principles in relation to green spaces and community uses, including the green space/park to the north of and connecting with Cutteslowe Park, allotments in the undeveloped land west of St Frideswide farmhouse and the green corridor to the eastern perimeter of the site which is land to be retained within the Green Belt.

### *Consultation*

- 3.19 The brief was published for public consultation from 26 January to 8 March 2022 by way of advertisement on the Council's website, emails directly to parish councils and technical consultees, and invitations to parish councils to a virtual meeting to raise or seek or clarification on particular matters. A total of 37 representations were received, 13 to the email inbox and 24 via the Let's Talk website. The representations have been made publicly available alongside this report and a schedule containing a

summary of each and officer responses is provided at Appendix 2. A precis is provided below.

## SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

### Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council

3.20 The comments raised from Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council are summarised as follows:

- Believes the development is overdevelopment of Green Belt land which is not within Kidlington Parish but is Gosford and Water Eaton Parish. Point out that brief is incorrectly stating land is within Kidlington Parish.
- Comments on the number of apparent inaccuracies and contradictory points.
- Concerned that the Development Brief is not entirely aligned with the landowners' plans
- Issues outlined within sections 4.2 Site Opportunities and Section 6.0 Development Principles.
- Comments made on position of properties to maximise light and future energy facilities like solar panels.

### Harbord Road Area Residents' Association

3.21 The comments raised by the Harbord Road Area Residents Association are summarised as follows:

- Concerns with commuter parking and believe a Controlled Parking Zone should be put in place to stop this. Also concerns visitors to Cutteslowe Park and new stadium at Stratfield Brake would also park within development.
- Would like to see biodiversity mitigation measures attempting to specifically protect the species that are in decline, but which are known to be present in good numbers and to breed in the area of PR6a. These include Skylarks, Linnets, Yellowhammers and Yellow Wagtails.
- Welcomes some points made within brief but concerns with discharge of effluent into waterways as a result of Thames Water lack of capacity to cope with existing levels of sewage and no provision of additional health facilities.

3.22 Greenway on behalf of the golfers at North Oxford Golf Course

- Concerns with commuter parking and believe a Controlled Parking Zone should be put in place to stop this. Also concerns visitors to Cutteslowe Park and new stadium at Stratfield Brake would also park within development.
- Would like to see biodiversity mitigation measures attempting to specifically protect the species that are in decline, but which are known to be present in good numbers and to breed in the area of PR6a. These include Skylarks, Linnets, Yellowhammers and Yellow Wagtails.
- Welcomes some points made within brief but concerns with discharge of effluent into waterways as a result of Thames Water lack of capacity to cope with existing levels of sewage and no provision of additional health facilities.

### 3.23 St Andrew's Church, Oxford

- Had comments to make on 3 elements of the brief listed below.
- Location of the Primary School – Concerns that the location of the local centre and primary school are not as close as suggested in section 6.6 community infrastructure. Believe that the school should be located further south at the physical centre of the development to be located near the community building. Together they will be able to form the practical heart of the new community.
- Local Centre – Agrees that the local centre should provide a local hub for retail, employment, community services and social interaction, as explained in Section 6.6 on page 57.
- Building a Healthy Community - support the expectation that there should be early planning and provision of health promoting design and infrastructure in order to establish cohesive and connected communities. However, concerns are made as the section does not go beyond expressing this principle in physical terms.

### 3.24 Oxford Cricket Club

- Outlined the threat of possible loss of current facilities within Oxford and propose that PR6B and development within Oxford (Jordan Hill) could be adapted to allow the retention of space for two cricket grounds and a pavilion by creating a site in part of PR6B. This would also retain green space within the proposed development and would be available not only for formal sport but also walking and casual recreation when not in use by the cricket club.

### Members of the Public

3.25 The comments raised from members of the public are summarised as follows:

- Concerns regarding access to current dwellings within the PR6A area.
- How St Frideswide Farmhouse will be affected and the need to preserve the privacy, amenity of the house for the benefit of its residents, visitors and owners.

