CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Part 3

November 2024

Cherwell
DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE

Contents

APPENDICES

1.Introduction

This Consultation Statement describes the third stage of public consultation undertaken on the Cherwell Local Plan Review between 22 September 2023 to 3 November 2023. This consultation statement sets out:

- The stakeholders invited to take part in the consultation;
- The consultation and publicity methods used;
- The material that was subject to consultation;
- A summary of the responses received; and
- How the Council has taken account of the responses received to the consultation in the preparation of the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

There is a legal process for the preparation of a Local Plan. The Council is required to consult with stakeholders and the public more generally, at a number of stages. The first stage is under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Regulation 18 requires the council to notify stakeholders it is preparing a plan and to invite them to make comments with their views on what the plan should contain. There is flexibility in how the initial stages of consultation and plan preparation can take place.

The timetable for preparation of the Cherwell Local Plan Review is presented in the Council's Local Development Scheme which is available online.

The overall consultation statement complies with the Cherwell Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) applicable during the relevant stages of plan preparation. The first relevant SCI was adopted by the Council on 18 July 2016 and the subsequent SCI Addendum prepared in July 2020 following government advice in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This third stage of consultation complies with the SCI 2021, which was adopted by the Council on 18 October 2021.

The SCI sets out who the Council will engage with in preparing key planning policy documents and determining planning applications and how and when they will be engaged. Its aim is to encourage community and stakeholder involvement and sets out clear expectations of the council. The 2021 SCI is available online at https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/33/planning-policy/383/statement-of-community-involvement.

The responses received through the consultation process have be used to shape and inform the development of the Cherwell Local Plan Review.

2. The 'Duty to Co-operate'

Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 introduced a 'Duty to Cooperate' which places a legal duty on local authorities to consider strategic planning beyond their boundaries and provides a mechanism to address larger issues than can be dealt with by the local planning authority working alone. Through the 'Duty to Cooperate', the Government expects that Councils will work collaboratively with other prescribed bodies[1] to ensure that cross boundary strategic issues are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. Cherwell District is committed to fulfilling this Duty and, as a matter of practice, works closely with neighbouring authorities[2] and other partner organisations and stakeholders.

The local planning authorities that border Cherwell District are:

- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Northamptonshire County Council
- Oxford City Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Stratford-On Avon District Council
- Vale of White Horse District Council
- Warwickshire County Council
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- West Northamptonshire Council

The Oxfordshire Councils are assisted in meeting the Duty to Co-operate by the Future Oxfordshire Partnership, formerly known as the 'Oxfordshire Growth Board'. It is a Joint Committee comprising Cherwell District Council, Oxford City Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, Vale of White Horse District Council, West Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council. It also includes co-opted non-voting named members from the following organisations:

- Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
- Environment Agency
- Homes England
- Oxford Universities
- Oxfordshire Skills Board
- Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership

[1] The prescribed bodies are defined in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

[2] Buckinghamshire Council, Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, Stratford-on-Avon District Council, Vale of White Horse District Council, Warwickshire County Council, West Northamptonshire Council, West Oxfordshire District Council

When considering matters that sit under the purview of the Local Transport Board, Network Rail and National Highways have the right to attend the Partnership as non-voting investment partners.

The application of the ‘Duty to Co-operate is also informed by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

The Council has prepared a Duty to Co-operate Paper that sets out in detail how the Council has complied with this duty.

3. Draft Local Plan Review Consultation

Previous Consultation

The Cherwell Local Plan Review was initially launched in March 2020 with the publication of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) which sets out the timetable for the preparation of the Plan.

On 31 July 2020 the Council published its first Community Involvement Paper for a six-week period of consultation to Monday 14 September 2020.

On 29 September 2021 the Council subsequently published a second Community Involvement Paper for a six-week consultation to 10 November 2021. This second Community Involvement Paper was a District-wide 'Options' consultation in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The consultation paper proposed a place and people-based draft vision for the district with a focus on developing a sustainable local economy, meeting the climate change challenge and healthy place shaping. The paper included a place-based discussion of Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington, Upper Heyford and the rural areas.

The second consultation was also accompanied by a further 'call for sites' and an invitation for applications for Local Green Space designation.

Statements of Consultation which summarised the issues raised during each of these consultations have previously been published. The documents are available on-line at https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/83/local-plans/729/local-plan-review-2040---planning-for-cherwell-to-2040

4. Consultation & Engagement

Consultation Arrangements

On 22 September 2023 the Council published a draft (Regulation 18) Local Plan for consultation. The Plan was prepared to engage with local communities, partners and stakeholders inviting comments and feedback on our emerging proposals.

How did we consult?

The formal consultation ran for 6 weeks from 22 September 2023 to 3 November 2023.

Distribution

The consultees listed in the Statement of Community Involvement and anyone who had registered on the Council's database (including previous respondents) were notified by email or letter and were asked to comment on the draft plan generally and answer specific questions.

Hard copies were also placed at deposit locations across the district including libraries and Council offices. In addition, hard copies were placed in Woodstock and West Oxfordshire District Council offices. A consultation summary leaflet was also produced and made available at these locations as well as on the Council's website.

Letters were sent to all Town and Parish Councils/Meetings in the district enclosing a copy of the public notice, a consultation poster and the Draft Local Plan Review. We asked all Town and Parish Council/Meetings to help us in publicising the consultation by placing the consultation poster on their notice board and other suitable public places in their area. Contact details for the Planning Policy team were provided in case of any queries or difficulties in accessing the consultation documents online, and to request an additional poster.

We aimed to increase awareness and address groups identified as potentially underrepresented in planning consultation and engagement by publishing a consultation booklet and flyer. These summarised the purpose of the consultation, provided information on how to access the consultation documents and explained how to submit comments and the deadline for submitting representations.

Included on the consultation poster and flyer was a QR code which, when scanned, took the user directly to the Local Plan Review consultation on the Council's consultation and engagement platform 'Citizen Space'. The QR code provided access to the consultation and supporting documents more quickly than by manually entering a URL, thereby helping to achieve a more convenient user friendly digital planning service. The public notice, consultation poster and flyer are included in **Appendix 1, 3 and 4.**

The three consultation bodies under the SEA Regulations – Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency – were sent a separate email inviting comments on the Draft Local Plan Review.

In addition, Duty to Co-operate authorities and other relevant bodies were sent an email inviting comments on the Interim Duty to Cooperate Statement.

Feedback was sought on the issues identified, and the questions and options presented in the consultation. Comments were also invited on the emerging evidence base. A representation form was made available for comments. The representation form is attached at Appendix 5. In addition, respondents were encouraged to submit comments online via the Council's digital consultation and engagement platform, Citizen Space, available at https://cherwell.citizenspace.com/planning-policy/cherwell-local-plan-review-2040-consultation-draft/ .

Hard copies of the consultation documents were also available on request.

Website and Online Consultation

The Council's dedicated Cherwell Draft Local Plan Review webpages[3] contained all the details relevant to the consultation, including the Draft Local Plan and appendices, supporting documents, evidence base and representation form. A designated email address (PlanningPolicyConsultation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk) was supplied for the submission of representations. The website also included a link to the Council's digital consultation and engagement platform Citizen Space (https://cherwell.citizenspace.com/planning-policy/cherwell-local-plan-review-2040-consultation-draft/) where interested parties could view the consultation documents and comment on the questions set out in the document online.

Press Coverage

A statutory notice was placed in the Oxford Mail and Banbury Guardian to advertise the commencement of the consultation (see Appendix 9).

Three press releases were published on the Council's website and issued to local media and interested stakeholders prior to, and during the consultation period. The press releases and media outlets covering each story are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Media releases and resulting coverage

Date of press release	Press release	Media outlets covering the story
5 September 2023	Consultation on Draft Local Plan to proceed later this month confirmed that a consultation on the draft Local Plan Review 2040 was approved by Councillors on 4 September and included a quote by Councillor Same which set out some of the high-level priorities of the Plan.	Banbury Guardian on 5 September 2023.
22 September 2023	Cherwell Local Plan consultation starts publicises the commencement of the consultation and provides information on the consultation dates and in-person consultation event.	Planning Resource on 21 September 2023. Banbury Guardian on 22 September 2023. Oxfordshire Independent on 12 October 2023.

[3] https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/local-plan-review-2040

		Banbury Guardian on 20 October 2023.
31 October 2023	Final few days to have say on the Draft Local Plan reminded people to take the opportunity to have their say on the consultation before the deadline. It provided a high-level commentary of the Plan by Councillor Sames, set out the next steps and explained how to submit comments online.	Oxford Mail on 2 November.

The press releases are included in **Appendix 10** and the resulting media coverage is included in **Appendix 11.**

Prior to the publication, Banbury FM published an article on 16 August 2023 notifying the local community that the Council's Executive Committee would discuss the local plan on 16 August.2023

Social Media

The Council's Facebook, X and Instagram platforms were used extensively prior to, and during the consultation. A post made on 5th September 2023 announced the forthcoming launch of the consultation and there was approximately one post a week during the consultation period which aimed to increase awareness of the consultation and how to participate. All the posts had a link to the Local Plan webpage and the digital consultation and engagement platform.

Table 2: Summary of social media reach

Date of post	Reach
Facebook	
5th September 2023	1,066 people reached. 1,124 post impressions. 28 post engagements.
22nd September 2023	3,014 people reached. 3,524 post impressions. 323 post engagements.
26th September 2023	3,014 people reached. 3,524 post impressions. 323 post engagements.
30th September 2023	3,014 people reached. 3,524 post impressions. 323 post engagements.
9th October 2023	3,014 people reached.

	3,524 post impressions. 323 post engagements.
11th October 2023	3,090 people reached. 3,337 post impressions. 53 post engagements.
13th October 2023	1,953 people reached. 2,010 post impressions. 81 post engagements.
15th October 2023	762 people reached. 803 post impressions. 3 post engagements.
16th October 2023	1,008 people reached. 1,133 post impressions. 20 post engagements.
17th October 2023	951 people reached. 1,004 post impressions. 31 post engagements.
20th October 2023	2,243 people reached. 2,434 post impressions. 53 post engagements.
21st October 2023	1,599 people reached. 1,947 post impressions. 49 post engagements.
27th October 2023	816 people reached. 929 post impressions. 18 post engagements.
1st November 2023	711 people reached. 795 post impressions. 12 post engagements.
Instagram	
22nd September 2023	52 people reached. 3 post engagements.
30th September 2023	54 people reached. 0 post engagements.
9th October 2023	52 people reached. 2 post engagements.
11th October 2023	27 people reached. 0 post engagements.
13th October 2023	22 people reached. 0 post engagements.
15th October 2023	32 people reached. 0 post engagements.
16th October 2023	46 people reached. 1 post engagement.
20th October 2023	43 people reached. 1 post engagement.
1st November 2023	31 people reached. 0 post engagements.
X	

22nd September 2023	5,425 post impressions. 99 post engagements. 1.8% engagement rate.
22nd September 2023	209 post impressions. 3 post engagements. 1.4% engagement rate
22nd September 2023	159 post impressions. 6 post engagements. 3.8% engagement rate.
26th September 2023	304 post impressions. 11 post engagements. 3.6% engagement rate.
26th September 2023	191 post impressions. 1 post engagement. 0.5% engagement rate.
1st October 2023	393 post impressions. 12 post engagements. 3.1% engagement rate.
9th October 2023	504 post impressions. 3 post engagements. 0.6% engagement rate.
9th October 2023	169 post impressions. 4 post engagements. 2.4% engagement rate.
11th October 2023	378 post impressions. 5 post engagements. 1.3% engagement rate.
11th October 2023	138 post impressions. 3 post engagements. 2.2% engagement rate.
11th October 2023	119 post impressions. 1 post engagement. 0.8% engagement rate.
13th October 2023	765 post impressions. 9 post engagements. 1.2% engagement rate.
16th October 2023	656 post impressions. 11 post engagements. 1.7% engagement rate.
16th October 2023	160 post impressions. 1 post engagement. 0.6% engagement rate.
16th October 2023	156 post impressions. 3 post engagements. 1.9% engagement rate.
17th October 2023	451 post impressions. 5 post engagements. 1.1% engagement rate.
17th October 2023	113 post impressions.

