

Appendix 2 - Comments raised in consultation on PR8

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Maya Ellis	<p>I have noted that the above development shows a cycle route running through Gravel Pits Lane.</p> <p>This lane is private in part and not suitable for cyclists. There is a pedestrian right of way only but lane is not suitable for cyclists or the density of pedestrians as a “primary” route as part of this development.</p> <p>Gravel Pits Lane, is a mix of gravel and dirt for at least 50% of the track. The gravel track is not wide enough to have pedestrian segregation, and in parts is so narrow pedestrians can’t pass each.</p> <p>Gravel Pits Lane is PRIVATE not adopted and not suitable for heavy pedestrian access or Cyclists.</p>	The intention is that it would be made suitable for cycling	No change
Penny McCarthy	<p>This will completely change the character of this village which is currently a rural location surrounded by green belt land. The whole point of identifying areas as ‘green belt’ is to protect areas of countryside and the habitats that this provides for wildlife. Prolific building in this area, as outlined in the plan, will change this area forever. We moved here 22 years ago because of the rural location and this is set to change if this building work goes ahead. It will become another faceless suburb of Oxford.</p>	This largely relates to the principle of the development - to the extent that it does this is outside of the scope of the Development Brief.	No change
Penny McCarthy	<p>Closing Sandy Lane at the rail crossing will cut off essential facilities to residents who use this route to access facilities in Kidlington on a daily basis.</p>	Whether or not Sandy Lane closes is outside of the scope of the Development Brief	No change
Penny McCarthy	<p>Wildlife habitats will be seriously impacted through the building of this development including badgers, newts and bats.</p>	This largely relates to the principle of the development - to the extent that it does this is outside of the scope of the Development Brief. Ecological impacts can be mitigated and this will be addressed in the decision on planning applications	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Penny McCarthy	<p>Infrastructures are not adequate to cope with the amount of traffic this amount of housing will produce. The A44 is already hugely congested each day making access to Oxford challenging each morning. More housing will inevitably result in more people wanting to travel into Oxford to work and the roads simply cannot take the increased amount of traffic this will produce.</p>	<p>This largely relates to the principle of the development - to the extent that it does this is outside of the scope of the Development Brief.</p>	<p>No change</p>
Alan Curtis	<p>Sandy Lane crossings must be kept open! Not everyone can walk or cycle from Yarnton to Kidlington and back. You are discriminating against the elderly and disabled. The extra distance to travel by car, onto already congested routes is not environmentally friendly. Please do not bring Oxford Low Traffic Neighbourhood schemes to us!! Please rethink these silly anti car proposals.</p>	<p>Whether or not Sandy Lane closes is outside of the scope of the Development Brief</p>	<p>No change</p>
Historic England	<p>no objections or comment</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
Canal and River Trust	<p>The canal should be considered not as an edge to the site but an integral part of the site which brings unique opportunities to it. The benefits of being located by water should be fully exploited and the towpath seen as a multi-functional green infrastructure asset which leads much further afield, brings sustainable transport, active travel and health and well- being opportunities as well as a multitude of other benefits to not only PR8 but to the existing communities.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
Canal and River Trust	<p>It is likely that the towpath will require improvement to the north, particularly as a result of the other proposed development locations and a proportionate contribution should be sought from any allocation in close proximity to it.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Canal and River Trust	<p>During lockdown we have recorded increases in use of towpaths in similar areas of up to 600% and this is only likely to continue, particularly where the towpath can provide a pleasant off road commuter route right into the heart of the city. Realistically, residents are likely to use the towpath as a commuting route or for recreational purposes and this is welcomed by the Trust provided that the towpath is suitable for the additional usage, both in terms of surfacing and width. This additional use is likely to take place anywhere between Oxford City Centre (for commuting) and north, perhaps as far as Langford Lane and beyond for commuting, recreation and health and well-being.</p>	Noted	No change
Canal and River Trust	<p>We note that the Design Brief mentions a new public walking and cycling route is to be provided along the Oxford Canal, either through enhancements to the existing towpath or provision of an adjacent new route while retaining the existing canalside hedgerow. This should also extend northwards towards Langford Lane. P43 Access south towards Oxford City Centre on a new walking and cycling route adjacent to the Oxford Canal or on improved sections of canal towpath is also mentioned.</p>	<p>Land extending north towards Langford Lane lies outside the PR8 site and therefore outside the scope of the Development Brief. That said, page 48 notes: "This should also extend northwards towards Langford Lane."</p>	No change
Canal and River Trust	<p>We question the need to provide an adjacent new route, when an improved existing towpath may be acceptable. Further discussions are needed to understand the council thoughts on this matter.</p>	<p>Page 48 notes that this will be "either through enhancements to the existing towpath or provision of an adjacent new route while retaining the existing canalside hedgerow."</p>	No change
Canal and River Trust	<p>We have published a design guide for towpaths, here but each stretch really needs individual design based on the width available, likely volume of use and need for bank protection and the area. The surfacing will alter dependant on whether the path is urban or rural in nature. The towpath may require widening and bank stabilisation to allow a suitable width.</p>	Noted (but see above)	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Canal and River Trust	It is noted that the development must provide a new elegant pedestrian /cycle /wheelchair accessible bridge over the canal, and although it is understood that detailed discussions have not yet commenced with the Trust it is noted that the brief signposts the need for engagement on the design and location on the bridge.	Noted	No change
Canal and River Trust	It should be made clear that the Trust are not obliged to accept a new bridge over the canal regardless of any requirement in the Local Plan or a development brief. However, we will work with the council and others to facilitate it if a suitable design and location can be agreed and if it has no adverse impact on the navigational use of the canal. It is for the council to determine which development sites should make a contribution towards the cost of provision and maintenance of the bridge but as the bridge is not required for navigation purposes, the Trust will not pay for or maintain it. The Trust will not take ownership or maintenance responsibility for the new bridge, and we would expect that it be adopted by the Highway Authority to ensure it does not become a long-term liability.	Noted. It is of course the course that planning decisions do not supersede other legislative requirements or land ownership. It is hoped that a suitable design will be agreed with the CRT. The CRT's comments in relation to the ownership and maintenance of the bridge are noted.	No change
Canal and River Trust	It must be noted that the precise location of any bridge has not yet been agreed by the Trust, despite it being shown in the brief and earlier application.	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Canal and River Trust	<p>We are pleased to note that the development brief makes it clear that the Trust will want full involvement. We further request that a reference is made to our Code of Practice for works affecting the Trust, which can be found here although this may only be relevant to the design and location of the proposed bridge and its interaction with a new path along the eastern side of the canal. This should prevent multiple requests from different developers requiring detailed guidance on such a complex issue without some kind of cost undertaking to cover the provision of our advice. We will of course comment on anything that comes forward as a planning application but would hope that all these matters would be dealt with before a detailed application is submitted.</p>	Noted - see below	No change
Canal and River Trust	<p>It is suggested that an assessment of the compliance of the proposed bridge location of the bridge and towpath improvement details with our guidance document is included in the list of required supporting documents in Section 7.</p>	This is noted and a suitable change will be made to Section 7	Amend the text of Section 7 accordingly
Canal and River Trust	<p>Ecological enhancement We welcome mention of enhancements for Otter, Water Vole and Great Crested habitats and links within the site and to adjacent areas of habitat including the Lower Cherwell Conservation Target Area and the Meadows West of the Oxford Canal Local Wildlife Site to create a network. We also support mention of measures to minimise light spillage and noise levels and the maintenance of a dark canal corridor.</p>	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Canal and River Trust	Sport and Recreation - Finally, there is no mention of the need to consider the creation of water-based sport facilities such as angler platforms and launch locations for paddleboarding and canoeing which could be provided in conjunction with the new path to the east of the canal. Carparking to facilitate access to such facilities would also be beneficial.	This lies outside of the scope of the Development Brief	No change
BBOWT	We believe the scale of development proposed should be matched by large-scale habitat restoration and enhancement. We are greatly concerned as to the impacts of this development on wildlife. If the Council is nevertheless minded to proceed with the allocation of this site for development then there are a number of aspects which will need to be required of developers to minimise the impact on wildlife.	This largely relates to the principle of the development - to the extent that it does this is outside of the scope of the Development Brief.	No change
BBOWT	We would expect that wildlife-rich areas will be protected within developments, during construction, and afterwards, during occupation. This will require long-term monitoring, and sensitive management to a plan, with developer-funded oversight.	This largely relates to the principle of the development - to the extent that it does this is outside of the scope of the Development Brief. Ecological impacts can be mitigated and this will be addressed in the decision on planning applications	No change
BBOWT	We welcome the intention to retain “existing individual and groups of veteran, transitional veteran, high and moderate quality trees” and “existing intact species rich, and other hedgerows”, and the requirement to follow best practice measures (for example, as set out in 'BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations') during construction and the requirement for a grassland habitat buffer of minimum 5 m on either side of the hedgerows (6.5.2 p55/56).	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>BBOWT would expect any planning application to be judged robustly against the biodiversity and green space elements of the 'Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need (Sept 2020)' and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) with reference in particular to the protection of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) • District Wildlife Sites (DWS) and proposed DWS • Ancient woodland and other irreplaceable habitats • Priority habitat (under Section 41 of the NERC Act) • Legally protected and notable species Priority species (under Section 41 of the NERC Act) • Wild bird habitat (as covered under paragraph 9A “Duties in relation to wild bird habitat” of the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) Regulations 2012) • Lower Cherwell Valley CTA • Oxford Canal Conservation Area 	Noted	No change