### Site Promoter Savills on behalf of Christ Church

3.26 The comments raised by Savills on the consultation version of the development brief are as follows:

- Savills outlines 4 key matters that feel should be addressed. These include the need to take account of the work undertaken by Christ Church, format and status of the development, location of the school and Oxford Road frontage.
- More points are made on more minor point relating to consistency etc.

### Avison Young on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd (Owner of Oxford Airport)

3.27 Would prefer that the development brief sites were not developed for noise sensitive uses like residential. Onus on developers to ensure that suitable noise conditions are created for future occupiers that accounts for the existing noise constraints associated with aircraft movements. Recommends planning permission is subject to

Section 106 obligations that require developer(s) to formally notify future purchasers in writing of the existence of flight paths that cross the sites.

#### Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks

3.28 No comments; had already commented in 2019 at the time of the Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review.

#### Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Forum

3.29 The comments raised from Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Forum are summarised as follows:

- Disappointed the Brief does not seem to take the opportunity to provide a 21<sup>st</sup> century development in terms of high-quality design and low carbon development
- Due to proximity of all development brief sites, the Forum suggests 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
- New developments should provide adequate compensation in terms of development quality and environmental protection in and around these sites to reflect the scale of loss of the green belt
- 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.

#### Oxfordshire County Council

3.30 The County Council's comments are:

- Advises as to certain additions to the text and outlines some typographical errors and advised of certain additions and amendments to the text of the development brief regarding strategic planning, transport development control, education, biodiversity, innovation and lead local flood authority sections

#### Berkshire Buckinghamshire Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust ('BBOWT')

3.31 BBOWT's comments are:

- Believes site should be considered alongside 6b in relation to the ratio of green spaces provided as provision of green space is inadequate. Proposed a nature reserve should be provided amounting to at least 50ha. Most obvious location for this is proposed extension to Cutteslowe Park.
- Scale of development proposed should be matched by large-scale habitat restoration and enhancement and concerns as to the impacts of the developments on wildlife.



## Officer Response to Representations

3.32 Responses to the representations made are included in the summary schedule at Appendix 2. Several comments relate to matters which either relate to the principle of development – which has already been set in the adoption of the Local Plan – or to matters relevant to the planning application. Where this is the case it has been noted as such in Appendix 2. In certain cases, specific comments have been made by respondents which are not been taken forward in the final Development Brief – where this is the case explanation is provided in the summary schedule at Appendix 2 and further coverage is provided in the paragraphs following this one. Officers are pleased to recommend to planning committee that some minor changes are made to the text of the Development Brief as set out later in this report.

3.33 In response to comments by London Oxford Airport:

- We note the comment that development of the Partial Review sites will introduce new receptors into a potentially noisy environment and that in accordance with 'agent of change' principles the existing airport use must not be prejudiced by this. However, the site has been allocated in the Development Plan for residential development.
- The need for detailed noise surveys and associated assessment work will be a relevant matter for planning applications for the site
- There is a need for consistency across the development briefs and those for PR7b and PR9 did not include reference to the need for developers to formally notify future purchasers in writing of the existence of flight paths that cross the sites. Nevertheless, insofar as this is a relevant point it will be picked up at the planning application stage.

3.34 In response to comments by St Andrews Church, Oxford:

- 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.
- Co-location of the local centre and the school 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.
- 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.

### 3.35 In response to comments by BBOWT:

- Parts 11-13 of Policy PR6a set out the detailed biodiversity requirements for the site
- We note the comment regarding the potential for light pollution and the need to consider lighting strategically and to manage and mitigate the effects of potential light pollution arising from the development. This will be an important consideration for planning application proposals.
- In relation to the management of green infrastructure and an endowment fund, it is important there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b and PR9.
- Matters relating to the impact of development on protected species of wildlife and to off-site compensation (also raised by Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Forum) will be relevant considerations for the planning applications but do not require amendment of the Development Brief
- We note the points made in relation to zoning and a hierarchy of access levels of the green areas. It may be that the BIA and BIMP 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.
- We also note the points made in relation to biodiversity features, green roofs, wildlife connectivity and raising community awareness. With regard to green roofs, 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.
- We note the point made in relation to the area provided for green space and the request for a large nature reserve of at least 50ha and for extension of the red line boundary of the site. 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.