	6 post engagements. 5.3% engagement rate.
20th October 2023	413 post impressions. 6 post engagements. 1.5% engagement rate.
20th October 2023	124 post impressions. 1 post engagement. 0.8% engagement rate.
20th October 2023	195 post impressions. 3 post engagements. 1.5% engagement rate.
21st October 2023	379 post impressions. 6 post engagements. 1.6% engagement rate.
27th October 2023	1,573 post impressions. 31 post engagements. 2% engagement rate.
1st November 2023	624 post impressions. 17 post engagements. 2.7% engagement rate.

A record of the posts on social media is included in **Appendix 12.**

Internal Communications

On 22 September 2023 the Cherwell Local Plan Review was publicised in the CDC staff weekly internal update from the former Chief Executive Yvonne Rees – which is sent to all colleagues. A link was provided to the online Citizen Space consultation landing page. The weekly update email from Yvonne Rees is included in **Appendix 13.**

Direct email notifications were also sent to the Chief Executive, Directors and other council services (particularly those in the working groups) to advise of the forthcoming consultation launch.

Consultation Events

Drop-in Events

We held 4 consultation drop in events during the consultation period as follows:

Wednesday 4 October, 3pm – 8pm
Kidlington Football Club, Yarnton Road, Kidlington, OX5 1AT
Friday 13 October, 2pm – 7pm
The John Paul II Centre, The Causeway, Bicester, OX26 6AW
Tuesday 17 October, 2.30pm – 6.30pm
Woodstock Community Centre, 32 New Road, Woodstock, OX20 1PB
Saturday 21 October, 11am – 3pm
Lock 29, Castle Quay Waterfront, Castle Street, Banbury, OX16 5UN

The exhibition boards are reproduced at Appendix 6.

Engagement with Town and Parish Council/Meetings and Stakeholders

Town and Parish Councils were invited to two workshops held on 19th October and 25th October 2023, the former was held in-person at the Bodicote House, the latter online via Zoom. Both workshops took place between 18:00-20:30. The aims of the session were to introduce and provide further detail on the overall vision, objectives, spatial strategy and core policies of the draft Local Plan Review 2040. The workshop was interactive and included time for an open discussion to allow attendees to voice their views/provide feedback on the draft Local Plan Review 2040. The workshop format consisted of an introductory briefing followed by an interactive open discussion where attendees were divided into four tables.

Table 2 below provides a summary of parish attendees of the 19th October 2023 session and a summary of what was discussed during these sessions by table grouping.

Town and Parish Council attendees of the 19th October 2023 in-person session were:

- Adderbury Parish Council
- Bicester Town Council
- Bletchingdon Parish Council
- Bloxham Parish Council
- Bourton Parish Council
- Chesterton Parish Council
- Cropredy Parish Council
- Deddington Parish Council
- Fringford Parish Council
- Hornton Parish Council
- Launton Parish Council
- Milcombe Parish Council
- Sibford Ferris Parish Council
- Swalcliffe Parish Council
- Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council
- Woodstock Town Council

Table 2:Town and Parish Council Workshop Summary 19th March 2023

Town and Parish Council In-Person Workshop – 19th March 2023
Table 1
Attendees: • Councillor Ginny Hope – Fringford Parish Council • Councillor Susan Davis – Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council • Councillor Helen Oldfield – Deddington Parish Council • Councillor Simon Turner – Launton Parish Council • Councillor Diane Bratt – Adderbury Parish Council
Comments/issues raised: **Adderbury Parish Council**

- Does CDC have any policies on how they can regenerate the town centres? How they will encourage business into the town centre. Car parks should be free or first hour free. Push that the centre is vibrant.
- Referenced a site with 18 houses and the applicant has persuaded CDC that the site is not viable and they are not providing any affordable housing.
- Referenced payment to landowners is a one-off payment and hence it needs to provide enough money for them to sell.
- How will the 500 be divided up and allocated?
- Should we do a housing needs survey? Would CDC use it? villages want affordable or cheaper housing for local people for the locality. Currently too difficult for local people to qualify.
- Had funding for a community hall but there is still a funding gap. Need more support from CDC to secure the community hall. Parish Council talking to Sport England. Need CDC to have joined up thinking re enabling delivery of projects.

Deddington Parish Council

- Not much information given for the villages in the Local Plan. Queried the strategy for Banbury – why was the M40 junction shopping development permitted.
- Affordable housing – the old system was 30% in towns, 35% in rural areas, now 30% across the district but village houses cost more. What is the rationale for village housing? Page 84 question – if we had more social rented housing what you would be prepared to sacrifice. What sacrifice? Bat nests – ok. Don't understand the question because don't know the list of compromises. Clarified if sustainable building costs more for developers – yes. Should do water re-use. The 30%/35% won't make any difference to climate change. Would be good if CDC built affordable homes. Referenced landowners around the village claiming viability issues, if they sold some land, they would still have a lot left.
- 500 houses across the villages gives 45 per village, is less than anticipated but real. Deddington is becoming a dormitory, need to secure the housing for local needs. A bigger village comes with traffic congestion etc. The village has a bus, but pubs are for sale. CDC could do shared ownership and affordable housing. Should look at the type of homes (mix and size) that is needed locally.
- Properties more expensive in rural areas, should be able to increase the % of affordable housing requirement within the rural areas.
- Need to do more to challenge viability.

Fringford Parish Council

- The Government needs to have ideas on how to stop out of town shopping developments (reference to conversation re M40 junction Gateway development.
- Villages need to be sustainable to take development. It needs to go further than a transport plan, eg tightened up criteria to be sustainable. Fringford has not got the infrastructure to support development and is not sustainable.
- Reference to 500 houses – need the right houses in the right areas. Cannot do an equal split across the rural areas. Sustainable build in areas that can accommodate it.

Launton Parish Council

- Retailers want larger stores, so they go out of town. Ended up with pop-ups when retail in large units failed.
- How can the CLP help with landowners selling their land (ref to land ownership comment above).

- Launton village only just keeping its bus service. Butchers has closed, second pub has closed, but it is still shown as a larger village. Plans predicated on shifting sands. More shopping online therefore shops are becoming dodos.
- Regulation 18 is the only opportunity to change the plan. When can we comment on rural villages. Need further consultation on rural areas outside of the LP consultation. Can the LP be given teeth to provide infrastructure that developers promise but don't provide. Referred to a community hall that wasn't provided.
- Also supports more affordable housing.
- Need more engagement with Parish for the Local Plan to progress the rural strategy- not enough in the LP at the moment.

Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council

- Key problem in Bicester – building 7,000 houses with small market centre retail shopping. People who use Bicester Village are not the same people who use Bicester town.
- Make Banbury a nice place, attractive, more green space.
- WotG has had development bolted onto the village, but it isn't anything like the village. Should be driven by plot size, character. Character of the countryside comes from the village, therefore new development should be distinctive to the village. Design code, road pattern etc. Villages would support development if acceptable design to the village and built to improve the local character of the area could be secured for certain. Policies need to be tighter. Hard to get data as surveyed people won't say they want affordable housing in the village.
- The way people live in the villages is changing.

Summary of key issues

- Affordable housing – why 35% in rural areas? What are the trade-offs? Discussion on viability.
- Stopping town centres going out of town. How to bring branded shops into the town centre.
- Rural development – neighbourhood plans to have a design code for the village (pro sustainable development).

Table 2

Attendees:

Councillor Diane Bohm – Weston-On-The-Green Parish Council
Councillor Jenny Hodges – Chesterton Parish Council
Councillor Dave Bunn – Bloxham Parish Council
Councillor Ed Sanders – Launton Parish Council
Councillor Christopher Pruden – Bicester Town Council
Councillor Steve Woodcock – Hornton Parish Council

Comments/issues raised:

Bloxham Parish Council

- Bloxham (Cat A) – the parish doesn't have capacity for additional development as there is a lack of supporting infrastructure. There should be further work undertaken to establish how 'sustainable' the larger villages are. The settlement hierarchy criteria should be looked into further as some facilities are outdated e.g. are village shops still relevant? Many people now do online shopping and use courier drop off points.

Chesterton Parish Council

- Chesterton – how can the parish supply a third of Cherwell's housing need? Chesterton does offer some potential for development as it's in a strategic location.
- Air pollution is getting worse in the district – there are more cars on the roads.

Bicester Town Council

- Ambrosden is a small village that lacks some supporting infrastructure. There's a pub there but it has limited opening hours. There's also a small village hall that is in need of refurbishment.
- Some scope for development in the Bicester opportunity sites.
- Bicester depot would be a good site for redevelopment, particularly 2-3 bed apartments.
- Town centres within the district are in need of urban renewal.

Hornton Parish Council

- Concern over rural pubs closing. The Asset of Community Value (ACV) process is complex, and it has proven difficult to get assets formally designated.
- Concern that climate change mitigation are not being fully translated into the Local Plan. Concern that officers do not adequately enforce sustainability policies.
- Delegated decisions – officers don't know have a full understanding of the local area.
- Parish Councils (PC) often lack the time and resource to prepare Neighbourhood Plans.

Launton Parish Council

- Queried how often CDC challenge statutory consultees, as often utility companies confirm they have sufficient capacity for the additional proposed growth, when in reality that isn't the case.

Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council

- CDC has been overly cooperative in providing Oxford's unmet housing need.

Wider group discussion on:

- There needs to be a balancing act with developers to ensure that Parish Councillors get adequate infrastructure and affordable housing provision. Often developers negotiate down the level of affordable housing.
- Housing size – the district has an ageing population and the elderly may need to downsize – this needs to be considered in the Local Plan. The housing mix needs to be differentiated for urban and rural areas as different communities have varying needs.
- Villages that are less accessible should take their fair share of housing and should contribute to overall housing supply.
- Rural primary schools could benefit from small population increases.
- The Oxford Stadium proposal would increase footfall and would result in local road closures.
- Parish Councils are keen to input on the strategic gaps work to provide clarity on which landscapes are valued at local level.

Summary of key issues:

- Concern that villages do not have adequate supporting infrastructure to support the proposed growth of the emerging Local Plan Review 2040.
- The categorisation of settlements may not reflect the true 'sustainability' of those places.

- Sustainability, climate change and improving air quality should all be key priorities moving forward.

Table 3

Attendees:

Councillor Jim Webb - Bicester Town Council
Councillor Damien Maguire - Bicester Town Council
Councillor David Morris - Bloxham Parish Council
Councillor Duncan Hedger - Bletchingdon Parish Council
Councillor Myra Peters - Milcombe Parish Council
Councillor Andrew Meyler - Sibford Ferris Parish Council

Comments/issues raised:

Milcombe Parish Council

- Issue with the categorization of Milcombe within "Category A" in the current Local Plan, as they are a settlement of 100 houses with minimal facilities. They were formerly classed as a "small village" and were upgraded to a "larger village" and would welcome a reassessment that places them back in the "small village" category.
- There have recently been two relatively substantial planning applications in Milcombe and there is a concern that there might be more.
- The number of homes that could potentially be built is not sustainable. The local infrastructure (doctors, schools etc) is becoming strained, and people are having to go further afield to gain access to services.
- A concern was raised about the possibility of Milcombe and Bloxham coalescing.
- The village sees a lot of traffic coming through from Hook Norton.
- Questioned how long it will take for the new local plan to go through.
- Concerned about the risks that might arise from a potential change in government.
- Social housing has been delivering some tiny houses, but the rents / valuations and Council Tax are very high – how is this affordable? The houses are comparatively the same size as one built in the 70s, but the 70s house has a lower Council Tax valuation. How is this true? Some of the social rents are excessive. Is there collusion between developers and housing associations?
- If developer profit margins were lower, it might help dwellings to be more affordable.