BBOWT	<p>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>	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>Rushy Meadows: Any proposed development must therefore demonstrate that there will be no adverse effect on the SSSI or that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest</p>	Noted	No change
BBOWT	<p>Compensation for impact on farmland and other birds: The site will provide habitat for a range of breeding and wintering birds, some of which can be expected to be declining farmland bird UK priority species and other red or amber listed birds. 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>	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>Access vs. undisturbed areas</p> <p>In order to provide the substantial benefits for wildlife that will be needed to achieve a net gain in biodiversity that is focused primarily on site then there should not be public access across the entire area of the green infrastructure. 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 (with an appreciation of the most obvious routes that people are likely to want to follow: '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, fencing and ditches. Broad zones might help keep some larger restricted access nature conservation blocks 'quiet' rather than fragmenting areas too much. This would be simpler zoning 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 the value of these nature reserves to wildlife and people. The need to have some areas without direct public access is supported by a research report published by Natural England 'Is the management of Local Wildlife Sites affected by the urban fringe?' (NERR063)</p>	<p>This is noted and suitably worded amendments will be made to the text</p>	<p>Amend as necessary</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>Proposals for wildlife management and maintenance: Our view is that the GI, including habitats for wildlife, should be managed in perpetuity (e.g. forever) and proposals should recognise this. Long-term management plans and effective, sensitive management (with regular reviews) will be needed for all sites - they all have some green infrastructure and wildlife habitat. To ensure management lasts for as long as the built environment is built up (e.g. likely to be forever) then an endowment fund will be needed to ensure that management costs can be covered.</p> <p>Ideally, there would be a funded officer-role to coordinate and oversee this. This could be alongside or sharing a role as a community engagement officer. This role could for example be delivered by an officer in an external organisation with appropriate experience (e.g. such as a member of Cherwell District Council's Biodiversity Partnership).</p>	<p>This largely relates to the principle of the development - to the extent that it does this is outside of the scope of the Development Brief. Ecological impacts can be mitigated and this will be addressed in the decision on planning applications</p>	<p>No change</p>
BBOWT	<p>Local Nature Reserve: We welcome the intention to create a Local Nature Reserve LNR on 29.2 ha of land at the northern end of the proposed development site. The purpose of this LNR should be to provide an area of high-quality nature conservation to be managed carefully and appropriately for wildlife. The eastern end in particular should be managed so that it forms a buffer to and extends the area of Rushy Mead SSSI. We agree that the SSSI adjacent to public rights of way should be fenced and appropriate design measures taken to prevent access around pond/water vole habitat (p52).</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>Nature Conservation Area: We welcome the proposal to provide a nature conservation area with limited public access on 12.2 ha of land to the east of the railway line, south of the Oxford Canal and north of Sandy Lane, with access restricted to a fenced route adjacent to the canal and along Sandy Lane. We agree that “The perimeter fence should allow animal ingress and be surrounded by planting to minimise the visual impact. The nature conservation area is to be designed to support ground nesting birds and mitigate impact on the SSSI to the north as a result of the development”. (6.5.1 p52)</p>	Noted	No change
BBOWT	<p>Informal public parkland: We welcome the intention to create “informal public parkland adjacent to the canal....to be publicly accessible and have an emphasis on nature conservation, informal recreation and natural play with a network of new footpaths and cycleways” and a visitor centre, or information point serving the parkland and Oxford Canal. (6.5.1 p52)</p>	Noted	No change
BBOWT	<p>Retained agricultural land: We welcome the intention to retain 12 ha agricultural land in the south-east part of the site to be managed for farmland birds to contribute towards compensation for loss of farmland (4.2.4 p25). We note that this will form part of the Canalside green corridor which is to be kept free of development (6.3.3 p41). We would request that covenants or other measures are put in place in order to keep this area free of development in the long term.</p>	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan We welcome the requirement for a Biodiversity Impact Assessment to be submitted as part of the planning application for the site and a supporting Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan and note that measures are to be incorporated into the development schemes to achieve a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain as required by the Environment Act 2021.</p>	Noted	No change
BBOWT	<p>Light pollution: We are concerned that these measures may still result in significant light pollution arising from the developments, both static lighting as well as lights from vehicles. We think that 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, from fixed lights as well as vehicles, particularly where there are likely to be species of wildlife affected by light at night, e.g. insects, bats, birds and badgers. 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 a low spill variety, a spectrum that minimises impacts on birds, bats and insects and directed into the development. We suggest that there should be conditions or covenants to control the type, power of and direction of security and outside lighting that can be installed on homes and other buildings.</p>	This is noted and is a matter which will need to be addressed in the decision on planning applications	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>Integration of wildlife features into the built environment - We note 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.” (para 6.5.2 p56)</p> <p>We think that this 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.</p> <p>The scale of development proposed is such that each scheme should be exemplary in terms of integrating biodiversity features. The Wildlife Trusts have published 'Homes for people and Wildlife: How to build housing in a nature-friendly way' which sets out what a good, nature-rich housing development looks like.</p>	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
BBOWT	<p>The Development Brief should require developments to maximise the provision of such roofs, and install solar panels on roofs which are not green roofs. The extent of biodiversity will depend on the type of green roof installed. Sedum roofs benefit a limited range of invertebrates and provide foraging for pollinators when in flower. Ecologically designed extensive green roofs can provide good habitat for wildlife, but there are limitations in terms of replicating habitat at ground level due to shallow depth of soils and the drying effect of wind and sun. According to www.livingroofs.org, a good green roof designed for biodiversity should include a varied substrate depth planted with a wide range of wildflowers suitable for dry meadows.</p>	<p>It would seem to go beyond the Development Brief's scope to require green roofs, but they should be encouraged as forming part of a wider strategy</p>	<p>Text to be added as appropriate to either 6.5.1 or 6.5.2</p>
Thames Water	<p>We have sewers and rising mains crossing the site which are mentioned in section 6.8 of the brief and that we must be consulted.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
Thames Water	<p>We consider that the brief should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of wastewater/sewerage and water supply infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs).</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>TBC</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
	<p>We recommend the brief include the following policy/supporting text: PROPOSED NEW WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT “Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.” “The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</p>	TBC	TBC
Thames Water	<p>It is our understanding that the water efficiency standards of 105 litres per person per day is only applied through the building regulations where there is a planning condition requiring this standard (as set out at paragraph 2.8 of Part G2 of the Building Regulations). As the Thames Water area is defined as water stressed it is considered that such a condition should be attached as standard to all planning approvals for new residential development in order to help ensure that the standard is effectively delivered through the building regulations.</p>	<p>This is noted and is a matter which will need to be addressed in the decision on planning applications</p>	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Thames Water	<p>Within Part G of Building Regulations, the 110 litres/person/day level can be achieved through either the 'Calculation Method' or the 'Fittings Approach' (Table 2.2). The Fittings Approach provides clear flow-rate and volume performance metrics for each water using device / fitting in new dwellings. Thames Water considers the Fittings Approach, as outlined in Table 2.2 of Part G, increases the confidence that water efficient devices will be installed in the new dwelling. Insight from our smart water metering programme shows that household built to the 110 litres/person/day level using the Calculation Method, did not achieve the intended water performance levels.</p>	<p>This is noted and is a matter which will need to be addressed in the decision on planning applications</p>	<p>No change</p>
Thames Water	<p>Proposed policy text: "Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the 'Fittings Approach' in Table 2.2 of Part G of Building Regulations. Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met."</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>TBC</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Thames Water	<p>Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change. SuDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to: improve water quality; provide opportunities for water efficiency; provide enhanced landscape and visual features; support wildlife; and provide amenity and recreational benefits.</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."</p>	TBC	TBC
Network Rail	Residential development has the greatest potential to change the character of use of a level crossing, both from individual development proposals, and through cumulative impact over time. For development that increases Level Crossing risk, Network Rail looks to the developer to mitigate the potential impacts	The comment is noted. It is noted that the LPPR Policy PR8 looks to reduce level crossing risk, whereas the applicant may intend to provide for vehicular access.	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Network Rail	<p>Section 6.4 of the development brief looks at the development principles for movement by active and sustainable modes of travel. It is acknowledged in the document that both Sandy Lane and Yarnton Lane level crossing are to be closed to vehicles with provision of a new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway at the location of Sandy Lane level crossing and Yarnton Lane level crossing in which Network Rail are progressing.</p> <p>At present, Network Rail are yet to have consent to close the crossings and are working on submitting a Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) to facilitate the closure of the crossings aligned with our Minimum Viable Product (MVP) bridge. We would also note that the design of the bridge has not yet been finalised.</p> <p>Page 43 states that access points for pedestrians and cyclists will be provided with regular access points from the developmental area into public open green space via the existing canal bridge and level crossing to the North East. This is assumed to be Roundham Locks LC although not explicitly named in this paragraph.</p>	TBC	TBC