### 3.36 In response to comments by the Harbord Road Area Residents:

- 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."
- With regard to the potential for a new stadium at Stratfield Brake, it is not possible to plan in the Development Brief for possible future eventualities.
- We note the concerns with regard the discharge of effluent into waterways and Thames Water capacity, but this 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.
- Long-term wildlife management and maintenance is required by Policy PR6a and would be secured through planning conditions and planning obligations of any permission given.
- Surveillance of play areas, and LAP requirements for different age groups are things that 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.

- 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.

### 3.37 In response to comments by Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council:

- The detailed siting of solar PV panels and the extent to which they are provided will be a relevant consideration for planning applications at the site
- Having regard to the layout shown at Figure 15 it should be possible in certain places across the site to locate the highest building behind / to the north of the lower south facing ones, but it would not seem appropriate to make this a stipulation given the potential impact on dwelling numbers and other development principles.
- 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 especially where they deviate from policy requirements or what is shown in the final Development Brief.
- 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.
- 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".
- We note the points made in relation to levels of parking provision, but this is a development principle arrived at through careful consideration as well as discussion with OCC, and reflects the approaches taken within Oxford. 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.
- With regard to the level of detail on roads and access, 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. The level of parking provision is not specified at Section 6.3.2. 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.
- We note the comments relating to the location of the primary school and local centre. If there were no site constraints, the central location for the school 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.

- 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. 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.
- We note the comments made in relation to building heights. 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.
- 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.
- CDC officers have been in regular discussion with the land promoter team including their transport consultants during the preparation of the Development Brief.
- It is not clear as to where the apparent contradictions lie in relation to sightlines. Sections 1-4 set out the constraints and opportunities, etc. 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.
- We note the comments relating to hedgerows and trees. 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.
- 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.
- The need for development to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents is noted and will be a matter for detailed consideration at the planning application or Reserved Matters stage.

### 3.38 In response to comments by Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Forum:

- We note the request to be consulted on the progress of the development briefs and on future planning applications at the site.
- We note the comment regarding the opportunity for the site to be of high quality design and a low carbon development. 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.

- We note the comment regarding the need for an overarching planning framework to ensure the sites are developed in coordination with clear timescales, phasing and infrastructure provision to secure an integrated approach. This is one of the roles of the development briefs, i.e. to hold each development to the same standards. In addition, Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites.
- Loss of Green Belt - The principle of development has been established through the adoption of the Plan. 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.
- We note the comment that leaving design, sustainability and infrastructure requirements to Section 106 agreements alone brings risk. However, 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.
- We note the comment made in relation to self-build and their success at Graven Hill. However, there is no planning policy requirement for the provision of self-build as part of the development.

### 3.39 In response to comments raised by Hodge Jones & Allen on behalf of St Frideswide:

- The point made regarding to access to St Frideswide's is a very important one and will be a relevant consideration at the time of the planning application but is not something that the Development Brief would include
- We note the comments about specifics in relation to St Frideswide's Farmhouse. 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

### 3.40 In response to comments raised by Greenway golf:

- 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.
- The retention of key views is picked up in the Development Brief.
- Cycle provision will need to be captured in the planning application submission
- Sewage will be an important material consideration for the planning application

### 3.41 In response to comments raised by members of the public:

- 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.
- Housing affordability is not within the scope of the Development Brief
- 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
- Housing types and design 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.
- In relation to cycling routes, it is considered that the detail in the Development Brief is sufficient for the purposes and remit of the Development Brief, which sets out requirements for the development, including enhanced walking and cycling routes. The detailed proposals will come forward as part of planning applications. Other policies, CDC and OCC, set out the requirements for surfacing, etc.
- 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
- 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.
- 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.
- 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".
- 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.
- The local centre and green square will be located within the 'mixed use' area as shown in Figures 12 and 15.
- 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.
- 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.