Sibford Ferris Parish Council

- Supported all the points raised by Milcombe Parish Council.
- The Parish Council feel the local road infrastructure is an issue, as they have narrow streets which has led to accidents. There is concern that future development will make these issues worse.
- The Parish Council are happy with the proposals in the local plan but are concerned about what might happen in the meantime.
- Pointed out that small villages like Milcombe and the Sibfords have limited infrastructure and transport links.
- Concerned that developers will renegotiate their social housing contribution after permission is granted.
-

Bletchingdon Parish Council

- The Parish Council has a neighbourhood plan in development.
- The Parish has seen roughly 100 new homes built in recent years, which is a 25-30% expansion of the settlement.
- The area is made up of a historic core and two hamlets. The hamlets have no buses, and the historic core has very limited access to a bus service.
- The new development has brought some improved infrastructure including a shop, a new school and a community hall.
- There is a concern about maintaining the character of the local area.
- There is further concern around maintaining the sense of community, while accommodating new development and integrating it into the existing settlement / community.
- The village is partly located in the Green Belt, with the Green Belt running through the middle of the village. There is concern that developers are interested in the Green Belt because of a lack of other available developable land.
- Traffic is an issue, the main road through the village connects the A34 to Banbury and when the main road networks are closed / congested the roads are used as a rat run.
- The Parish Council wants to conserve habitats, ancient woodlands, listed buildings, and other elements of local character.
- The Parish Council are not against development, but they are unsure how to accommodate it and keep the local character.
- Questions what the appropriate trade-off between the gain from new housing and the loss / damage to the environment, particularly with regard to The Moors site as it falls within a floodplain.
- Content with the overall strategy and direction of the Local Plan Review 2040.

Bloxham Parish Council

- The local area has had some new developments come forward.
- On paper, the village has a high level of facilities, but, in practice, elements such as the shop are inferior quality compared to those of other local villages and other infrastructure is strained.
- The Parish Council accept that more housing is needed but know that a consequence of this might be that the centre of the village might move; alternatively, a local bypass road will be needed.

Bicester Town Council (West ward):

- The local area was promised a new relief road, but the funding for it has been allocated elsewhere by the local highway authority.
- The infrastructure that is coming forward is not sufficient.
- The local roads are chaotic.
- It is extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment.
- There is a shortage of sports grounds, there is good provision for younger children. A Bicester Sporting Arena that could facilitate future Town Athletics, Rugby, Hockey and Football teams
- Generally, there is a need for improved infrastructure and services.
- The gridlocked roads are not good for businesses or residents.
- Questions whether CDC has the expertise for retrofitting, fitting solar panels, etc.

Bicester Town (South ward):

- The local cemetery capacity is “overloaded”
- Graven Hill is not selling / not as popular as expected.
- Generally, are houses selling more slowly than expected?
- How are things modelled?

- Questions about how affordable housing is defined. Developers take 25% profit; in Germany the profit margin is closer to 5%.
- Energy use is a factor, devices are more energy efficient, but we have more devices overall which means our energy use has not decreased. We need to develop a culture of reducing our overall energy use – fewer devices. What is available for retrofitting our existing dwellings to make them more energy efficient? Are developers able to build more sustainable properties to help keep running costs down?

Summary of key issues:

- Over development in small villages.
- Impact on character of villages / character is changing due to over development.
- Traffic – no thought given to how traffic moves through villages i.e. sat nav routes
- Lack of affordable housing.
- Overall need for additional doctors, dentists, schools, recreation grounds, better highways, cemeteries, etc.
- Questions whether the housing requirement is too high.
- Questions whether energy efficient buildings and solar farms / wind farms are being addressed in the draft Local Plan Review 2040?
- Agricultural land being sold for housing when we need to be increased food security/resilience.

Table 4

Attendees:

- Councillor Tania Johnson – Cropredy Parish Council
- Councillor Stephen Bowen – Bourton Parish Council
- Councillor Nigel Davis – Milcombe Parish Council
- Councillor Stephen Warrington – Swalcliffe Parish Council
- Councillor Chris Lane - Bletchingdon Parish Council
- Councillor Katherine Roussel - Sibford Ferris Parish Council
- Councillor Paul Burden – Hornton Parish Council
- Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt – Woodstock Parish Council and West Oxfordshire District Council

Comments/issues raised:

Hornton Parish Council

- Sewage over capacity, no interface between utilities and infrastructure – whole system is uncoordinated.
- The Parish's priorities are: protect the village, support the vibrant village community, village is constrained as it is on the top of a hill, potholes, no bus service, protect the local pub, facilities to replace village pub.

Milcombe Parish Council

- Community driven development, considering the Neighbourhood Plan, including rewilding and a community wind farm.

Bournton Parish Council

- Parish priorities are to tackle the loss of bus services, coalescence/merging of settlement, strategic flood risk, density of housing – particularly in village centres.

Swalcliffe Parish Council

- Parish priorities are to sustain and enhance character of village, support vibrant local community, facilitate limited expansion of village (infilling), securing OCC support for road infrastructure, Woodstock solar PVC on roofs not fields, Local Plan Review 2040 site is not adjacent to Woodstock, Woodstock GP services are inadequate.

Cropredy Parish Council

- Parish priorities are to tackle the over-reliance of the car, parking is difficult, flooding – there needs to be a better flood alleviation scheme on Daventry Road, heritage fields – Cropredy battlefield work, community protection of landscape, good GP surgery.

Bletchingdon Parish Council

- The Parish priority is to preserve the village.

Sibford Ferris Parish Council

- Parish priorities are as follows: climate change, sustainable economy, sustainable communities, boarding school narrow lane. Other priorities include accurate Category A settlement classifications, 5 year housing supply, protect smaller villages and support development in sustainable locations.

Summary of key issues:

- Protecting and enhancing the rural character of villages/parishes.
- Ensuring supporting infrastructure can accommodate growth.
- Addressing climate change.

In October 2023, Town and Parish Councils and stakeholders were invited to a webinar on the draft Local Plan Review 2040. The webinars were conducted remotely through Microsoft Teams and took the form of a short introduction and presentation by the Planning Policy team and those attending were given the opportunity to discuss the content of the draft Local Plan Review 2040. Attendees were divided into three breakout rooms. The attendees and key areas of discussion are summarised by breakout room below.

Attendees present included:

- Adderbury Parish Council

- Bodicote Parish Council
- Chesterton Parish Council
- Duns Tew Parish Council
- Kirtlington Parsh Council

Table 3: Town and Parish Council Workshop Summary 25th March 2023

Town and Parish Council Virtual Workshop – 25th March 2023
Breakout Room 1
Attendees: **Present:** Councillor Caroline Elmitt – Bodicote Parish Council Councillor Philippa Tickle – Duns Tew Parish Council **Absent:** Councillor Diane Bratt -Adderbury Parish Council Bob Duxbury - Banbury Town Council David Beck (Clerk) - Horley Parish Council Chris Hall - Shutford Parish Council Councillor Johnathan Chavda - Chesterton Parish Council
Comments/issues raised: **Bodicote Parish Council** • Development of Banbury Town Centre is a good idea, it needs investment. Every available property should be filled before we build new housing. Higher densities in Banbury should be sought. • There isn't any housing allocated within the existing town centre. • Noted that Canalside must have availability issues but is an obvious regeneration site, with potential for cycling and walking improvements. • CDC pledge in the rural strategy that rural areas will be protected. Bodicote Parish Council disagrees that this is the case and we have no more land for development. Bodicote Parish Council do not want to encroach into the surrounding open fields. Questions what is happening with Bodicote House. • The existing Saltway development has no supporting infrastructure, it's put pressure on our existing facilities, particularly GP practices. • Bodicote Parish Council want our heritage protected. No new development is forced to have solar panels or ground source heat panels. What's being done to implement sustainable measures? These should be conditions put to developers. • Green corridor focus is admirable, but what about tree planting? • Questions how much power does CDC have to manage development / make sure development is completed to a good standard? We have a play area that isn't finished and is messy. **Duns Tew Parish Council** • The key priorities in Duns Tew are: o Maintaining sense of rurality o Finding land for amenities – particularly for an orchard, allotment and spaces for young people o Transport links – we had a recent issue with maintaining the school bus service.

- CDC should look at ways to resist out-of-town developments.
- It is understandable why out-of-town centre places exist as they are often cheaper and easier to access (less congestion etc.).
- A GP practice was expected at the Heyford Park but have not materialised.
- No one has responsibility for the capacity of GP practices/future needs – someone needs to be responsible for this as it's an ongoing issue that will get worse as we move forward with the Plan. Rural communities lose out as they have to access those and they're typically delivered in urban areas.
- Questions how net zero standards are enforced.
- A key priority is to protect our rurality. Putting development in sensible places, without precluding rural parishes from further development.

Table 2

Attendees:

Present:
Mark Gerold – Adderbury Parish Council
Councillor Jonathan Chavda – Chesterton Parish Council
Christine Marsh – Kirtlington Parish Council

Comments/issues raised:

Adderbury Parish Council

- Recognises they are on the list of the 11 large villages, but that each of the 11 villages have their own individual characteristics.
- The Parish Council would like to avoid coalescence / "urban creep", and particularly they want to avoid being subsumed into Banbury (Chesterton seconded this point in respect of their own relationship with Bicester).
- Untamed urban expansion / coalescence will lead to an unacceptable loss of character.
- The Parish Council are not against any new development, but they only want to accept its fair share.
- The Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan and are unsure if they should allocate sites. The Parish Council can only do it if the numbers are reasonable (a higher number is seen as a political "hot potato")
- Concern that by reducing the larger villages / category A settlements from 23 down to 11, there is a disproportionate burden on the 11 larger villages to accommodate more development.
- Development should be managed and directed to the right places.

Chesterton Parish Council

- Acknowledges that infrastructure is a major issue, and that its delivery is the responsibility of other parties, but that CDC has a part to play in keeping a dialogue going.
- The Local Plan seems to be inconsistent, questions how can the plan have small villages but also have an allocation of 500 new homes adjacent to the village (the LPR37a site).
- The LPR37a allocation of 500 homes would more than double the size of Chesterton.
- Air pollution from the M40 is an issue in some areas of the district.
- Chesterton has a lack of facilities – questions do the strategy work. Chesterton residents are within 30 minutes of Bicester but are not a main urban area. Questions why Chesterton is treated as a suitable development area?
- Chesterton do not want to be subsumed into Bicester.

Kirtlington Parish Council

- Infrastructure is the number one issue. Recognises that the parish has little control over things like highways, water or energy as these are in the hands of infrastructure providers. Questions whether there is anything the Parish can do to exert pressure to achieve improvements, for example by introducing triggers that require infrastructure improvements to be delivered before further tranches of housing are permitted.
- Whenever there is an accident / congestion around M40 junction 9, traffic reroutes through the village including articulated lorries etc.
- Limited infrastructure capacity limits Kirtlington's ability to expand / growth. This is a major issue for Cherwell district as a whole.
- The Parishes have very limited buses (called a "skeleton" bus service).
- Unsure about the amount of homes that are to be allocated. 46 dwellings or more is simply too much for the area to accommodate.
- Questions whether a neighbourhood plan would be trumped by the local plan and whether a neighbourhood plan would protect the parish from speculative development.