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Network Rail	<p>Network Rail have made previous comments regarding Roundham LC which had not been studied for detailed feasibility; however, if improvement and promotion of this route is to occur then a new vehicular bridge would be required if private road rights cannot be released. Alternatively a new ramped footbridge would be required. Any public right of way only bridge would have also account for non-mechanical vehicles as the public right of way is a restricted byway, over which the public is entitled to travel on foot, horseback and with non-mechanically propelled vehicles (such as pedal cycles and horse-drawn vehicles). In light of this promotion Network Rail have asked OUD for their projected traffic figures over the crossing in order that we can calculate the level of additional risk this will import over this level crossing.</p>	Noted	No change
Kidlington PC	<p>Seeks greater clarity in the Development Brief on land to the North of Sandy Lane as it is not specific on the breakdown between the business and housing for the site. If the site is taken forward solely for business use does this mean that the housing numbers as allocated in the partial Review of the Local Plan will not be met? Kidlington Parish Council wishes to see the housing allocation met on this site to avoid the need for further housing allocations in the Kidlington area at a future date in the event of Oxford's unmet housing needs not being addressed associated with this development.</p>	<p>The policy for the PR8 site requires a certain number of houses and a certain area for employment. These requirements are set. The objective of the Development Brief is to set out how these requirements are met. The development framework provides flexibility as to where the required uses are located. The intention is not to be over-prescriptive about the locations of these uses.</p>	No change
Kidlington PC	<p>Seeking to ensure that this site is not utilised to address housing needs associated by Oxford University rather than Oxford as, again, it has the potential to create future demand to address the city's unmet housing needs on other Green Belt sites at a future date</p>	<p>We entirely agree. If OUD wishes to provide for housing to meet Oxford University's wants or needs, this must be in addition to the requirements of Policy PR8. It must be remembered that the site has been removed from the Green Belt specifically for the purpose of meeting Oxford's unmet need</p>	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Kidlington PC	Retains its objection to the proposed closure of the Sandy Lane crossing and does not consider this draft development brief addressed that issue satisfactorily	Whether or not Sandy Lane closes is outside of the scope of the Development Brief	No change
Kidlington PC	Seeks direct reference within the Development Brief as to community benefits that can be achieved through this development, particularly for Kidlington	These are set out in Appendix 4 of the LPPR Plan	No change
Kidlington PC	Seeks greater clarity in the Development Brief as to the sports facilities that are to be provided, especially playing fields to help address any overall shortfall within the wider area of the relevant four parishes	These are set out at Sections 3.1, 5.1 and 6.6. The secondary school must incorporate a 4 court sports hall, the use of which must be shared with the community. The policy also requires "Formal sports and play areas within the developable area" although as per Section 5.0 it is the Council's preference "that in lieu of on-site formal sport pitch provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities at south east Kidlington, based upon CDC adopted developer contribution standards."	No change
Kidlington PC	The information within the Development Brief about future education provision needs to be more specific and detailed as to how this is taken forward.	It is not the purpose of the Development Brief to replace planning policies or other development plan documents, but to guide the layout and design of the development, ensuring that the education requirements are met including the optimal location and layout. CDC has worked closely with OCC in regard to the site requirements for education provision.	No change
Yarnton PC	The PR8 site, as defined in the LPPR, did not include either the disused quarry/rubbish dump in Sandy Lane or the garden centre (Yarnton Home and Garden) area. These are both included within this Development Brief without explanation, and it assumes that they are now a part of PR8 and that whatever happens on those areas can be a part of this development brief. Is that correct?	The PR8 site as defined in the LPPR does include the former landfill site on Sandy Lane and the Yarnton Home and Garden Centre - Figure 8 shows the policy map for the site. At the start of the work for the Development Brief, the landfill site was in different ownership and did not form part of the development, but it has since been acquired by OUD and now forms part of their plans. This has afforded greater flexibility to the layout of the development, with this -essentially square- area forming a new public green space onto which housing will face on three sides and the local centre facing onto it from the northern side.	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Yarnton PC	<p>The nature of the development - is it intended to create a new community, a new parish, or is it going to integrate with the existing communities? The Brief speaks of the development as being a new 'urban village' with its own identity and its own centre 'connected to Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington which will have retained their own identities'; yet the development lies entirely within the parishes of Begbroke and Yarnton, predominantly Yarnton, and contiguous with the houses on the eastern side of Yarnton and even surrounding some of them. The Brief even suggests that the local centre could have space for a Parish Office. Which parish?</p>	<p>Planning policy documents shape only the design and layout of the development. Governance is not within their remit. In spatial planning terms, it is intended to create a new development which is integrated with the existing communities. The location of the convenience facilities is one example of this, to provide an improved offer to existing residents of Yarnton; another being the location of purely residential and educational uses on land bordering the existing village of Yarnton. The land south to the east and south of Begbroke is to be kept as a Local Nature Reserve.</p>	No change
Yarnton PC	<p>The nature of the connection – the connectivity - with Kidlington. Is this to be maintained, or is it to be severed? Throughout the brief, Kidlington is seen as the local hub; it is the centre to which Begbroke and Yarnton and Gosford and Water Eaton and all the new PR developments relate and defer. Yet there is no public transport link between Kidlington and Begbroke, Yarnton and PR developments along the A44, and it is proposed to close the only road that is a direct link between them.</p> <p>The Development Brief as set out in the LPPR made it clear that vehicular connectivity between the villages and the new development must be maintained; and the maintenance of the present direct link was recently endorsed unanimously by the District Council at its meeting in July 2023.</p>	<p>Whether or not Sandy Lane closes is outside of the scope of the Development Brief</p>	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Yarnton PC	Drop-off points - There is mention of car drop-off points being created at several places around the development, at the schools, at the local centre, at the railway halt. Drop-off points at all these places presume that they are pick-up points as well. Dropping off takes only a moment and cars are in and out quickly and do not require much space, but picking up involves waiting, and that needs space for a lot more cars if it is not to be a nuisance to other traffic.	This is noted. Appropriate changes to be made to 6.4.4, 6.4.8, 6.6	Amend as applicable
Yarnton PC	Residential Development - The LPPR allocation was 1950 dwellings with 50% being so-called 'affordable'. The Development Brief also lists (Para 3.1.1) 'Limited number of homes for students and those working for the University at Begbroke Science Park, to be agreed with the Council'. What does this refer to? Is it a part of the 50% affordable, or is it an excess above the number approved in the LPPR?	This is in addition to the 50% Affordable Housing. It may form part of the 1,950 net dwellings or it may be in addition to that number, but it must be in addition to the 50% Affordable Housing.	No change
Yarnton PC	Little Marsh Playing Field - There are several mentions of this playing field. There is the possibility of a connection to it directly from the PR8 area (p. 25). There is mention of a 'ball strike risk assessment' (Para 4.1) but this is perhaps not now necessary; cricket is no longer played there. There seems to be no mention of the fine oak tree that stands on the north-east boundary with the PR8 area; is this not of veteran status, or close to it? This boundary is a substantial one with other mature trees, and it must be questioned whether the area immediately north-east of it would be suitable for allotments (Figure 1) given that it would be largely shaded by the trees in the hedge.	Reference to be added to the oak tree that stands on the north-east boundary with the PR8 area. The related point re the location of the allotments is noted and the indicative location of the allotments will be moved west/north-westwards.	Changes to be made accordingly

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Yarnton PC	Buses - The statement about buses on p. 20 is misleading in implying that there is bus connectivity; there isn't. The buses on the A44 connect Begbroke, Yarnton, PR8 and PR9 to Oxford. The buses on the A4260 connect Kidlington to Oxford. There are no buses connecting the two roads.	The statements on page 20 are factual and aren't intended to imply anything further. Nevertheless the point is noted	No change
Yarnton PC	The Canal Bridge - This bridge has a weight limit of 3 tonnes, not 1 tonne as stated, and it is misleading to state that the traffic control 'can cause traffic to queue back towards the level crossing' (p.23). The canal bridge and the level crossing are at least two hundred yards apart and there are never more than three or four cars waiting. For the light traffic to which it is limited the bridge and its traffic lights work well and cause no delay.	TBC	TBC
Yarnton PC	Opportunities - One of the opportunities listed for the local centre is for a skateboarding area. An excellent idea, but not there. Adjacent to Yarnton Lane is the large area of the disused sewage farm; it is an eyesore in proximity to the new development and enhancement of the lane as a green cycle and footway, and it could ideally be converted to a skateboarding park, and a location for building indoor sports facilities. The site is no longer owned by the water company, and it has great potential.	We accept the point regarding the putative local centre location and happy to amend this. The sewage farm is located outside of the PR8 area so it is not within the scope of the Development Brief to suggest the skateboard area is located there. Perhaps the ex-landfill site is a better location, to the south of the local centre.	The reference to the skateboard area will be amended accordingly
Yarnton PC	Errors - The Development Brief is full of errors of fact, east instead of west, north instead of south, etc. Here are those that I have noticed: p. 9: The role of Land The land to the east of the A44 is located EAST of Yarnton and WEST of Kidlington, not vice versa. The Begbroke Science Park is in the NORTHERN part of the site, not the centre.	These errors are noted and need to be corrected	The first two sentences of the penultimate paragraph on page 9 to be amended to read: "Land to the east of the A44 is located to the east of Yarnton, west of Kidlington and south east of Begbroke village. Just north of its centre is Begbroke Science Park."