### 3.42 In response to comments raised by Savills:

- 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.
- With regard to the level of detail, 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.'
- 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 and/or reduction in the width/provision of the green corridor or harming archaeological remains it is not possible to deliver the central location. The central location has no ability to expand in the future.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. Removal of trees to facilitate multiple traffic lanes would not retain the rural character of the road.
- We note comments regarding the landowner's logo and authorship of the Development Brief. However, it is considered important and appropriate that there is consistency across the Development Briefs; the land promoter has inputted to this Development Brief; and the other Development Briefs have the same text as currently shown here.
- Regarding the local centre, 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 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.

- Play areas - 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.
- 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
- Access strategy - 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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
- We note the point made in relation to Figure 10, 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.
- Re Figure 11, 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.

- Re the Park & Ride access, the opportunity exists - land ownership is not an insurmountable constraint. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to amend the wording.
- For PR6a and PR6b 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
- '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.
- 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. 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"
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- With regard to Savills' comment with continuous frontages, 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.
- With regard to Section 6.4.1, 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- The Water Infrastructure Capacity assessment should form part of / inform the FRA and the Drainage Assessment.
- 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.

### 3.43 In response to comments made by OCC:

- The Development Plan requirement for specialist housing stands irrespective of whether it is reiterated in the development brief.
- The Stratfield Brake proposals do not form part of the Development Plan and at the present time no application for planning permission has been received. It can therefore not be a consideration in the preparation of the Brief.
- With regard to digital infrastructure, innovation, sustainable construction, future transport modes and also the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, the requested text was not included for PR7b and PR9 and it is important there is consistency across the development briefs. It is not appropriate to refer to documents as yet unadopted, e.g. the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, and the Innovation Framework. These will be material considerations when planning applications are submitted.
- For the same reasons the requested changes re car parking provision, cycle parking and the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide have not been made. It is important that the Cherwell Residential Design Guide takes primacy.
- 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.
- 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 met the OCC Education team's advice re distance to pylons.
- Re Section 7.1, 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.

## Summary of Changes

- 3.44 In response to a comment by Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust,
- the biodiversity requirements set out on page 53 of the Brief have been amended to emphasise the importance of wildlife connectivity
  - text 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
  - text 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
- 3.45 In response to comments by the Harbord Road Area Residents Group,
- a sentence has been added at Section 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."
  - regarding the orchard adjacent the site, a NERC Act S41 habitat, text to be added at Section 4.2.4 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 at Section 6.5 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 at Section 6.3.1 (page 35) text to be added after "...ground vegetation removed" say "except where this would result in harm to existing wildlife corridors")
  - text added at page 53 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
  - after the third bullet point at 6.5, the words "in perpetuity" have been added after 'agricultural use'
  - in the 6th bullet point on page 52 "as far as possible" has been replaced with "unless any loss is robustly justified"
  - at the fifth bullet on page 30 reference has been added to health care provision

3.46 In response to comments by Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council,

- text added at page 49 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"
- 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 has been 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
- the figures on page 37 have been amended to show the cycle ways further into the site away from the Oxford Road frontage

3.47 In response to comments by Greenway Oxon,

- a sentence has been added at Section 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."

3.48 In response to comments by Savills on behalf of Christ Church,

- references to "Bronze Age (potentially Iron Age)" have been replaced with "Anglo-Saxon"
- page 1, 7th bullet (and page 14, 7<sup>th</sup> bullet) - the word "retained" has been added after "land"
- figure 1 - 'mixed use' has been changed to "broad location for local centre"
- figures 13, 15, 21 - a walking & cycling route has been added 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.
- the appropriate figures have been updated to reflect the approved layout for the Croudace development
- the appropriate figures have been 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 has been amended to replace "the farmhouse" with "Pipal Cottage"
- Section 1.4.1 has been amended in line with the Briefs for PR7a, PR7b, PR9 to say: Public consultation on the Draft Development Brief took place between 26 January 2022 and 8 March 2022. Comments received have informed the final Development Brief. "