Table 3

Attendees:

Stephen Webster – Chesterton PC
David McCullagh – Fringford PC
Dawn Seaward – Ambrosden PC
Jane Olds – Launton, Fringford and Caversfield PCs

Comments/issues raised:

Chesterton Parish Council

- Not committee view but mixed development maybe appropriate.
- Potentially allocate for high end employment
- Preserve a buffer between Chesterton and any allocation.
- Residential not appropriate.
- All villages have the same problems.
- Schools, public transport, roads and congestion, sustainability.
- Not confident in OCC.
- J9 problems. A4095 is a rat run to avoid J9.
- Infrastructure and settlement gaps important to improve and maintain.
- Affordable housing provision important.
- Support policies on climate change and sustainable construction.

Ambrosden Parish Council

- Ambrosden is a rat run too.
- Priority is to improve infrastructure before development starts.
- Roads constantly clog up.
- Cycling routes to Bicester are poor.
- Should build on brownfield land first to protect wildlife.
- SE Bicester extension has issues and constraints including flooding.
- Windmill on Blackthorn Hill
- Local Wildlife site.

- Transport and traffic implications need to be understood. A41 is congested.
- Prefer to spread development around rural areas.

Launton, Fringford & Caversfield Parish Council

- Infrastructure and water is an issue
- Need to protect green infrastructure and have buffer zones.
- Fringford supports recategorization from Cat A.

5. Consultation Responses

Who Responded to the Consultation?

Consultation materials were made available for comment to a wide range of organisations and individuals and representations were received from the following:

- Adjoining local authorities and other local authorities;
- Other organisations and companies (e.g. agents and developers);
- Town and Parish Councils / Meetings;
- Local councillors;
- Residents' associations, community groups and other organisations;
- Statutory bodies, utility companies, NHS, emergency services; and
- Residents and other individuals.

Number of Comments Received

A total of 932 representations were received from residents, individuals and organisations. The comments received in relation to each question, including questions on the Draft Local Plan Review, the implementation of the Plan, Plan appendices and supporting documents are set out in **Table *44***.

Table 44: Number of Comments Received

Question No.	Question	Number of Comments Received
Introduction		
Q1	Do you have a view on the Plan period?	104
Q2	How could we improve presentation of the Plan?	83
Q3	Do you have any comments on our draft proposals for retaining/saving existing policies?	71
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Introduction Chapter?	20
Vision and Objectives		
Q4	Do you have any comments on the draft Vision?	126

Question No.	Question	Number of Comments Received
Q5	Do you have any observations on our objectives?	109
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Plan Vision and Objectives Chapter?	49
Spatial Strategy		
Q6	Do you have any comments on our strategy?	158
District-Wide Policies		
Q7	Should we seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain if this means sacrificing other requirements?	160
Q8	Should we identify further land for employment?	110
Q9	We would welcome information from local businesses and landowners that would like to expand or potentially relocate. It will help inform an Employment Land Review and the further consideration of employment land needs.	25
Q10	Do you have any comments on our approach of focusing employment development on strategic sites at Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington?	100
Q11	What are your views on our proposed approach towards development at existing and allocated employment sites?	58
Q12	What are your views on our proposed approach towards new employment development on unallocated sites?	69
Q13	What are your views on allowing ancillary uses on employment sites?	47
Q14	What are your views on our proposed approach to rural diversification?	57
Q15	What are your views on our proposed approach to tourism development?	57
Q16	What are your views on our proposed approach to retail development and town centres?	68
Q17	Do you agree with the town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries shown on the plans?	41
Q18	Do you agree that only within the primary shopping frontage area E use classes should be protected?	43
Q19	Do you have comments on the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment?	160
Q20	Do you have comments on our emerging housing distribution?	132
Q21	Are there any Parish Councils seeking a specific housing requirement for Neighbourhood Plans?	21
Q22	What are your views on our settlement hierarchy proposals?	108

Question No.	Question	Number of Comments Received
Q23	What are your views on our suggested policy for affordable housing?	116
Q24	Would you support maximising the delivery of affordable housing, and in particular the delivery of more social rented housing, if sacrifices were made in respect of other requirements?	104
Q25	Do you agree with our approach for assessing the suitability of sites for travelling communities?	42
Q26	Would you like to propose any sites for consideration as Local Green Spaces?	137
-	Do you have any additional comments on Our Strategy for Development in Cherwell Chapter?	59
Banbury Area Strategy		
Q27	What are your views on our aspirations for the Banbury area?	64
Q28	Do you think these sites in the Banbury area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?	50
Q29	Are there any alternative housing sites for Banbury you wish to suggest?	32
Q30	Are there other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Banbury?	16
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Banbury Area Strategy chapter?	35
Bicester Area Strategy		
Q31	What are your views on our aspirations for the Bicester area?	87
Q32	Do you think these sites in the Bicester area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?	93
Q33	Are there any alternative housing sites for Bicester you wish to suggest?	32
Q34	Do you agree with the employment sites we have selected at Bicester to accommodate new employment development?	43
Q35	Are there any alternative sites to accommodate housing and employment needs that you think are more suitable?	26
Q36	Are there any other transport schemes that you think should be delivered at Bicester?	45
Q37	Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Bicester?	22
Q38	Is there other green and blue infrastructure you think should be delivered at Bicester?	33

Question No.	Question	Number of Comments Received
Q39	No question – Duplication in draft Local Plan	15
Q40	Are there any other measures we should be taking to improve Bicester town centre?	38
Q41	What are your views on our proposed approach to development proposals at Former RAF Bicester?	35
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Bicester Area Strategy chapter?	50
Kidlington Area Strategy		
Q42	What are your views on our aspirations for the Kidlington area?	89
Q43	Do you think these sites in the Kidlington area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?	216
Q44	Are there any alternative housing sites for the Kidlington area you wish to suggest?	48
Q45	Do you agree with the employment sites we have selected at Kidlington to accommodate new employment development?	34
Q46	Are there any alternative sites to accommodate housing and employment needs that you think are more suitable?	25
Q47	Should this Plan adjust Green Belt boundaries in the Langford Lane area in response to recently developed land?	51
Q48	Should land for employment use be identified at London Oxford Airport?	37
Q49	Do you have any comments on the transport schemes proposed for the Kidlington area?	44
Q50	Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes in the Kidlington area?	20
Q51	Do you have any comments on the green and blue infrastructure proposed for the Kidlington area?	26
Q52	Do you have any views on the proposed changes to the village centre?	18
Q53	Do you have any views on the areas of change identified?	15
Q54	Are there any other opportunity areas or sites that we should be including?	20
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Kidlington Area Strategy chapter?	42
Heyford Park Area Strategy		
Q55	Do you have any views on our aspirations for Heyford Park?	41

Question No.	Question	Number of Comments Received
Q56	Do you agree with the local service role for Heyford Park proposed in Core Policy 3?	26
Q57	Do you think we should be considering employment uses alongside the potential allocation for more homes in the longer term at Heyford Park?	31
Q58	Do you have any comments on the potential allocation at Heyford Park?	32
Q59	Do you have any views on the principle of phased development at Heyford Park subject to implementation of the approved masterplan and the delivery of transport infrastructure?	17
Q60	Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes in the Heyford area?	19
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Heyford Park Area Strategy chapter?	14
Rural Areas Strategy		
Q61	Do you have any views on our aspirations for our Rural Areas?	106
Q62	Do you support our preliminary proposals for housing in our rural areas?	88
Q63	Are there any potential rural housing sites you wish to suggest?	66
Q64	Do you know of any potential new rural employment sites?	18
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Rural Areas Area Strategy chapter?	39
Implementing the Plan		
Q65	Do you have any comments on these measures?	30
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Implementing the Plan chapter?	18
Appendices		
-	Do you have any comments on the appendices?	21
Supporting Documents		
-	Do you have any comments on the supporting technical evidence?	18
Additional Comments		
-	Do you have any additional comments on the Draft Local Plan Review?	78

How Representations Were Submitted

The majority of representations were submitted by email while some were received by post and 115 were submitted – either fully or in part – through the Council's online

consultation and engagement platform Citizen Space. Some representations were submitted in duplicate by methods including email and post or email and Citizen Space. 131 representations were invalid due to the omission of either an email address, full name, or comment. Of these, 129 invalid representations had no email address associated with them and the remaining two failed to include any comments.

Table 5 below provides a detailed summary of the responses received for each consultation question by respondent type. Full copies of each representation can be viewed online at XX.

Table 5: Regulation 18 Local Plan Review consultation responses by question

Question 1: Do you have a view on the Plan period?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 15 people - the plan period was correct • Approximately 4 people - the plan period was too long • Approximately 3 people - if the plan is adopted later, the plan period should be extended • Approximately 3 people - need for flexibility within the plan period • Other comments - the plan exceeds government housing requirements, objection to The Moors, that the plan should be adopted by the end of 2024 and that the plan should be separated into discrete time periods • Approximately 10 people - the consultation period was too short or not communicated effectively	Comments are noted. The length of the plan period follows national guidance regarding planning for the long-term future of an area. The plan period will be extended to 2042 to reflect at least 15 years from the anticipated point of adoption. The plan will be reviewed at least every five years to take account of changing circumstances, changes in policy etc.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Bloxham and Cropredy Parish Councils - the plan period is reasonable • Bourtons Parish Council - the plan should be extended to 2042 or 2045 but any plan which covers more than 10 years will be based on an element of supposition • Drayton Parish Council - happy with the plan period and hopes there is not a need to extend the plan period • Horley Parish Council - no comment to make, if the plan meets the vision • Somerton Parish Council - the plan does not acknowledge how society is likely to change in the plan period, and how it can respond to changes that might need to be made • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the period is reasonable, but being in the timeframe before adoption does not make sense • Banbury Town Council - support the plan period but there is likely to be confusion to the public by the 2050 vision being considered almost simultaneously	Comments are noted. The length of the plan period follows national guidance regarding planning for the long-term future of an area. The plan period will be extended to 2042 to reflect at least 15 years from the anticipated point of adoption. The plan will be reviewed at least every five years to take account of changing circumstances, changes in policy etc.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	

• Approximately 35 representations - the plan period should be extended to 2041, 2043, 2045 or 2050 • If the plan period is extended, the housing requirement should be increased to reflect this • Approximately 3 representations - the proposed timetable is lengthy and should be condensed to ensure the plan is adopted as soon as possible • The start date should not be 2020, and rather be pushed back	Comments are noted. The length of the plan period follows national guidance regarding planning for the long-term future of an area. The plan period will be extended to 2042 to reflect at least 15 years from the anticipated point of adoption. The plan will be reviewed at least every five years to take account of changing circumstances, changes in policy etc.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Home Builders Federation - the plan period should be extended to 2041	Comments are noted. The length of the plan period follows national guidance regarding planning for the long-term future of an area. The plan period will be extended to 2042 to reflect at least 15 years from the anticipated point of adoption. The plan will be reviewed at least every five years to take account of changing circumstances, changes in policy etc.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxford City Council - support the 2040 plan period	Comments are noted. The length of the plan period follows national guidance regarding planning for the long-term future of an area. The plan period will be extended to 2042 to reflect at least 15 years from the anticipated point of adoption. The plan will be reviewed at least every five years to take account of changing circumstances, changes in policy etc.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Keep Hanwell Village Rural and Bure Park FC - support the plan period	Comments are noted.

• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the council need to be more flexible to meet new circumstances • Banbury Civic Society - the start date should be the date of formal adoption and objects to the plan period being extended • Banbury Chamber of Commerce – question why the plan period is to 2040 when other consultations e.g. Banbury 2050 have a longer timeframe. Suggests that these are combined	The length of the plan period follows national guidance regarding planning for the long-term future of an area. The plan period will be extended to 2042 to reflect at least 15 years from the anticipated point of adoption. The plan will be reviewed at least every five years to take account of changing circumstances, changes in policy etc.

Question 2: How could we improve the presentation of the Plan?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 9 people - the presentation is clear • Approximately 5 people - the plan is difficult to navigate through • Approximately 9 people - need to engage the public and that the consultation period should have been longer • Other comments suggested a summary booklet for each area, clearer maps, more visuals and statistics, there should be a large print version, and all households should receive a hard copy. Additionally, the plan should be made available on social media platforms	Comments are noted. We appreciate that the plan contains a level of technical language, and a glossary is provided. The document is quite lengthy, and we have sought to use illustrations to help break up the text. The plan can be accessed electronically in an accessible format. The cost of providing a copy to every household is not practicable.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - would be useful to have a summary table of all policies, cross referenced to themes • Bourtons Parish Council – the plan could be made fully interactive • Somerton Parish Council - the plan is long and text rich and questions how accessible this is to those who cannot read, write or that English is not their first language. Suggests including pictures and summary bullet points • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - improvements to navigating the plan would be welcome • Caversfield Parish Council and Banbury Town Council - the presentation is clear • Cropredy Parish Council - the document could be complemented with an online video presentation • Somerton Parish Council – the plan is long and text heavy and suggests utilising pictures and summaries • Launton Parish Council - there are some typos and maps are of poor quality • Hanwell Parish Council - the contents are more important than the presentation	Comments are noted. The Plan should be read as a whole, though the structure is set out in the introductory chapter. We appreciate that the plan contains a level of technical language, and a glossary is provided. The document is quite lengthy, and we have sought to use illustrations to help break up the text. The plan can be accessed electronically in an accessible format. We will endeavour to provide access to the plan to any person or groups who are unable to digest in its current format.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - some interested parties could receive bespoke invitations to comment	Agree – we maintain a database of all interested persons and they receive notifications on the plan progress and

	information regarding the consultation stages. Being added to the database is available to all on request.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 3 representations - the plan is simple and well presented • Approximately 2 representations – it could be more concise and focussed • Approximately 4 representations - there could be a better use of digital tools • Approximately 4 representations - there could be a section listing the proposed policies in the plan • Approximately 5 representations - it would be useful if the maps used were the same as in the 2015 plan and 2020 partial review	Comments are noted. We recognise the length of the plan and have sought to strike the balance between being concise and providing sufficient explanation and justification. There will be an update to the interactive proposals map.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England and The Canal & River Trust - the plan is clear and easy to follow • Historic England suggested a clarification between development policies and core policies • Thames Valley Police suggested a rewording to theme three point 1 to 'achieving well designed, safe and healthy places'	Comments noted
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd – needs to address questions people have • Keep Hanwell Village Rural noted that comments made should be evaluated and key points included • Bure Park FC - there needs to be a greater focus on sports and recreational facilities • Banbury Civic Society - the structure and presentation is good	Comments noted. All representations are considered, and, where appropriate, changes made to the emerging Local Plan.

Question 3: Do you have any comments on our draft proposals for retaining/saving existing policies?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 6 individuals supported incorporating existing policies into the plan • Approximately 1 individual objected to incorporating existing policies into the plan • Approximately 2 individuals - plans should be more open and not pre-determined • Approximately 2 individuals - saved policies should be restated clearly and better protected by robust plans and wording • Other comments - concern over existing plans to build on the Green Belt and green spaces, concern over why existing plans is cut short, the existing policies predate current understanding of climate change, concern over the housing numbers and proposed areas for development in Kidlington, brownfield development should be prioritised, and green buffers should be retained	Comments noted.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Bourtons Parish Council - concern about the lack of infrastructure to support housing developments • Somerton Parish Council - the proposal is to replace most of the plan, and there is no rationale for this other than to address challenges associated with climate change and biodiversity. Also, up-to-date evidence-based policies will be needed to support the plan and that the policy on employment land and unallocated sites does not consider the needs of the countryside. States a dark skies policy is required and one to maintain/protect hedgerows to achieve a 40% increase by 2050 • Banbury Town Council - appendix 1 is clear regarding what is to be saved and requests explanation behind the intention to retain policy Banbury 10 • Hanwell Parish Council - most policies have been amalgamated or replaced which may weaken the councils' position when rebutting speculative planning applications • Ambrosden Parish Council - proposals should be retained where they are still relevant • Fritwell Parish Council - the presentation is good but was too much in terms of content to address within 6 weeks, and printed documents should not be distributed as widely due to the environmental cost	Comments noted. The review of the plan has sought to consider what is still relevant and where changes are required. Proposed criteria-based employment policy provides flexibility for rural areas to support growth. The Bretch Hill Area continues to be a focus for regeneration; therefore, it is appropriate to retain this policy.
What the Ward Councillors said:	

• Councillor Steve Kilsby - continuity is important and so supports the retention of earlier, relevant policies	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 11 representations - it would be preferable to incorporate all required policies into the new plan rather than having policies spread across several older documents to ease clarity • Approximately 3 representations queried if existing allocations are still suitable and developable, and should be reviewed • Approximately 4 representations - policies are overly detailed and too prescriptive • Approximately 2 representations supported retaining policy PR6a • Approximately 2 representations supported retaining policy PR6b • Other comments - support for retaining Banbury 4, support for retaining SE Bicester, policy villages 5 is too long and some criteria conflicts between policies, there is not enough provision made for SME developers which will have a negative impact on housing delivery, sites for development should be identified in the villages, and queries regarding if BSC1 and CP50 will be replaced or retained	We recognise comments regarding clarity, but these policies have already been assessed and examined. To reintroduce them could cause unnecessary delay and additional cost. Where site allocations have yet to be delivered, their prospect of future development has been considered. Comment regarding length of Policy Villages 5 is noted, but it needs to provide sufficient clarity for the user.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Defence Infrastructure Organisation - if they're brought forward there may be implications for MOD sites and matters of national security should be considered by recognising that MOD establishments are of strategic military importance	Comments noted. This can be dealt with on a case-by-case basis recognising their military importance.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxford City Council welcomed the commitment to helping to deliver Oxford's unmet need, and welcomed retaining allocations from the partial review	Comments noted. If there is a proven unmet identified need, Cherwell will work with Oxford City and the other Oxfordshire districts to see how this could be accommodated.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - 1996 plans are irrelevant now and require updating • Banbury Civic Society - Banbury 6 and Banbury 15 are not fit for purpose • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum - in support of retaining policy villages 5	Comments noted. These sites have been assessed, examined and found sound. Policies

• Bure Park FC queried where the last playing pitch strategy is • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - many sites have been retained and some have not been developed despite allocation in previous plans	Banbury 6 and Banbury 15 have been delivered. The Playing Pitch Strategy will be published alongside the next consultation. Where site allocations have yet to be delivered, their prospect of future development has been considered.

Chapter 1 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Introduction Chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals - the plan was not well advertised making it complicated for the community to respond • Approximately 2 individuals - infrastructure improvements, for example regarding travel, should be made before new developments are approved • Other comments - there are no plans for renewable energy sites, new forests/hedgerows or for food production, the plan requires key performance indicators to assess the plans success, there should be a bullet pointed list of the overarching policies, the council should listen more to residents and there should be more detailed maps for Northwest Bicester	Comments noted. The public consultation on the emerging Local Plan was undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and accords with government regulations relating to public consultation on planning documents. The plan will be supported by a full Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out how the impact of development proposed within the plan will be mitigated. It is not considered necessary to allocate land for all eventualities, but when proposals come forward for renewable energy these will be assessed against policies within the plan. Unless there is a change of use, there would not need to be a planning application to use land for food production. There is an overarching Supplementary planning Document (SPD) for NW Bicester which provides additional detail. This SPD will be reviewed to reflect the emerging Plan policy for NW Bicester.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Drayton Parish Council welcomed the Cherwell Local Plan and hope it can be adopted as soon as possible • Somerton Parish Council found the question/answer format helpful • Cropredy Parish Council liked the presentation of the three themes	Welcome comments.
What the Ward Councillors said:	

• Councillor George Reynolds' main concern is to ensure the policies in the plan to protect/preserve the integrity of the villages and prevent them being joined to Banbury	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Timesaving measures could be identified to bring forward regulation 19 consultation, more digital tools should be used including publication of responses to the consultation, theme 2 should be expanded to recognise the role Cherwell plays in Oxfordshire more widely, and the introduction would benefit from context about the future development for the district	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - there is a lack of infrastructure and roads are overstretched, so public priorities should be considered	Comments noted. The plan will be supported by a full Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out how the impact of development proposed within the plan will be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be supported by an Infrastructure Funding Statement.

Question 4: Do you have any comments on the draft vision?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 6 individuals support the draft vision • Approximately 1 individual objected to the draft vision • Approximately 9 individuals - infrastructure, for example healthcare, schools and roads, needs to be prioritised before more housing development • Approximately 2 individuals - there should be more public engagement with the plan • Approximately 2 individuals - greater focus needed on retaining the rural character of the area • Approximately 3 individuals - focus on using brownfield sites over rural areas • Other comments - there should be a statement about clean water and air, there should be more to tackle social deprivation, there is no detail on how climate mitigation will be achieved, there should be a focus on providing recreational facilities, and there should be a greater focus on climate change • The vision is too long, there is not enough weight given to the importance of the natural environment, it should be clear which parts of the vision will rely on others to provide, and the standard method should be used for housing calculations	Comments noted. There is a balance to be struck between the need for development and protecting the rural environment. The plan will be supported by a full Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out how the impact of development proposed within the plan will be mitigated. Public engagement has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Some of the matters raised go beyond the remit of the plan and would be better addressed by other Council strategies.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Banbury Town Council and Drayton, Sibford Ferris, Shenington, and Cropredy Parish Councils - support the draft vision • Fritwell Parish Council - efforts should be directed towards sustainable development • Bourtons Parish Council - all industrial and commercial buildings should have solar panels on them • Somerton Parish Council - the vision covers key issues, but more could be done to embrace diversity • Yarnton Parish Council - ensuring access to facilities and road networks for residents has been missed in the strategic objectives • Launton Parish Council - the vision is more aspirational than realistic Horton cum Studley Parish Council - the draft vision is reasonable but does not consider current and projected economic growth	Comments noted. The plan will be supported by a full Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out how the impact of development proposed within the plan will be mitigated. There is a balance to be struck between the need for development, both residential and economic, and protecting the rural environment.