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Yarnton PC	p. 18: 3.2.1: To the west the site is bounded by modern semi-detached houses comprising the EASTERN extent of Yarnton... not western	These errors are noted and need to be corrected	The 6th bullet of 3.2.1 to be amended to read: "To the west, the site is bounded by modern semi/detached houses comprising the eastern extent of Yarnton and the A44."
Yarnton PC	3.2.3: The University of Oxford's Begbroke Science Park is located towards the NORTH of the site...	Noted - this will be amended	The 2nd bullet of 3.2.3 (p18) to be amended to read: "The University of Oxford's Begbroke Science Park, is located to the north of Sandy Lane "
Yarnton PC	3.2.4: Yarnton Lane runs SOUTH WEST to NORTH EAST ... not vice versa	These errors are noted and need to be corrected	The 3rd bullet of 3.2.4 to be amended to read: "Yarnton Lane runs south west to north east through the eastern part of the site..."
Yarnton PC	4.2.5: Opportunity to strengthen connectivity with Begbroke to the north and south and towards Yarnton. Begbroke lies to the north of PR8, not south	There is a stray "and" in the 1st bullet of 4.2.5	The 1st bullet of 4.2.5 to be amended to read: "Opportunity to strengthen connectivity with Begbroke to the north and south towards Yarnton"
Yarnton PC	6.4.2: A second access point in the southern part of the site will be provided via a new junction onto the A44 to the SOUTH of the existing petrol filling station ... not north	This error is noted and will be corrected	The 2nd bullet of Development principles on page 42 to be amended to read: "A second access point in the southern part of the site will be provided via a new junction onto the A44 to the south of the existing petrol filling station as indicated indicatively on Figure 15."
Yarnton PC	p. 43: The weight limit on Sandy Lane canal bridge is 3 tonnes not 1 tonne.	TBC	TBC
Newcore / Yarnton Garden Centre	No objections or comment	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	Overall, given that policy PR8 is a very detailed policy, it is unclear why further 'guidance' and suggestions are necessary in the development brief, especially where these are caveated with phrases like "subject to further assessment." This brief would be better framed as considering the policy criteria in turn, and how the solutions and outputs can be feasibly and viably achieved. That said, the principles in the draft brief are generally supported.	The very purpose of the Development Brief is "to provide a site specific vision and comprehensive development principles addressing land use, character, layout, green infrastructure, movement, utilities, healthy place making and sustainable design", to guide developers and help shape the design of the development.	No change
Hallam Land	Queries the justification for the brief as material consideration and whether it adds value above that of the Policy	The place and role of the Development Brief is set out in the policy for the site.	No change
Hallam Land	<p>as cited at 1.2.2 of the development brief, the document is not a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However, SPDs are – as set out in PPG and Regulations – material considerations. The PPG specifically states that SPDs are a material consideration, so to suggest that the development brief is a material consideration, but not an SPD is somewhat of an anathema to the PPG.</p> <p>The development brief follows the broad description of what an SPD is, because the development brief appears to expand on a range of Local Plan policies which are relevant to PR8 – Land East of the A44. Therefore, for the development brief to truly be a material consideration, it should go through the formal processes of becoming an SPD.</p>	Noted the points regarding the status of the dev briefs and the comparison to SPDs but the development brief is a Policy requirement intended to secure the comprehensive development of each site and (all briefs in combination) the overall vision and strategy of the LPPR. The brief is clearly concerned with land-use matters, its requirement within policy was tested at examination and it will be subject to public consultation in addition to extensive engagement with key stakeholders and landowners/promoters.	No change - the brief is a policy requirement and planning applications will be expected to be prepared in accordance with the brief.

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Moreover, if the development brief is not an SPD, then it reads as though it is an interpretation of the policies in the Local Plan and what they represent. There is a risk therefore, that the development brief is predetermining what could be acceptable through the planning application process and is removing the planning judgment of the local planning authority and its officers.</p> <p>It should be remembered, and quoted in the development brief, that the weight given to material considerations is a matter of judgement and that in addition to the development brief not being an SPD, it is not policy, and as such no part of the development brief is a requirement unless that requirement is set out in a Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>This comment suggests a lack of understanding of the role of the Development Brief. Its very purpose is to guide the preparation of development proposals, to set parameters and principles which the LPA expects the development to follow and to form part of the planning judgement of the local planning authority. The Development Brief is a policy requirement and planning applications will need to accord with the Brief.</p>	No change
Hallam Land	The noise attenuation requires further definition or explanation	Query whether further definition is needed. If there is general alignment the points raised by Hallam can be dealt through the Planning application	No change
Hallam Land	Page 3 - Indicates requirement for equipped play area (this is subsequently identified as LAP on Figure 18)	The requirement is as per Figure 18 - it is acknowledged that page 3 does not distinguish between LAP, LEAP, NEAP and MUGA	Consider whether Figure 1/page 3 needs to be clarified
Hallam Land	<p>Page 3 - Identifies retained groups of trees and hedgerows between the HLM site and the wider allocation as per HLM current parameter plans;</p> <p>Additionally identifies a "Veteran tree" and "Transition veteran tree" within the retained boundary planting between the western edge of the HLM site and the wider allocation;</p>	Noted	No change
Hallam Land	Page 3 - Shows requirement for "Key new walking/cycling route" running parallel with the existing 'ditch' within the HLM site. The other walking/cycling route in this area is to the west of the HLM site within the wider allocation.	This is correct	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Page 3 - The cycle/footpath link down the edge of the water course in the HLM part of the site is in an area which floods. Therefore, the specific location needs to be considered as widths will be above 3.5m for such a facility.</p> <p>We note that the plan also defines the water course through the HLM site for retention/enhancement.</p>	<p>Add a note to say that its exact position will need to be subject to further testing</p>	Amend
Hallam Land	<p>Page 18 - The HLM site drainage is not referenced (i.e. no reference to a 'watercourse' within the site) - is there a specific reason for this?</p>	<p>Agree, the site context figure does not reflect all water courses. It is picked up within the Site constraints map.</p> <p>We either include all relevant watercourses within the context map or none.</p>	Amend
Hallam Land	<p>Page 22:</p> <p>Bullet 3 and Figure 10 identifies a single veteran oak (T1) on the boundary of the HLM site.</p> <p>HLM surveys (likely) identify this as 'T4' but it is not listed as a veteran and instead identified as a Category B specimen. We do not know who did the survey for the wider PR8 site and when this was done, but it was not HLM's consultant's opinion (from 2020 and June 2023) that this tree was veteran status. Regardless, the only constraint it would form if the LPA insisted on veteran status is an increase in buffer (extending from 12m currently, to 15m). Given the green corridor on this edge and relationship to the development parcel, HLM consider that this could be achievable, but specific comment on this matter would be appreciated.</p>	TBC	TBC
Hallam Land	<p>Page 23/Figure 10:</p> <p>Flood risk extent differs from the HLM consultant's assessment.</p> <p>Services not up to date and missing several services such as rising mains across the site.</p>	<p>Need to address factual corrections. If we are using national datasets instead of developers' info need to make clear but if more detailed info on flood risk exists and has a bearing on the sites, we should acknowledge.</p>	TBC

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Page 25-26 Site opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity identified to create development frontage to A44, which appears to be at odds with the need for noise abatement. • Opportunity to expand Littlemarsh Playing Fields, which has not be foreshadowed in policy and could potentially restrict the potential to deliver much needed new homes in a short term. 	<p>Agree to an extent. Noise attenuation doesn't necessarily mean a barrier to frontages. The dev framework notes size/type to be confirmed. A44 frontage is important, agree that perhaps it is a matter of addressing noise in the most suitable manner and based on noise survey info but A44 frontage. This can be suitably explained in the text.</p> <p>Development Principles figure 14 notes the key frontages are indicative.</p> <p>Agree that we need consistency. Although it is right and proper that the brief highlights this opportunity. Leisure made clear they prefer off-site contributions to formal playing pitches. PR8 still needs to provide informal/amenity space to adopted standards and the opportunity remains to link the playing fields to amenity space and site GI.</p>	<p>Re Hallam's first comment, no change required to figures but make edit to text to clarify</p>