- page 7 - the land described on the aerial photograph as 'North Oxford Golf Club' has been changed to 'PR6b'.
- in the third sentence of the penultimate para on page 14 the word "a" will be added before "combined".
- 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"
- 3.2.4, 4th bullet has been 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)."
- 3.2.4, 6th bullet, add the sentence "In addition, there is a vehicular access onto Oxford Road which serves Pipal Cottage."
- 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.
- Figures 9 and 10 re medieval features - the relevant figures and text have been amended accordingly.
- Section 4.1, bullets 11 and 12 have been amended as per Savills' suggested wording.
- Section 4.1, bullet 18, the words "Once developed" have been added at the start of the sentence and the word "is" has been replaced by "would be"
- Section 4.2.1, bullet 4, an additional circled number 1 has been added where the school is shown in the Local Plan proposals map
- Section 4.2.2, bullet 5 - add the words "(Pipal Cottage) and/or barns" prior to 'within the new development'
- Figure 11 - Add an arrow to connect the words 'St Frideswide Farmhouse' to the building itself between the numbers 2 and 7.
- Page 24, first bullet - change "districts" to "district"
- 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."

- 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."
- Section 4.2.5, bullet 7 – text re the southbound bus lane has been amended as per Savills' suggestion
- Section 6.1, fourth paragraph – the text has been amended as per Savills' suggestion; although their suggested text has the same meaning as drafted it has given added emphasis to the requirement for electric vehicle charging
- 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."
- page 31, 9th bullet, add "of those spaces" after surveillance at the end of the sentence.
- the appropriate figures have been updated to reflect the approved layout for the Croudace development
- page 35, 9th bullet - Add the words "or as close as possible to" before "the Park & Ride junction"
- page 35, 10th bullet - Add the words "Other than for Pipal Cottage" at the start of the last sentence.
- 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.
- the figures on page 37 have been amended to show the cycleways further into the site away from the Oxford Road frontage.
- page 38, 1st bullet under Southern area, text to be amended to reflect Savills' submission
- section 6.3.2, 3rd bullet - "semi-" to be amended to "near-"
- page 43, 4th bullet under Development principles - amend 5.5m to 6.5m; 7th bullet - amend 'designend' to "designed"
- 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.
- page 45 - add text after "urban blocks" - ". Secondary streets will be low speed / flow environments and will not require separate cycleways."

- section 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".
- section 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."
- page 48, list of documents, delete "Policy ESD16: The Oxford Canal"
- page 49, Development Principles, 2nd bullet - change Hair Streak to "Hairstreak". 3rd bullet - add after "hedgerow line" the words "which may include tree planting"
- 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)"
- 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". Page 56, 2nd bullet - change "outside and outside" to "area and outside"
- page 56, 2nd para under Green Belt - remove the words "including enhancements to the setting of St Frideswide Farmhouse".
- page 59 - list of policies - C21 to be removed, and page 60 – 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet removed
- page 61 amended to reflect that the land promoter has received a scoping opinion from CDC in relation to the requirements for inclusion in an Environmental Impact Assessment
- page 63 - Reference to PR12b to be deleted
- page 64 - Reference to Policies TR11 and TR22 to be deleted, as well as C29.

### 3.49 In response to comments by Oxfordshire County Council,

- the appropriate figures have been updated to reflect this approved layout for the Croudace development
- text of section 6.5 has been amended, but reference to land outside the allocated boundary has not been included as this is outside the remit of the development brief
- reference to the aggregate rail depot has been added to figure 10 and section 4.1
- section 4.2.5 - the 2nd bullet point has been amended 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."