• Hanwell Parish Council - there is not enough focus on maintaining the rural character of the district • Ambrosden Parish Council - villages will not be able to thrive if they become a suburb of Bicester	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Tom Beckett - the vision should include improving water, electric and sewer infrastructure to support developments and the creation and maintenance of an ecological network • Layla Moran MP - overall support but does not believe that the approach taken will deliver the aims	Comments noted. The plan can promote improvements to utilities infrastructure where this demand has arisen from planned development.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 30 representations supported the draft vision • Approximately 3 representations - the Local Plan Review downplays opportunities for growth, and objects to this • Other comments - the vision should more explicitly recognise the role that Oxford City plays in driving economic success in the district, meeting Oxford's unmet need should be referred to, additional infrastructure should be provided to support residential development in rural areas, there should be a greater focus on rural housing allocations, the plan period should be extended to 2042, support for the focus on the climate emergency, and as there is no policy requirement for specialist housing there is no guarantee it will be delivered in the plan period	Comments noted. There is a balance to be struck between the need for development and protecting the rural environment. The plan can promote improvements to utilities infrastructure where this demand has arisen from planned development. The plan does refer to Oxford's unmet need. The timeline of the Plan has been extended to 2042.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England support the draft vision and welcomed the reference to enhancing the districts heritage assets • The Woodland Trust support the aspirations to meet climate action targets and enhance biodiversity • Thames Valley Police – it should reference the need to create safe communities	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• South and Vale District Councils in general support of the vision, but the climate and natural environment section could be more ambitious • Oxford City Council welcomed the vision	Comments noted.

What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society support the draft vision • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - older housing requires improvements for energy efficiency and the council should have a list of traders guaranteed to be competent • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum - local infrastructure should be sensitively scaled up to meet the demand of expanding communities • Cotswolds National Landscape in overall support but there should be more specific detail • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - the vision is excellent but notes concern about how to ensure it will be implemented	Comments noted. The plan can promote improvements to utilities infrastructure where this demand has arisen from planned development.

Question 5: Do you have any observations on our objectives?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 3 individuals - rural communities are poorly served by public transport • Approximately 3 individuals - there is a lack of infrastructure in Bicester to support new development • Approximately 6 individuals - there should be a brownfield first approach • Other comments - in the south of the district there should be closer working with Oxford City and Oxfordshire County Council, there are no costed details, the objectives are idealistic but not realistic, objections to North of The Moors, the objectives should be to protect the greenbelt and natural environment, all developments should use as many energy efficient products as possible and there is no specific objective for water quality	The plan can promote improvements to utilities infrastructure where this demand has arisen from planned development. The plan will be supported by a full infrastructure delivery plan which sets out in greater detail the requirement for and likely costs of required infrastructure. The site at North of the Moors is not proposed for allocation.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Launton and Cropredy Parish Councils and Banbury Town Council support the objectives • Finmere Parish Council - rural motorists who need to use a car to travel for work should not be penalised by the objectives • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - many objectives include elements which are outside of the remit of Cherwell's implementation and that policies SO1,2,4 and 10 need a more robust line of monitoring to ensure high quality design for the houses proposed • Bourtons Parish Council - SO1 represents a change in perceived attitude with little promotion of solar roofs, SO4 has little focus on retaining agricultural land, and in SO20 there is a significant rural unmet need for bungalows which building of appears to be prevented by policy • Horley Parish Council - the objectives are too high level and not specific enough • Somerton Parish Council - there should be an objective specifically relating to maintaining rural villages • Sibford Ferris Parish Council requested addition to SO5 to recognise the necessity of private car use in rural areas and limit development in areas with little public transport, and to SO11 to include those on lower incomes requiring affordable housing • Hanwell Parish Council - not enough focus on maintaining the rural character of the district • Ambrosden Parish Council - carbon free developments should be enforced, not just promoted and that car drivers should not be penalised for having a car	Comments noted. Appreciate that the plan is trying to strike a balance between a number of issues and consider the level of detail appropriate for its purpose. It is recognised that the private car is important, though methods of sustainable transport will be promoted wherever possible and to support sustainable patterns of development. The plan promotes net zero carbon new developments, and the policy requirements are stepped up in line with Government targets.

What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Calum Miller broadly supported the draft vision and associated objectives in particular the emphasis on climate change at the heart of place-shaping (SO1). Welcomed the focus on promoting housing in sustainable locations, promoting active travel and public transport. Objected to housing numbers being above the standard method and objected to taking Oxford City's unmet need. Stated that employment should be cited near new housing to reduce the need for travel • Councillor Steve Kilsby - SO9 and SO13 could be more robust and unless it is linked to a register of specific locations requiring extreme care in locating developments it is meaningless. SO10 could include percentages of affordable housing	Comments noted. There remains a duty to cooperate regarding strategic cross boundary matters, including unmet housing need. If there is a proven unmet identified need, Cherwell will work with Oxford City and the other Oxfordshire districts to see how this could be accommodated. Percentage of affordable housing set out in policy rather than strategic objectives.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 14 representations supported the strategic objectives • Approximately 1 representation objected the strategic objectives • Other comments - questioning if the plan can realistically deliver the aspirations, SO1 is not deliverable, new developments should be walkable to reduce car dependency, and 14 objectives is a lot and there could be scope to rationalise some of them as there is some overlap	Comments noted. Objectives have been reviewed to minimise unnecessary overlap when possible. Sites are located where patterns of sustainable development can be promoted, and alternative means of transport can be readily provided.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England - the objectives are sound • Historic England broadly supported the objectives, particularly SO4,9 and 13 • The Woodland Trust strongly support SO1-SO5, particularly integrating natural solutions. Recommended adding reference to nature-based solutions to SO1 and the integration of a green infrastructure network to SO5 as well as a reference to access to nature in SO14 • Thames Valley Police suggested amending theme three to include safe communities • Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership suggested SO9 should include a specific reference to biodiversity	Comments noted. Some changes made to strategic objectives as requested to address comments from Woodland Trust, Thames Valley Police and Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - more outdoor workers will be needed with better pay and career structure to attract people, there should be greater collaboration with Wildlife Trusts and the RSPB, and more needs to be done to protect Bicester's historic surroundings	Comments noted. The strategic objectives cover a wide range of ambitions for the Plan and consider the points

• Banbury Civic Society - in support of the draft objectives • Bure Park FC - not enough clear objectives around sport and recreation facility development • Cotswolds National Landscape overall supported the objectives • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - the objectives are excellent but are watered down later in the plan by terms such as 'where possible'	raised are included. some of the matters raised fall outside the remit of the plan's delivery. The inclusion of 'where possible' is necessary to ensure flexibility can be provided.

Chapter 2 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Plan Vision and Objectives Chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• New developments should be environmentally sustainable, the plan is not strong enough to protect green spaces, solar panels should be placed on roofs before in green spaces, and the proposed development would negatively impact infrastructure	Comments noted. The plan sets out policies to support development which is environmentally sustainable. The plan promotes the use of solar panels and protects important local green space.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - flooding is a considerable problem, and any plans should pay attention to flood mitigation especially where more development is proposed • Horley Parish Council - there is no support for small local businesses • Adderbury Parish Council support the Local Plan, vision and objectives • Cropredy Parish Council – there should be a specific strategic objective on rural areas • Somerton Parish Council - there is a need for a commitment to protect villages from urban sprawl • Hanwell Parish Council - there is a need for clarity that an objective is to direct and limit development to identified locations only	Comments noted. Agree that the Plan should provide policy direction to direct development away from land at risk of flooding. The district is predominantly rural in character, so this is recognised across the strategic objectives rather than in one single objective. The spatial strategy at the heart of the Plan seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations whilst protecting the more rural parts of the district from development.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Tom Beckett - SO1 should be built upon to be more specific and that the vision should include improving water, electric and sewerage infrastructure to support developments and the creation and maintenance of an ecological network	Improvements to utilities will be supported where this can be linked to the additional demand created by new development. Ecological gain, biodiversity and green infrastructure networks are promoted within the strategic objectives.
What the development industry said:	

• Request made for a proposal to replace all existing policies in the new Local Plan, and to see if timesaving measures could be used to bring the Local Plan forward more quickly. All suitable sites should be allocated in the plan for development and that small scale development in the smaller villages should be included to ensure a wider housing mix	The policies that have been saved have already been assessed and found sound at examination. The need to have a plan in place as quickly as possible is recognised, but the stages for production are set out in the regulations and the need for evidence and political ratification requires time. The HELAA identifies 'suitable' sites, but it is for the plan making to select from that available pool to include sites necessary to meet need. The plan permits development at sustainable villages.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England - Sport England's Active Design should be embedded into the plan in SO10 • The Woodland Trust support the inclusion of protection for the natural environment and integration of nature-based solutions within the Local Plan • NHS Property Services Limited - CP51 supporting text should explicitly require consideration and mitigation of the impacts of development on healthcare requirements and engagement with NHS for schemes of strategic scale	Comments noted. Consider the reference to Sport England's Active Design too much detail for strategic objective and better placed elsewhere in the Plan. Policy COM18 provides reference to infrastructure required to meet health needs. The detail is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council supported climate action being central to the local plan and support of the high-level themes that underpin the Local Plan	Comments welcomed.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the historic environment must be considered as well as modernising the Market Square • Oxfordshire Keep our NHS Public - there is an aspiration for a healthier less deprived population in Banbury	Comments noted. Plan seeks to promote healthier, less deprived communities across the board. Do not consider that the Green Belt particularly contributes to the strategic objectives, it is a planning tool

• Community First Oxon - there is a need for funded long-term community development to support the process of new community formation and a need to develop community-led management of green open spaces. Suggested that housing targets should be decreased • Oxford Preservation Trust - no reference is made to the Oxford Green Belt in the proposed objectives or plan vision which should be included • Banbury Civic Society - the green agenda would be enhanced by the provision of a Civic Amenities site in or close to Banbury to prevent residents having to travel to Alkerton • Banbury Chamber of Commerce questioned if Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire Country Council will commit to achieving the vision	which can be used/amended, rather than an objective. There is nothing to prevent the Civic Society advancing a planning application to provide a civic amenities site.

Question 6: Do you have any comments on our strategy?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals supported the strategy • Approximately 3 individuals - there should be a focus on infrastructure developments to support housing • Approximately 8 individuals objected to further development in the villages • Approximately 7 individuals - settlement gaps need to be clearly defined • Other comments - the plan should have a clear strategy for carbon emission reduction, concern over developing greenbelt land, and the housing numbers are too high	Comments noted. There is a balance to be struck in providing sufficient development to meet needs and protecting the environment whilst ensuring any necessary mitigation is provided.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - a more detailed spatial strategy would be welcome to consider the growth of Banbury and Bicester on surrounding villages and there should be more encouragement for green space initiatives • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - there are no significant local green spaces set aside in the plan to support Bicester becoming a sustainable garden town • Bourtons Parish Council - there is no specific mention of rural areas which is wrong as they make a significant part of the district • Drayton Parish Council strongly supported rural areas bullet point 1 • Somerton Parish Council - Cherwell should not take Oxford's unmet housing need until all possible development opportunities in Oxford have been exploited and there needs to be sufficient affordable housing provided. New builds should be future-proofed, energy developing sources should be installed on roads and pavements and that safe cycleways should be created and maintained • Sibford Ferris Parish Council were content with the strategy, particularly in rural areas and the categorisation of Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris as smaller villages • Shenington Parish Council supported concentrating development in towns and larger villages • Cropredy Parish Council welcomed the clear hierarchical spatial strategy and new village classifications • Banbury Town Council - the Banbury strategy should include a comment recognising the need for renewal of Banbury's employment areas	Comments noted and welcome support. Consider the spatial strategy sets out a clear framework for the district and for sustainable patterns of development. The strategic objectives make reference to the countryside, towns and villages. It is intended to be district wide, as there are separate strategy areas elsewhere in the Plan. Unplanned development refers to all types of development.