Hallam Land	<p>Page 29 - We note that there is no requirement for formal sport pitch provision on site.</p>	<p>That is correct but worth adding a sentence to the first para noting that informal play/amenity space will still be required to be provided within the built-up area to adopted standards.</p>	<p>Amend text to make clear that off-site contributions to formal sports is required</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Page 31: We note (with our emphasis) that: “The development is to comply with and where possible exceed the local and national standards for sustainable development including enhancement to the natural environment and biodiversity net gain.” The weight of this comment is not clear and is unlikely to be capable of being a ‘material consideration’ as it amounts to an aspiration at best. Furthermore, we note that:“The outline planning application should establish the principles of sustainable development to be delivered across the site and manage and utilise these as a baseline which can be stretched further through the delivery of the development.” The site will not be delivered through a single outline application. Policy PR8 recognises that development will be delivered through more than one application, and this should be clearly and consistently reflected in the development brief. Considering other matters of sustainable development, the HLM team has reviewed the various ‘guidance’ and again we question if some of the ‘aspirations’ can truly be material considerations, and if they were, they would hold limited weight given that many of the issues are not specially foreshadowed in Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>We agree that the brief should help delivery the principles in the LP not to bring new ones. However, it could also be argued that the LP was prepared under NPPF12, and NPPF21 requirements could be applied alongside LP when assessing proposals today.</p> <p>With regards to multiple ownership, the dev brief in page 70 requires the ‘Delivery and Phasing Plan accompanying the planning application...to demonstrate how the implementation and phasing of the development shall be secured comprehensively and how individual development parcels, including the provision of supporting infrastructure, will be delivered.’</p> <p>All applications will be assessed against compliance with the brief regardless, but some land equalisation is likely to be required between all promoters. Section 7 could be strengthened for this complex site. In this section it would appropriate to address how to deal with multiple applications.</p> <p>Given the complexity of the site should we follow Milton Keynes East of M1 development framework example or other dev brief/framework examples for sites in multiple ownership?</p>	<p>No change re 6.1 other than as per above. Strengthen section 7 Consider editing text re multiple ownerships to reflect dev framework example from Milton Keynes</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Page 35: “In line with Policy PR8 a single comprehensive, outline scheme is to be approved for the entire site supported by a Delivery Plan across the multiple applications which the Council expects to be submitted.”</p> <p>This statement is incorrect and clearly not in line with Policy. Policy PR8 recognises that development is likely to be delivered through more than one application, and whilst the above sentence attempts to reflect the likely multiple planning applications it does not make sense.</p>	<p>The dev brief sentence is an almost word by word replication of PR8 point 31 and not incorrect.</p> <p>“Single comprehensive outline scheme” does NOT mean a single planning application.</p> <p>However, dev brief in page 35 could cross refer to section 7 and section 7 could provide greater clarity on how to secure the delivery of a comprehensive scheme though multiple planning applications.</p>	No change
Hallam Land	<p>Page 36 (Fig 14): Urban Design principles of key frontages (indicative) align with the current HLM parameter plans, aside from reference to ‘Noise attenuation’ requirement along A44. There appears to be some tension between the two elements which the Council should resolve.</p> <p>The maximum heights suggested across the HLM site fall within the 2-4 storey range, which is a parameter that HLM supports.</p>	<p>Noise attenuation doesn’t necessarily mean a barrier to frontages. The dev framework notes size/type to be confirmed. A 44 frontage is important, agree that perhaps it is a matter of addressing noise in the most suitable manner and based on noise survey info but A44 frontage. This can be suitably explained in the text.</p> <p>Development Principles figure 14 notes the key frontages are indicative.</p>	No change
Hallam Land	<p>Page 42: 6.4.1 – the design of the streets is required to follow guidance set out in the Cherwell Residential Design Guide and Manual for Streets. We note that there is no reference to the Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide which is some 5 years more recent in publication than the Cherwell guide</p>	<p>Add OCC Street Design Guide. Also reference text box in page 53 should include Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide and any other relevant doc such as parking standards. Will be a need to strike balance between highways requirements and good urban design.</p>	Amend

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Page 42: 6.4.2: we note that the first bullet point reads: “...the A44 will require reconfiguration with the design determined by the scale of impact of sites PR8 and PR9 assessed together and is to be agreed with OCC Highways. The junction will need to have sufficient capacity to cope with demand from both developments.”</p> <p>There appears to be no reference here to the County Council’s ‘Decide and Provide’ approach which effectively seeks, as far as is practical and safe to do so, to set to one side junction capacity and focus entirely on ensuring that more sustainable modes take priority, even if that is at the expense of junction / network capacity more widely.</p> <p>Now that the HLM network modelling exercise is complete, we believe it is inevitable that the introduction of the southbound bus lane of A44 will adversely impact network capacity and the capacity of the two PR8 access junctions. As such, the simple point here is that assuming our interpretation thereof is correct, the wording of the development brief does not reflect the County’s current approach to network management.</p>	<p>OCC's comments are a material consideration; the text has been drafted in partnership with OCC Highways and we are content that it does not need to be amended</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Page 45: heavy on detail and certainly mainly contains points for Reserved Matters applications. There ought to be some level of prioritisation in the guiding principles – and the originating polices / guidance should be clearly cited.</p> <p>Differences between OCC and CDC guide re. street widths. geometry cited is from the Cherwell ... If OCC will indeed accept a narrower primary street, it would be helpful for the Development Brief to build-in sufficient associated flexibility.</p>	<p>It is helpful that the Development Brief sets out these principles so as to give certainty and clarity to all parties as what is required</p>	<p>No change</p>
Hallam Land	<p>Arboriculture/ Ecology Figures 1, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 18 We note that various figures (as listed above) identify 'Transitional Veterans' on the HLM site boundary. HLM's consultants do not usually note transitional veterans on plans and only make mention of them in the report itself, as transitional veterans do not hold any specific protection, However, HLM does not foresee any potential conflicts in this regard. Furthermore, as previously mentioned in these submissions, HLM's consultants have not identified veteran trees on the site.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Landscape - The document refers to 'Landscape design of noise attenuation' along the eastern edge of the HLM site boundary in the key for Figure 18: Green Infrastructure. This reference is not made within the main body of text, it simply refers to 'good acoustic design' (e.g., pg. 68). In the HLM emerging masterplan proposals there is limited space between the development parcels and railway line and the acoustic mitigation proposed is an acoustic fence, which is capable of delivering the same noise attenuation effect, therefore the 'landscaping' suggested should be clearly identified as guidance.</p>	<p>Note issue of space raised by Hallam and their proposed acoustic fence.</p> <p>Preap report for this site recommends that the development includes natural sound barriers within the acoustic barrier.</p> <p>Leave unchanged.</p>	No change
Hallam Land	<p>Page 55: Reference to requirement for 1.8ha of allotments in total. Proportionally (by unit numbers), this would equate to around 0.27ha (15% of total) being accommodated within the HLM site.</p> <p>Classification L2 - Business Data</p> <p>HLM suggests it can comply with this requirement through around 0.1 ha as allotments with a further 0.16ha as a community orchard.</p>	0.27ha seems right. But this is a detail for the preapp and planning application. The brief indicates overall requirement plus location	No change
Hallam Land	<p>We note that: "There is an opportunity for such a park to the south of the local centre, where green space provides a buffer to existing hedgerow and watercourse and could provide a play space close to the primary school."</p> <p>Similar to our previous comment on Figure 18 – this 'opportunity' is contrary to other diagrams which indicate this area is for residential development.</p>	There is no inconsistency. Amenity space is to be provided to adopted standards within the developable area and not shown in other figures.	No change
Hallam Land	Page 61 - We note that reinforcing SUDS use throughout the site with reduced reliance on ponds for storage. Also references to all SUDS being under a Manco, and not adopted.	Noted	No change at this stage

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
Hallam Land	<p>Page 65 - We note the following comments:</p> <p>“Potential noise pollution arising from the A44 and railway line should be mitigated by following the principles of good acoustic design. For example, it is assumed that houses at the site boundaries should face onto the source of the noise to shield gardens and provide mitigation to the rest of the development site.”</p> <p>The above presents only one solution to dealing with noise, where other options exist. Properties backing onto areas that require to be secure and have no public access (i.e.. the railway line) with acoustic fencing to the rear of properties should also be considered.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p> <p>The brief clearly notes ‘for example’. No change needed in the brief.</p>	<p>No change</p>
OUD	<p>OUD does not consider that the Development Brief represents a sound policy position for the land, nor does it reflect the positive and meaningful pre-application discussions held between OUD, Hallam and CDC in respect of the PR8 proposals.</p>	<p>The Development Brief is couched in the terms of the planning policy; it does not set new planning policy; it may be more prescriptive than developers would prefer, but in a way that is one of the roles of the Development Brief. DM planners may agree something different as part of pre-application discussions and they have the flexibility to do so. However, this does not detract from the purpose and importance of the Development Brief in guiding and shaping appropriate development</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