- section 6.4.6, second paragraph amended 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."
- section 6.4.6, sentence added 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."
- 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 57, the word "site" added between education and checklist
- section 6.3.1, page 35, - new bullet added 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."
- page 1 - in the paragraph headed Site Location on page "Bronze Age (potentially Iron Age)" has been replaced with "Anglo-Saxon"
- various minor edits have been made to the text to correct typographical errors

## **4.0 Conclusion and Reasons for Recommendations**

- 4.1 Overall, officers are happy to conclude that the Development Brief for the site accords with Policy PR6a and the vision and objectives for the site, and that it provides an appropriate framework for the development of the site – adherence to the Brief will be important in achieving an acceptable form of development.
- 4.2 It is recommended that the planning committee approves this Development Brief as a framework for the development and delivery of site PR6a - Land East of Oxford Road and that it will be a material consideration in the determination of any future planning applications for the site.

## **5.0 Consultation**

Councillor Colin Clarke - Lead Member for Planning (briefing only)  
 Councillor George Reynolds, Chairman – Planning Committee (briefing only)

## **6.0 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection**

- 6.1 The following alternative options have been identified and rejected for the reasons as set out below.



Option 1: Not to endorse the Development Brief. Since Policy PR6a requires the planning application for the site to be supported by and prepared in accordance with a Development Brief, this option would require a new Brief to be prepared, adding significant expense for the Council and delaying delivery of the development.

Option 2: To request further significant changes to the Development Brief. Officers consider that the final brief presented to Members represents an appropriate response to Local Plan policy and will assist in achieving high quality development. This option would also delay the determination of any planning application and may require further public consultation, thereby creating uncertainty.

## **7.0 Implications**

### **Financial and Resource Implications**

- 7.1 External work on the development briefs is being funded by the respective site promoters through Planning Performance Agreements but controlled directly by Council officers. Costs for internal work are included in existing budgets.

Comments checked by:

Kimberley Digweed, Service Accountant. kimberley.digweed@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

### **Legal Implications**

- 7.2 The purpose of the development brief for site PR6a is to identify how national and local policy requirements and guidance will be applied to achieve high quality sustainable development at this location. Once approved by the Council the brief will be a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications at the site.

Comments checked by:

Shahin Ismail, Assistant Director - Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer  
Shahin.Ismail@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk

### **Risk Implications**

- 7.3 The relevant Local Plan policy requires a Development Brief to be produced. Whilst not a reason for approval, not approving the brief may require re-consideration of the Planning Performance Agreement with the respective promoter. This and any other arising risks are monitored through the service operational risk and will be escalated to the Leadership Risk Register as and when required.

Comments checked by:

Celia Prado-Teeling, Interim Assistant Director – Customer Focus, 01295 221556  
Celia.Prado-Teeling@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

### **Equality & Diversity Implications**

- 7.4 The proposed brief supports Local Plan policy that has been the subject of Equalities Impact Assessment and has been reviewed in line with this report. As there are no new impacts arising from this report, no new mitigations are required.

Comments checked by:  
Celia Prado-Teeling, Interim Assistant Director – Customer Focus, 01295 221556  
Celia.Prado-Teeling@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

## 8.0 Decision Information

### Key Decision

**Financial Threshold Met:** N/A

**Community Impact Threshold Met:** N/A

### Wards Affected

Kidlington East  
Other wards affected by Partial Review sites: Kidlington West

### Links to Corporate Plan and Policy Framework

Business Plan Priorities 2021-2022:

- Housing that meets your needs
- Leading on environmental sustainability
- An enterprising economy with strong and vibrant local centres
- Healthy, resilient and engaged communities

### Document Information

**Appendix 1:** Development Brief – Land East of Oxford Road  
**Appendix 2:** Summary of representations and officer responses

### Background papers

None

### Reference Documents

Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Partial Review:  
<https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/83/local-plans/215/adopted-cherwell-local-plan-2011-2031-part-1-partial-review---oxfords-unmet-housing-need>

### Report Author and contact details

Nathanael Stock, General Developments Team Leader  
01295 221886  
[Nathanael.Stock@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:Nathanael.Stock@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)