• Launton Parish Council - directing development at the larger villages will threaten their character and deprive the smaller villages of becoming more sustainable • Hanwell Parish Council - the open countryside needs to be defined more clearly to protect existing buffers • Piddington Parish Council - 'avoid' is too weak of a word in 'avoid unplanned development in the open countryside' and that this should also be applied to development of gypsy and traveller sites	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Tom Beckett commented on SO1 that to achieve net zero carbon developments, they also need to be net zero in operation, that there should be an inclusion of surface urban drainage including the creation of new blue infrastructure, that the plan should consider wind as a renewable energy source, that on CP7 the 'benefits of development outweigh risks from flooding' should be better defined and that development should be limited on the Nature Recovery Network • Councillor Steve Kilsby - the preference of brownfield sites for housing should be stated • Councillor Charlie Hicks welcomed the 'decide and provide' approach referenced in the local plan but that it does not go far enough to fully meet Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan 5 regarding transport decarbonisation and reducing car travel. Suggested that chapter 3 is updated to set out the 'decide and provide' approach fully	Comments noted. Much of the move towards net zero is being advanced through Building Regulations. Agree that SUDS are important, and this is realised in specific policies within the plan. The Plan allocates a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites. Realistically prioritising brownfield sites would jeopardise our housing trajectory and ability to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. We are working with Oxfordshire County Council to integrate transport planning in the Local Plan, addressing all modes of travel and supporting the preparation of town specific transport area strategies for Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington to help deliver the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan 5 decarbonisation and care travel reductions.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 10 representations - the strategy should improve the prospects of rural areas, and more housing should be directed to the villages • Approximately 5 representations supported the spatial strategy	Comments noted and support welcomed. The availability and suitability of sites will always influence the level of development directed to any particular location. The spatial

• Approximately 7 representations - the draft spatial strategy should direct more development towards Banbury • Other comments - support for contributing to meet Oxford's unmet need, support for the emphasis on climate change, support for directing growth to Bicester, more green belt land should be released to support development, and support for Core Policy 34	strategy tries to strike a balance between the level of development and the towns and the most sustainable villages.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England - bullet point 3 should include a reference to wellbeing and recreational activity in line with Sport England's Active Design principles • The Canal & River Trust requested that core policy 2 includes a reference to net zero heating and cooling opportunities using canal or river water and commented on core policy 7 that flooding can be caused by more than fluvial flooding and therefore all sources should be considered. Regarding core policy 15, there is a need to protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure • Historic England in broad support of the spatial strategy but suggested wording alterations to include reference to the historic environment, and more detail should be included regarding the approach to development at Upper Heyford to maintain the heritage significance • The Woodland Trust suggested removing 'wherever possible' from the strategic goals and core targets • NHS Property Services Ltd - core policy 54 support for the provision of sufficient, quality community facilities but objected to specific wording and requested that where the NHS can demonstrate a health facility will be changed as part of NHS estate reorganisation, there will be sufficient support from the local authority to do so • Anglian Water - development on the border of the district may be unable to be supplied by Anglian Water	Comments noted. Consider reference to Sport England principles too prescriptive in this context. Opportunities for river/canal water incorporated in Core Policy 1. Core Policy 7 relates to all types of flooding. Consider that Core Policy 15 does protect green and blue infrastructure and encourages its inclusion within new proposals. Changes made to reflect importance of historic environment. Consider the use of 'where possible' provides flexibility where it may be needed and no change proposed. We have sought to work with the ICB for Oxfordshire to determine the long-term strategy for health care and estate management. Disposal of estate will be considered on a case basis if not planned for.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• South and Vale District Council - it will be difficult to balance the housing needs with other parts of the strategy and it should be clarified as to what circumstances exist for removing land from	Comments noted. Where land is required to be removed from the Green Belt, the exceptional circumstances will

the Oxford Green Belt. Questioned why Cherwell District Council have not tested the option of not meeting Oxford's unmet need • Oxford City Council welcomed the reference to meeting Oxford City's unmet need	be set out. The site at North of the Moors bis not included as an allocation so there is no need to set out reasons for removing this land from the Green Belt as this is not proposed. If there is a proven unmet identified housing need, Cherwell will work with Oxford City and the other Oxfordshire districts to see how this could be accommodated.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG - not enough thought into building infrastructure before allowing more housing development • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd support the strategy but questioned how it will be implemented and the logistics which surround this • Keep Hanwell Village Rural - there should be a stronger and more specific definition and protection of settlement gaps • Oxford Preservation Trust - there should be an objective included to echo the government's commitment to Green Belt protection and strategic objective 10 should not come at the expense of releasing green belt land • Banbury Civic Society generally in support of the draft spatial strategy but noted there is no provision mentioned for performance space in Banbury which is proportionate to the size of the new community, and active travel is not appropriate for those not able • Bure Park FC - there is more space required for sports and recreation facilities • Cotswolds National Landscape support the strategy and suggested rewording for the section on the Cotswolds AONB • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - 'wherever possible' will be used by developers in viability assessments to suggest requirements are not possible and therefor the plan should have clear and precise requirements in all circumstances	Improvements to infrastructure will be supported where this can be linked to the additional demand created by new development. The provision of this is not always able to be delivered up front as the sale of early units is required to fund large infrastructure items. Whilst Government policy protects the Green Belt against inappropriate development, it still provides for its review through the plan making process. Performance space in Banbury can come forward through a planning application and does not need to be identified through the Plan. The Plan needs to retain flexibility hence the use of 'wherever possible. '

Question 7: Should we seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain if this means sacrificing other requirements?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 33 individuals in support • Approximately 10 individuals - no • Approximately 7 individuals - it depends on what other requirements were to be sacrificed • Approximately 10 individuals highlighted the importance of swift bricks and suggested that there should be an explicit reference to them in the Local Plan to be installed in all new developments, including extensions • Other comments - renewable energy should be prioritised on brownfield sites or roofs over greenfield, concerns over developing greenbelt land and that it needs to be a genuine 10% requirement which is upheld by developers	Comments noted. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review includes policies that support renewables and seek to make efficient use of previously developed land.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Fritwell Parish Council - yes, but it is unclear which sacrifices would need to be made • Finmere Parish Council - a 20% biodiversity net gain would be preferable, but consideration should be given to the importance of the other requirements. Concern over the increased solar energy requirements and that there is no clear prioritisation of brownfield sites for solar generation • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - the minimum should be 20% and more than 20% could be demanded in rural areas. Core policy 13 to resist development in conservation target areas should be stronger. Regarding core policy 24, rural development should have a housing density of less than 30/hectare to retain the open character of rural settlements • Bourtons Parish Council - the increase in solar energy production should come from brownfield, or a rooftop led approach and speculative development of solar farms on agricultural land should be prevented. Also, the 30dph housing in rural villages is too high and should be lowered • Drayton Parish Council - support core policy 6 but stressed that the adverse impacts in the policy should be rigidly adhered to, when considering large rural solar farms • Horley and Shenington Parish Councils - no • Somerton Parish Council - yes, and the minimum should be 20%	Comments noted. Local Plan policy on biodiversity net gain is underpinned on the latest viability evidence to ensure that on-site biodiversity requirements are ambitious and feasible on development sites across the district. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review is taking forward a minimum figure of 10% BNG on development sites and an elevated 20% BNG figure on strategic allocations and sites within the Nature Recovery Network Core and Recovery zones. (Unless exemptions apply) Development in the rural areas should align with the density multiplier set out in the

• Caversfield Parish Council - yes, 10% biodiversity net gain should be a minimum, but it depends on what the other requirements are • Cropredy Parish Council - nothing less than 10% biodiversity net gain should be accepted • Shipton-On-Cherwell & Thrupp Parish Council - they recognise the plan adheres with the biodiversity net gain framework, but this does not set out how it will be assessed and monitored for compliance • Banbury Town Council - it is difficult to answer generally, and that the requirement should be site specific • Launton Parish Council - unable to answer without knowing what the other requirements which would be sacrificed are • Hanwell Parish Council - there is little supporting evidence regarding the benefits of an artificial increase in biodiversity • Ambrosden Parish Council – yes, but infrastructure also needs supporting	HELAA, which applies 20dph as a starting point with a discount based on site size.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Tom Beckett – yes – the Council should seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain if this means sacrificing other requirements • Councillor Steve Kilsby – no – the Council should not seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain if this means sacrificing other requirements	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 33 representations - the plan should reflect the requirements (10%) of the Environmental act and national guidance and that any provision over the 10% should be a benefit not a requirement due to the impact on deliverability and viability • Other comments - a 10% biodiversity net gain is appropriate for most developments when reliant on on-site mitigation could result in inefficient uses of land so promotes off-site provisions to be available on a flexible case by case basis, core policies 2,3,4 and 5 are ambiguous, the carbon fund is unnecessary, request for clarification as to what constitutes an urban extension and that having over 10% biodiversity net gain should not come before other policy expectations	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review is taking forward a minimum figure of 10% BNG on development sites and an elevated 20% BNG figure on strategic allocations and sites within the Nature Recovery Network Core and Recovery zones. (unless exemptions apply)
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Canal & River Trust will consider proposals from developers to deliver biodiversity net gain on its land on a case-by-case basis	Comments noted. Local Plan policy on biodiversity net gain is underpinned on the latest viability evidence to

• Historic England - a strategic approach to biodiversity needs to be holistic and recognise the potential for delivering good outcomes for biodiversity, climate and heritage. In support of core policies 1 and 4 but that retrofitting traditional buildings must take a whole building approach • The Woodland Trust supported seeking more than a 10% biodiversity net gain where appropriate as a more ambitious target increases chances that 10% biodiversity net gain will be delivered across the plan • BBOWT requested a minimum of 20% or greater biodiversity net gain. Welcomed core policies 1,2,3 and 4 and suggested that core policy 6 needs to ensure renewable energy projects do not come at the expense of biodiversity. Concerned that there is no policy on priority habitats and priority species and suggested that there should be an additional policy on the nature recovery network. Noted that the quality of green spaces is important regarding the benefits it can provide for mental and physical health and recommended that the policy makes specific, measurable requirements about the amount of green space provided • Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership requested the expansion of the policy to at least 20% biodiversity net gain for all developments. Commented on core policy 1 that nature-based solutions should be prioritised for climate mitigation and adaptation. Noted strong support for core policy 5,7,13 and 14 but that core policy 11 is not ambitious enough, for example that on irreplaceable habitats. Suggested that additional policy is required on the nature recovery network • Home Builders Federation - 20% biodiversity net gain requirement is unjustified due to concerns over viability. If local mitigation is not available, then credits can be delivered outside the local area, or national credits could be purchased. Suggested that it should be noted in supporting text that biodiversity net gain can either be delivered through a section 106 agreement or conservation covenant	ensure that on-site biodiversity requirements are ambitious and feasible on development sites across the district. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review is taking forward a minimum figure of 10% BNG on development sites and an elevated 20% BNG figure on strategic allocations and sites within the Nature Recovery Network Core and Recovery zones. (Unless exemptions apply) Consideration for priority habitats has been given on a site-by-site basis for each of the site allocations.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council - the text in core policy 12 should be updated to reflect that the version of the Defra metric to support mandatory biodiversity net gain will be metric 4.1. Noted support for 10% biodiversity net gain where it can be justified	Comments noted.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG, Banbury Civic Society and Banbury Chamber of Commerce - the Council should seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain if this means sacrificing other requirements	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review is taking forward a minimum figure of 10% BNG on development sites and an elevated 20% BNG

• Bure Park FC - the Council should not seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain if this means sacrificing other requirements • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd – yes, due to the amount of biodiversity loss and highlighted the importance of core policy 18. Suggested that there should be a byelaw limiting the brightness of all household outdoor lights • Community First Oxfordshire - core policy 6 may encourage PV arrays and turbines in the countryside and over time technology may mean that less land is required for this, hence, planning conditions should ensure the sites are restored to appropriate biodiversity-based uses. Suggested that development of energy projects should achieve a biodiversity net gain above 10%. Regarding core policy 7, to achieve the slow release of surface water there should be re-engineering of watercourses away from canalized formats to provide meanders and ponds for example. Stated on core policy 11 that it is important that infrastructure is planned to protect existing biodiversity hotspots and to not erode their capacities and on core policy 12 that in rural locations proposals should deliver significantly higher biodiversity net gain • Cherwell Swifts Conservation Project – on core policy 11, the local plan provides an opportunity to make swift bricks mandatory in all new developments • Swifts & Planning Group - support for core policy 11 but requested that swift bricks should be installed in accordance with best practise guidelines and highlighted the importance of protecting existing colonies of the species which are overlooked by the biodiversity net gain metric • Keep Nethercote Rural - concern that there has been little work in the area to establish the biodiversity levels present currently to enhance and protect. The area east of the M40 is often referred to as a natural green buffer along the border with Northamptonshire and requested that this is reflected in policy • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum - support for applying 20% biodiversity net gain in areas but questioned what would be sacrificed for this to occur • Cotswolds National Landscape - support for the biodiversity net gain to be higher than 10% and support for core policy 12 seeking a 20% biodiversity net gain. Suggested that this should be explicitly applied to the Cotswolds National Landscape	figure on strategic allocations and sites within the Nature Recovery Network Core and Recovery zones. (Unless exemptions apply) The Local Plan Review includes a policy on the 'Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity' which stipulates that all development proposals will be required to incorporate features to enhance biodiversity.