<p>OU</p>	<p>OU's proposals are the result of considerable engagement with the public, an extensive pre-application programme with CDC and Oxfordshire County Council ('OCC') facilitated by a Planning Performance Agreement, two design review panels, and extensive scheme development based on in-depth and robust evidence to inform the proposals. The Development Brief does acknowledge the work undertaken by OU at section 6.5.2, but the proposals do not reflect this work, nor provide a sound rationale for the deviations between the OU proposals and what is then contained within the Development Brief. OU considers that the Development Brief is not sound, as it deviates from both the Local Plan and the proposals set out within the OPA without proper justification. OU do not consider that it is appropriate for the Development Brief to deviate from or seek to exceed adopted planning policy. The Development Brief would be an informal planning policy document, which has not been formally consulted on, nor based on robust evidence. On this basis we consider that the Development Brief would have limited weight for decision-making purposes.</p>	<p>Some elements of the OU proposals are unchanged from before the public engagement and the design review panels. The design review panels expressed concerns and recommended various changes. It is for the OU proposals to provide sound rationale for deviation from the policy and the Development Brief, not the other way around. The Development Brief has been formally consulted upon and is based on sound and robust evidence, and has been amended in various ways to reflect the OU proposals. OU is reminded of the policy requirements in respect of the Development Brief.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>OU</p>	<p>The potential for discrepancies between the Development Brief and any planning application(s) is noted in section 1.2.2. of the Development Brief. The language used throughout the document does not reflect this understanding and OU would echo the thoughts of the design review panel in commenting that the draft Development Brief is more prescriptive than a non-statutory planning document should be, and is not based on sound planning evidence. For the delivery of PR8 to be a success, flexibility is needed to allow its development to respond to circumstances as they arise and evolve.</p>	<p>The Development Brief is not overly prescriptive, and it does provide for sufficient flexibility</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OUD	Section 1.2.2, page 6, OUD queries the engagement between landowners and the Council. OUD says it sought to coordinate the preparation of the Dev Brief and the planning application by engaging members of the Dev Brief team in the pre-application process	The Council had good engagement with OUD's original planning team and the overall development framework for the site was agreed between the two parties. Unfortunately, OUD then changed its planning team and departed from that agreed strategy with an alternative development framework that had not been informed by robust evidence. That work has since taken place, but the overall development framework presented in the planning application had already been set out. The Development Brief team have attended meetings with the newer OUD planning team but despite best endeavours the dialogue was principally one-way.	No change
OUD	Section 4.1, page 23: the need for access between the development area west of the railway and the open space to the east of the railway is more than just for management of the nature reserves. OUD suggest ending this sentence after the word 'railway'.	This text was amended in response to OUD's comments on an earlier version, where they advised that the remaining undeveloped part of Parkers Farm would not remain in agricultural use. They commented that there was a need for access to land east of the railway, but not for agricultural use. We agree in that the land will primarily be used for public green space, wildlife areas and nature conservation areas.	No change
OUD	Section 5.1, page 28 - change "provision of a foot, cycle..." to "provision for a foot, cycle..."	Agree	Make change, i.e. of to for

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
<p>OULD</p>	<p>Figure 12, page 30: OUD previously highlighted that it had discussed the option of relocating the retained agricultural land to north of Rowel Brook where the agricultural land value is higher and access could be more easily achieved. OUD also previously commented that the trees identified in the Development Framework as being either veteran or transitional veteran status does not align with OUD's own arboricultural survey of the site, provided in the Environmental Statement, Volume 3, Appendix 13.1 submitted with the application. That survey shows that whilst there are veteran trees within the site, none are located in land to the east of the railway, where the draft Development Brief indicates there are 3 trees of transitional veteran status. The term 'transition veteran' is not one commonly used in the arboricultural profession – a tree is either veteran/ancient or it is not. Those trees identified by the draft Development Brief are managed as pollards. This means that not only are they currently not of veteran status, the way they are managed means that they will be able to achieve several of the core components of veteran trees. In summary, OUD request that the tree survey information provided with the OPA is used to ensure that the site's arboricultural value is accurately recorded.</p>	<p>Veteran and transitional veteran trees</p>	<p>Amend as necessary</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
<p>Figure 12, page 30: Figure 12 acknowledges that the location of the schools within the site are subject to further detailed assessment. This detailed assessment has been carried out by OUD and agreement has been reached with OCC on the location of the schools, which sites the secondary school to the east of central park and the 2FE primary school further northwest than is currently indicated. The draft Development Brief would benefit from reflecting these discussions.</p> <p>Figure 12, page 30: Figure 12 acknowledges that the location of the schools within the site are subject to further detailed assessment. This detailed assessment has been carried out by OUD and agreement has been reached with OCC on the location of the schools, which sites the secondary school to the east of central park and the 2FE primary school further northwest than is currently indicated. The draft Development Brief would benefit from reflecting these discussions.</p>	<p>The dev brief hatched area provides flexibility to accommodate the school and address concerns from OCC and sufficient land to enable contiguous expansion to the Science Park if that were needed (need to check the area indicated as contiguous provides for 14.7 ha). Nevertheless, secondary school within a defined science education quarter shouldn't be a competing use particularly with shared use of sports hall.</p> <p>However, on 26.05.23 received an assessment of school options which seems to favour location by rail station.</p> <p>Once the principle of moving the school is established Policy does not have an objection to different location parcels subject to not preventing other policy requirements.</p> <p>As a note, it seems odd that OCC objects to the location in the LP in noise and air pollution grounds but has no objection to location by railway line.</p>	<p>The dev brief hatched area provides flexibility to accommodate the school and address concerns from OCC and sufficient land to enable contiguous expansion to the Science Park if that were needed (need to check the area indicated as contiguous provides for 14.7 ha). Nevertheless, secondary school within a defined science education quarter shouldn't be a competing use particularly with shared use of sports hall.</p> <p>However, on 26.05.23 received an assessment of school options which seems to favour location by rail station.</p> <p>Once the principle of moving the school is established Policy does not have an objection to different location parcels subject to not preventing other policy requirements.</p> <p>As a note, it seems odd that OCC objects to the location in the LP in noise and air pollution grounds but has no objection to location by railway line.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Section 6.1, page 31: remove the words "and where possible exceed": OUD is proud to be able to put forward a best-in-class sustainability strategy that will deliver operationally net zero carbon buildings and 20% net gain in biodiversity. Nonetheless, it is not the place for the Development Brief to set out requirements to exceed policy "where possible". Such a requirement is not based on any adopted planning policy and nor has such a requirement gone through the necessary testing to understanding if it is feasible. The Development Brief should simply expect compliance with local and national standards.</p>	<p>Section 6.1, page 31: remove the words "and where possible exceed": OUD is proud to be able to put forward a best-in-class sustainability strategy that will deliver operationally net zero carbon buildings and 20% net gain in biodiversity. Nonetheless, it is not the place for the Development Brief to set out requirements to exceed policy "where possible". Such a requirement is not based on any adopted planning policy and nor has such a requirement gone through the necessary testing to understanding if it is feasible. The Development Brief should simply expect compliance with local and national standards.</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>TBC</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OUD	<p>Section 6.3, page 33: Replace the words "parameter plans" with "indicative figures": This sentence is new compared to the version circulated to landholders earlier in the year. It is notable that it uses much of the same language as used in OUD's own OPA.</p> <p>References to parameter plans within the draft Development Brief should be removed to avoid confusion between the role of the Development Brief – which is to guide the preparation of applications – and the applications themselves, which are responsible for forming the 'Rochdale envelope' that will control future development. It is not the role of the Development Brief to do this.</p>	Disagree	No change
OUD	<p>Section 6.3, page 33: Replace "a street-based layout" with "movement-based layout": References to a 'street-based layout' could be interpreted as overly car-focussed and does not align with other development principles to prioritise more sustainable modes of travel.</p>	TBC	TBC
OUD	<p>Section 6.3, page 34: The existing and expanded Begbroke Science Park, allotments on the A44, and former landfill site and existing residential dwellings are to be well integrated into the overall layout.</p>	Agree that the dev brief should afford same flexibility as the LP.	Provide flexibility in the dev brief for the relocation of existing allotments if needed in addition to provision of allotments to adopted standards.
OUD	<p>Section 6.3, page 34: Remove the words "if necessary" and replace "clear justification and consideration of the impact on existing users and residents of Begbroke and Yarnton." with "achieving an equivalent quantity and quality as the existing allotments". Policy PR8 requires that if the allotments are replaced then this should be to an equivalent quality and quantity as the existing allotments. The draft Development Brief should use the same wording to avoid confusion, rather than adding in further requirements that are not grounded in policy.</p>	This text has already been amended in response to OUD's comments to an earlier iteration and there is no clear reason to amend further	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OUD	Section 6.3.1, page 39: "The existing tree-lined public right of way leading north from Sandy Lane is to be retained or reprovided to an equivalent quality providing access to the Science Park, local centre and schools by foot and bike, and terminating in the listed Begbroke Hill Farmhouse and a new public square."	There is no justification for this change and no need to move the public right of way	No change
OUD	Section 6.3.3, page 41: Remove the words "It is to be kept free from built development." The land's designation as green belt is sufficient protection from inappropriate development, which the wording here strays beyond. It also contradicts Figure 12 which indicates that the land to the west of the Yarnton Road canal bridge could be suitable for a visitor centre or pavilion style building.	<p>PR8 envisages informal public parkland and retention of agricultural use south of Sandy Lane/east of the railway line. The LP clearly notes 'free of buildings' but it was prepared under NPPF12 which addresses facilities for outdoor recreation in GB slightly differently. Mindful of OUD proposals for this area 'formal sports and recreation area'.</p> <p>LP envisages PR8 point 37 the areas north along Rowel Brook and east of the railway to reflect and enhance local landscape character and wildlife including the Oxford Canal and Rowel Brook. Point 38 notes the contrast between dense urban development and canal-side parkland setting should be used as a positive and integral design feature.</p> <p>Formal sports pitches bring an urbanising element not intended by the policy neither needed/ requested by CDC recreation. I would recommend retaining the policy wording. LPPR Evidence doc PR50 notes: "The open agricultural land between Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton provides an important separation to the settlements, preventing coalescence of the villages. The agricultural land also provides a setting to the conservation area associated with the Oxford Canal, which passes along the west edge of the village." If current agricultural use is no longer viable (the only info from promoter I am aware of is that Rowel Brook area has better quality agricultural land) need evidence. 12 hectares seems a reasonable size for smaller scale food production and could link with the retention of the orchard at PR7b</p>	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OUD	Section 6.4.1, page 42: "...creating excellent pedestrian, cycle, wheelchair and bus connectivity within the site, to Yarnton, to allocated sites PR9 and PR7b..." Buses key component of the sustainable transport strategy.	Agreed - text to be amended accordingly	Text to be amended accordingly
OUD	Section 6.4.2, page 43: Change "1 tonne" to "3 tonne"; replace Sandy lane with Yarnton Road and change Yarnton Lane to Sandy Lane. Yarnton Road canal bridge has a 3 tonne weight limit.	Not clear as to why the road names need to be amended	TBC
OUD	Section 6.4.4, page 45: Remove the words "and is to have a minimum carriageway width of 6.2m"; it is not clear why if the design is to be agreed with OCC it is necessary to further stipulate the minimum carriageway width. Furthermore, OCC's Street Design Guide allows flexibility on carriageway width, which the wording here seeks to remove without any justification.	The design of the road is not the same as its minimum width. The Development Brief is setting a parameter regarding the minimum width - considered important for urban design reasons, and beyond that the design of the primary street is to be agreed with OCC. OCC has requested 6.2m be amended to 6.5m because of the requirement for the primary street to be a bus route.	No change
OUD	Section 6.4.8, page 51: Delete the words, "it is assumed that this will have one platform on each side of the tracks measuring approximately 150m in length and 6m in width. No buildings will be required to serve the rail halt due to the limited frequency of services, however shelter, ticket machine, lighting and tannoy will be required." and replace with "the design should be agreed with CDC, OCC, Network Rail, and any other key stakeholders. There is a high degree of uncertainty around firstly the need for and secondly the design of any rail station or rail halt within the PR8 site. The draft Development Brief should more simply acknowledge this uncertainty and point to the design of any station being agreed with Network Rail, CDC and OCC at a later date.	TBC	TBC

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OUD	Section 6.5.1, page 52, replace "November 2023" with "January 2024" and add at the end of the following sentence: "(though this does not itself equate to a policy requirement to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain)." Further information has been issued by the Government on the introduction of the biodiversity net gain requirement. Further text should be added to make clear that a direction from the Executive committee is not equivalent to planning policy.	Noted - the date will be amended. The other suggested change should not be made, given that the legislation does require a 10% biodiversity net gain	Replace "November 2023" with "February 2024"
OUD	Section 6.5.1, page 52: Remove the words, "on the SSSI to the north". Potential effects to Rushy Meadows SSSI were considered in OUD's Environmental Statement, Chapter 13. It confirms that the delivery of the nature conservation area will help strengthen the local green infrastructure network but that it is not required as mitigation to avoid harm to the SSSI.	See below	No change
OUD	Section 6.5.1, page 52: Remove the words "The SSSI adjacent to public rights of way is to be fenced and", and replace "are to be taken to prevent access around ponds/water vole habitat" to "should be taken to prevent access to the Rushy Meadows SSSI and around ponds/water vole habitat".. Rushy Meadows SSSI falls outside of the University's land ownership and so OUD recommend this is adjusted to reflect that fencing the SSSI is not necessary deliverable.	Although the SSSI is outside PR8, the site must mitigate potential impact on SSSI. Agree to a point with the deliverability issue. Preapplication and application process better suited to ensure deliverable mitigation. No change.	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OUD	<p>Section 6.5.2, page 56 - OUD takes issue with the paragraph, "There should be no incongruity in the design layout of housing plots and public open space: the boundaries must not be blurred (plot boundaries should be defined by walls, fences and formal hedges or other clearly defined boundary treatment). Existing features such as retained hedgerows should have enough usable open space between the plot line and the hedgerow, with an intervening path or road to clearly define boundary ownership and minimise the possibility of illegal land encroachment in the future." Comments such as these seem overly restrictive and do not allow for the consideration of innovative design. Greater flexibility should be allowed so as not to stifle good ideas in the future.</p>	<p>The development brief clearly indicates 'housing plots' and the intention of the dev brief here is not that of stifling innovation.</p>	<p>No change</p>
OUD	<p>Section 6.5.3, page 57, left hand side: Remove the words "of an urban character" - It is not clear why the Development Brief needs to dictate the character of play equipment within the Site nor what benefit this provides.</p>	<p>This is a requirement worked through with consultees</p>	<p>No change</p>
OCC	<p>This development brief is being consulted on after all the others for the Partial Review allocated sites.</p>	<p>Resources meant that the Development Briefs had to be prioritised in order of sites coming forward for development. Other than PR6b, PR8 is the last of the six sites to be subject of planning applications</p>	<p>No change</p>
OCC	<p>Ideally this development brief should have been consulted on earlier as an outline planning application covering much of the allocated site was lodged in July 2023 without the benefit of a confirmed brief.</p>	<p>Agreed. Work on the Development Brief had progressed in Autumn 2022/Spring 2023 but was put on hold for wider review</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	Cherwell District Council has advised that Policy BSC 4 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (adopted July 2015) does not apply to the Partial Review allocated sites. The County Council has an interest in affordable specialist housing related to our Social Care functions, for example for older people or those with disabilities. No provision for such specialist housing is made in the development brief nor the current application 23/02098/OUT. We understand this to be the policy position so have no comment.	Noted. This relates to planning policy and to the planning application rather than to the Development Brief	No change
OCC	As the housing on the site is allocated for Oxford's unmet need, the affordable housing elements need to be agreed with Oxford City Council.	Noted. This relates to planning policy and to the planning application rather than to the Development Brief	No change
OCC	The development brief does not address the possibility of more houses on the site than identified in the allocation which anticipates 1,950 homes. Application 23/02098/OUT anticipates some 1,800 homes, so together with the anticipated 300 on the land to the south, we think consent might be granted for some 2,100 homes which will provide more housing for Oxford's unmet need	Yes - 2,100 homes would exceed the allocation of 1,950. This needs to be borne in mind by decision makers particularly in relation to the contributions / proportions of contributions made by PR8 applicants/developers towards infrastructure, but this is not a matter for the Development Brief. The Development Brief must not stray beyond the planning policy; its purpose is to provide detail as to how the policy should be implemented and the site developed. It would not be appropriate for the Development Brief to advocate, or address the potential for, a number of homes greater than that in the policy	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>Some 65 hectares of the 190-hectare allocation remain in the Green Belt. Page 10 of the draft development brief refers to a Local Nature Reserve, nature conservation area and informal canalside parkland. It also refers to a walking and cycling route linking to Oxford and via a canal bridge with PR7b to Oxford Parkway Station, which we support. Further details of green infrastructure are provided on pages 52 to 59. We do not seek any amendments.</p> <p>The information between pages 18 and 20 provide useful site context and the map clearly identifies the land which remains in the Green Belt.</p>	Those uses would all be appropriate uses in the Green Belt. Noted.	No change
OCC	<p>We seek clarification of the text on page 33. The text advises that 'a single comprehensive, outline scheme is to be approved for the entire site'. As there is a current application which does not cover all of the site, 23/02098/OUT, we are not clear how there can be such a scheme for the whole allocation. Nevertheless, we support the intentions, which include a design code for the entire site. We seek that the text be amended to clearly indicate how the intent will be achieved given that the first application does not cover the whole site.</p>	<p>This has been a common misunderstanding on the part of various interested parties. The words are taken directly from the planning policy for the PR8 site. It is necessary for each applicant to demonstrate how their development forms part of a single, integrated whole, so as to avoid a piecemeal approach, etc.</p>	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>Sandy Lane - The development framework on page 3 (and on page 30) may require amendment to provide for an alternative bridge arrangement than the one proposed by Network Rail at Sandy Lane. However, we recognise that there is text in the key on page 3, which states "...potential for alternative bridge further north with restricted vehicular access, subject to agreement between OUD and Network Rail". There is also text on page 29 indicating: "Alternative land use arrangements will be considered through future planning applications subject to evidenced justification..." and text on page 42 indicating: "...potential restricted vehicle access via a bridge further north may be delivered, subject to agreement between Network Rail and OUD".</p>	<p>We will give thought to providing suitable amendment/clarification to the development framework on page 3 and 30</p>	<p>TBC</p>
OCC	<p>Railway Station - The development brief envisages a future Begbroke railway station at a location able to be accessed by cars both from the west and east. Policy requirements include safeguarding 0.5ha for such a station. The term Rail Halt has been used in the Local Plan, presumably to acknowledge that a large railway station is not envisaged. However, the term 'halt' is outdated. We use the term railway station.</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>TBC</p>
OCC	<p>As the railway line in this location is double tracked, there will need to be one platform northbound (on the west) and one platform southbound (on the east) connected via a bridge or tunnel.</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>TBC</p>
OCC	<p>Amendment should be made to the brief, for example on the development framework on page 3 (and on page 30) to show the zone for the railway station extended northwards. This would recognise the option that is now within 23/02098/OUT, although we would direct you to our Transport comments on the application which at the time of writing include a transport objection.</p>	<p>The zone has already been expanded from earlier versions and now covers an area/distance measuring c.1km and covers the entire eastern edge of the site that is outside of the Green Belt and within OUD's land</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>Amendment may need to be made to the text of the brief under 6.4.8 on page 51 following further discussion with Network Rail and other interested parties. At this point in time there has been no business case prepared about services to such a station. We expect this would be part of a stopping service between Oxford and Banbury like the next station at Tackley which currently has 13 trains stop in each direction on weekdays and a lesser number on Saturdays.</p>	<p>Noted - text to be amended to include reference to discussion with Network Rail</p>	<p>In the 2nd para of 6.4.8 add after "Should a halt be developed" the words "and subject to further discussion with Network Rail"</p>
OCC	<p>The development framework on page 3 has blue arrows shown in the key to indicate vehicular access but those aren't included on the plan for the PR8 site. There are blue arrows indicating the vehicle access for PR9 opposite on the same plan. Amendments should be made to include blue arrows.</p>	<p>Agreed - Figure 1 to be amended accordingly</p>	<p>Fig 1 to be amended to include the blue arrows for the vehicular accesses from the A44.</p>
OCC	<p>The figure 2 on page 5 is meant to indicate not only existing key sustainable movement routes but also proposed ones. However, amendments need to be made as follows: The ped / cycle route through Cutteslowe Park and over the A40 overbridge to Wren Rd should be shown.</p> <p>The Banbury Road, south of the Cutteslowe Roundabout should be indicated with an arrow. Woodstock Rd, south of the Wolvercote Roundabout has a green line and arrow indicating onward connection, Banbury Road should have the same.</p> <p>The route between Sandy Lane and the proposed new canal bridge to PR7b which is indicated on the plan on page 3 and is a requirement of policy should be shown. The proposed route through PR7b is already shown.</p>	<p>Noted - Figure 2 to be amended as far as practicable</p>	<p>Amend as per OCC's request</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	On page 12 (2.1.3) - references the County Council's Local Transport Plan and strategy for 'Park & Ride and Rapid Transit' should be updated to refer to the LTCP and strategy for Mobility Hubs and strategic public transport network.	TBC	TBC
OCC	References throughout the document to 'Transport Hub' should be updated to 'Mobility Hub'.	TBC	TBC
OCC	On page 42 (6.4.2) the 5th point which begins 'crossing opportunities will be explored...' should be clearer that it is referring to the crossing of the railway / Sandy Lane replacement bridge. It follows a point about the bridge but read on its own it isn't clear what it is referring to and might raise concern about whether or not crossings of, the example, the A44 are going to be delivered.	Noted. Text to be amended accordingly	Text to be amended accordingly
OCC	On page 45 it should be noted that the primary street should have a width of 6.5m for a bus route. This is needed also in Figure 16.	Noted	Text to be amended accordingly
OCC	On page 47 the section on Tertiary Streets should be reviewed to encourage the "living streets" concept. Streets may be narrower than for "living streets" without parking and which potentially operate in a one-way system.	TBC	TBC

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>Controlled Parking - OCC has adopted new parking standards which have a specific standard for 'edge of Oxford' sites. This sets out a lower level of residential and employment car parking, more akin to Oxford City standards. In order to enforce this, prevent inappropriate overspill parking, and to prevent the site from becoming an informal park and ride (given new bus services and potential rail halt) OCC will be looking to adopt the streets and implement a CPZ. Prior to adoption, a scheme of private parking enforcement will be required which directly mirrors the operation of a CPZ. This has been done recently at the Barton Park development. Text should be included on the need for the scheme of parking enforcement.</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>
OCC	<p>Bus route - It is envisaged that there will be a bus route in future through the site. Reference should be made to the desirability of higher densities in locations close to a bus route.</p>	<p>Agreed - text to be amended accordingly</p>	<p>Amend text as per OCC's suggestion</p>
OCC	<p>Mobility Hub - The County Council wants to see a mobility hub created on the site by the local centre, enabling interchange between bike, e-bike, e-scooter, walking and public transport services. Reference should be made to this both within section 6.4 on movement and access and in section 6.6.2 on the local centre.</p>	<p>Agreed - text to be amended accordingly</p>	<p>Amend text as per OCC's suggestion</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>The development brief does not contain a lot of advice on how the development will follow the principles of sustainable drainage. The brief should mention how the development will follow the SuDS discharge hierarchy. We would like the brief to better explore:</p> <p>The SuDS features that will be implemented to attenuate and treat surface water before being discharging at greenfield run off rates.</p> <p>The use of infiltration techniques that will be implemented on site.</p> <p>How the surface water network will benefit the local area and reduce flood risk.</p> <p>The offsite drainage features that will be implemented to mitigate flood risk.</p> <p>How the development proposals sit with the different flood zones.</p> <p>How drainage integrates with landscape elements.</p>	TBC	TBC
OCC	<p>On this site we expect a full Flood Risk Assessment that forms the basis for a Sustainable Surface Water Management Strategy. We acknowledge that work has progressed through the current planning applications.</p>	Noted	No change

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>The school site area requirements in Local Plan Policy PR8 are incorrect. The areas we are seeking for the schools are 8.03ha for a 1,100-place secondary school, 3.02 ha for a 3FE primary and 2.22ha for a 2FE primary. The PR8 requirements are referred to Page 1, Page 15, Page 28 and Page 61. On Page 61 there is an additional paragraph: "The exact size of the required school sites is to be agreed with OCC with consideration of the site constraints and topography". We assume the lack of correct figures in the development brief and plan policy will not be an issue. The applicant, OUD, is aware of the County requirements and we have agreement with them on providing the required areas.</p>	<p>We note the areas sought by OCC. The figures in the Development Brief reflect those in LPPR Policy PR8, which have been through examination.</p>	<p>No change</p>
OCC	<p>Sports Hall Requirements - Regarding the 4-court sports hall, a standard school sports hall is typically 18m x 28m or 33m (for three or four courts respectively) x 7.5m high, whereas a community sports hall for school use and formal club-level use outside school hours, designed to larger Sport England dimensions, typically 20m x 34.5m (with four courts) x 7.5m high. Additional funding would be required from the developer to meet the larger hall requirements as the standard contributions being sought by the County Council are insufficient to cover a larger hall.</p>	<p>This is noted and we appreciate OCC's clarification. The Policy PR8 requirement is for a sports hall that can be used by the community outside school hours and it will therefore need to be designed to the Sports England dimensions. In view of OCC's response, additional funding would be required by the developer to meet the larger hall requirements.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>School locations have been shown on several maps e.g. on Page 3, Page 10, Page 14.</p> <p>The 3FE primary school location is agreed and consistent with the OUD outline planning application.</p> <p>The locations for the secondary school and the 2FE primary school have been the subject of considerable discussion. The OUD outline application shows different locations to those in the draft development brief. We expect the amendment to the OUD planning application to include amended sites, which we expect we will agree to as, providing they meet the County Council requirements, we will have no reason to object. Those locations are not the same as the development brief locations. The District Council may therefore wish to consider updating the development brief to reflect what might be agreed locations for the schools by that time prior to finalising the brief. At the very least, we would expect the development brief to be clear on the possibility of alternative locations for the schools being acceptable.</p>	<p>The Development Brief states that the school site locations are subject to further detailed assessment</p>	<p>No change</p>

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
OCC	<p>Schools should be located close to local centres so parents who have to drive can make use of car parking facilities in those locations and not congest the area around the school. This is captured on Page 62 for Primary 1 Pupil drop off parking should be provided within the local centre as although walking and cycling are preferred it is recognised that, for a variety of reasons, for some parents driving to or from school may be the only option. Of course, if this is the case for Primary 1, the question of how to deal with parents driving to or from school will also arise with Primary 2. However, there should not be any implication in the development brief that drop off car parking will be provided on the school site (that is never done) and it may also be the case that surrounding streets will not have suitable space for car parking spaces on the street and other shared spaces may need to be provided if there is no proximate local centre.</p>	<p>We entirely agree. The locations currently identified in the Development Brief are located close to local centre and/or convenience facilities. We would expect any alternative locations proposed or agreed as part of the planning application to meet this objective as set out by OCC</p>	<p>No change</p>
OCC	<p>On Page 43 it is noted that although Sandy Lane will be closed to through vehicle movements, there will need to be provision for some uses. The primary school is mentioned. We note that the OUD proposed location of the secondary school would also result in vehicles associated with the school e.g. for staff and deliveries, needing to access the secondary school along the route of that road.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
OCC	<p>Education - The development brief refers throughout specifically to a 3-form entry primary school and a 2-form entry primary school. Some flexibility in the wording would be more useful, as the exact sizes of the schools will depend on the local context at the time of construction. "Up to" 3- form entry and 2-form entry would be more accurate.</p>	<p>The requirements set out in the Development Brief reflect the requirements of the Policy PR8. It would be inappropriate for the Development Brief to deviate from the specific requirements of Policy PR8. In addition, it would be easier to compromise on a less onerous position than to seek to negotiate up from a revised position.</p>	<p>No change</p>