Question 8: Should we identify further land for employment?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 25 individuals - no, for reasons including that existing infrastructure cannot support more development and that no land should be allocated for employment until existing industrial estates are operating at capacity • Approximately 9 individuals - yes • Other comments - the land should be spread out through the district, more employment land should not be at the expense of the greenbelt, brownfield sites should be used first before further expansion and that it depends on what employment it is for highlighting the need for more high skilled work	The plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which highlights the need for new infrastructure provision and the timing and location of this. Disagree regarding employment sites – they do not get taken up in the same way as residential allocations, and there is a greater element of choice and competition in the market. Brownfield land is important, but the location of such sites in the district mean that they will not necessarily be suitable for all new employment types.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - brownfield sites should be prioritised if further land is identified • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - employment land allocation in the rural areas should only be allowed where infrastructure already exists to support this, and transport requirements will not adversely affect local traffic congestion • Bourtons Parish Council - no, and noted that the north of the district is predominantly rural, and this must be preserved • Horley Parish Council - it should be for local small businesses • Somerton Parish Council - the proposed policy is weaker than the existing local plan policy and should be revisited • Shenington Parish Council - yes in the larger villages and brownfield sites • Caversfield Parish Council - employment land should be linked to the number of houses built, not proposed • Cropredy Parish Council - no, as the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment was completed recently in 2022	Brownfield land is important, but the location of such sites in the district mean that they will not necessarily be suitable for all new employment types. The Plan seeks to provide a choice and range of sites for employment use. This includes allocating sites where a range of sized units can come forward. Employment land has been reviewed alongside requirements set out in the adopted local plan and subsequent evidence base.

• Banbury Town Council - concern over the lack of employment allocations at Banbury • Launton Parish Council - no, and that any identified land should be readily accessible to the local workforce through infrastructure and transport • Hanwell Parish council - no, and highlighted the increase in warehouses recently and the vacant units existing currently within the towns	Site allocations will depend on the availability and suitability of sites in a particular location.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - no, as the district is already a fair performer in employment generation	The Plan should at least meet the identified need for employment land.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 18 representations - further land should be identified for employment and land is promoted for this • Other comments - core policy 24 is not justified under national planning policy, allocating additional land would provide greatest flexibility for delivery and support for the proposed employment allocations, and housing provision should be provided alongside employment sites to reduce the need for travel	The Plan should at least meet the identified need for employment land. Where possible residential and employment allocations will be located together or as mixed-use allocations, but this will not be practicable in every instance.
What the national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council - land should be identified as mixed-use as much as possible as specific land for employment means that there will be more car-dependency in developments	Where possible residential and employment allocations will be located together or as mixed-use allocations, but this will not be practicable in every instance.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd questioned what the driving force for development is • Keep Nethercote Rural - it is positive that employment land sites LPR57, LPR58 and LPR59 at Nethercote and Huscote Farm are not being taken forward and that policies which prevent development in unsuitable locations are weaker than in the current plan • Banbury Civic Society - yes in the south of the district, but any further allocated land should be protected for high-tech uses over B8 warehouses	The Plan should at least meet the identified need and type of employment set out in the evidence base.

• Bure Park FC - yes • Kidlington Development Watch – concern over the increase in proposed land allocated for the expansion of Begbroke Science Park and if this continues throughout the district there could be an over-provision of employment land • Cherwell Development Watch Alliance - employment use has only been given in hectares and there is no indication of floorspace or employment type. Further concern that there will be an over-provision of employment sites • Banbury Chamber of Commerce – yes, as existing Cherwell businesses cannot identify suitable buildings for expansion, and smaller scale developments should be encouraged. Concern that the employment allocation is not realistic	

Question 9: We would welcome information from local businesses and landowners that would like to expand or potentially relocate. It will help inform an Employment Land Review and the further consideration of employment land needs.	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals - in support of businesses expanding or relocating • There is no need for additional employment land, Oxford Airport is already too large, and Bicester town is too small to sustain more employment	At least the identified employment need should be planned for.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Bourtons Parish Council - there is inappropriate commercial and industrial development in the villages which has had a significant negative effect on the rural road network. If existing local businesses need to expand, they should relocate to identified industrial development sites and not place a burden on the rural areas	Some rural employment uses will support village vitality, though recognise that this will need to be considered in line with policy requirements.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 9 representations promoted land for employment development • Other comments - there is a need for more employment land, queries over whether the employment land review covered the need for new and growing technologies, and a rolling yearly HELAA update would be useful	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the question is directed at those wanting development and that these companies require servicing with 'unskilled' jobs • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - many members have expansion needs, and many businesses do not need to be based on traditional industrial estates and could relocate to the town centre if small units were available	The employment evidence requires a range of jobs-both skilled and unskilled. Agree that different business will have different needs, size requirements and access priorities. The

	Plan provides sufficient flexibility in land use terms.

Question 10: Do you have any comments on our approach of focusing employment development on strategic sites at Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 19 individuals supported the approach to focusing employment development on strategic sites at Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington • Approximately 11 individuals - public transport /good accessibility should be key considerations when deciding upon where to locate future employment locations • Approximately 5 individuals - future employment sites in Kidlington should be kept to a minimal • Approximately 2 individuals - concern regarding cumulative impacts on future employment locations and the local road network, notably traffic/congestion issues and air pollution • 3 individuals highlighted that Heyford is potentially a suitable area for future employment space • Other comments - concern over the plan's lack of focus on cultural infrastructure/employment opportunities, risk of flooding at M40 J9, lack of vision in terms of diversifying the employment offer across the district and existing air quality issues associated with in-town employment sites such as Kraft. Others questioned the need for additional employment space due to existing high vacancy rates and stated that the development of employment space on Green Belt land near Kidlington would be unjustified. Some also reaffirmed the importance of developing on brownfield sites and stated that the redevelopment of Canalside should be a key priority moving forward	Comments noted. Cumulative impacts on traffic and air quality are tested and reported on as part of the plan production and can be found in the evidence base. Recognise that Heyford provides existing employment opportunities and existing vacant structures could be better utilised. Recognise that there will always be a level of vacancy of employment units across the district as the demand for employment space, type, size etc will vary significantly.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council supported the siting of strategic employment sites at Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington but voiced concern over the lack of detail on the large scale of employment spaces proposed. The Plan should have greater control on the scale and siting of future employment sites • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - employment sites in rural areas should only be permitted where there is adequate infrastructure in place and that this will not lead to traffic/congestion issues. They do not support the concept of a 'tech corridor' in Bicester • Bourtons Parish Council supported the proposed employment strategy • Horley Parish Council - greater focus needed on smaller businesses and active travel arrangements	Comments noted. Whilst land is allocated for employment uses for the need identified, the market will have a strong influence over end users. The plan does allocate land for the identified employment need but needs to retain some flexibility. Employment in the rural areas will be considered on a case by case in accordance with the Plan policies.

• Somerton Parish Council supported the Plan's employment strategy and added that employment opportunities should be centred around the most populous areas of the district	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby supported focusing employment development on strategic sites in Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and that new employment space should be sited on brownfield land. Parishes, including Banbury, should prepare Neighbourhood Plans	The Plan identifies a range of employment sites on both greenfield and brownfield sites and the Plan policies allow for further employment development or rationalisation/expansion on existing sites. It will be individual parishes to determine whether they wish to pursue a Neighbourhood Plan.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 19 representations supported the proposed employment strategy of providing employment space on strategic sites in Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington • Approximately 6 representations highlighted the importance of Bicester being a centre of new employment space on the grounds that it is accessible and is regarded as a key commercial centre • Approximately 6 respondents - the employment strategy is too narrow and should consider alternative employment sites, even in rural locations • 1 respondent - Kidlington is a less sustainable location, as the link between residential and employment space is less strong than in Bicester and Banbury • 1 respondent noted the importance of Heyford Park for employment • Others comments - land adjacent to the Oxford Park and Ride site may be suitable, employment uses on the PR8 site should be permitted to allow for the expansion of the Science Park, Bicester 4 should not be included within the Plan and that the Employment Land Review assessment conclusions for LPR34 should be reassessed for its potential to support a hybrid development. Another respondent questioned how 15ha of non-strategic employment development will be delivered through neighbourhood plans and voiced support for the Bicester 1 policy remaining unchanged	Comments noted. The Plan policies provide the flexibility for some rural employment on suitable, well served sites. It is recognised the role that Heyford Park plays in contributing to employment need through the reuse of existing structures. Bicester 4 remains an appropriate employment site, and this allocation is proposed to be saved through the Plan review. Non-strategic employment development can be delivered through Neighbourhood Plans and through the flexibility afforded by the Plan policies for rural areas. There is not a cap on this provision.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - supported the proposed employment strategy	Support welcomed.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	

• Oxfordshire County Council - it is good to put employment sites in areas with denser housing as a means of promoting active travel to/from those sites. This is crucial if the Council's LTCP targets are to be met • Stratford-Upon-Avon District Council - cross-boundary impacts of proposed employment locations would need to be carefully considered, and adequate mitigation required	Comments noted.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows - local employment spaces reduce the need for private vehicles and thus reduce pollution levels. Employment should be close to, or within, the main towns • Banbury Civic Society - support for the proposed employment strategy • Bure Park FC - the Plan should prioritise the needs of technology companies • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - the Plan's allocations in Bicester and Heyford enhances the lack of vision for Banbury	Comments noted. It is recognised that there are a number of different employment needs within the district and the Plan seeks to identify suitable sites to accommodate these different needs and to provide flexibility for the market. The proposed sites reflect the availability and suitability of sites from which choices for allocations can be proposed.

Question 11: What are your views on our proposed approach towards development at existing and allocated employment sites?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 9 individuals supported the proposed approach towards development at existing and allocated employment sites • 2 respondents opposed the proposed employment strategy on the grounds that Bicester and Banbury are overwhelmed with warehouse facilities • 1 respondent - employment buildings should be carbon positive, not just net zero • 1 respondent - greenfield sites should be avoided when considering suitable sites for employment space • 1 respondent - the residential growth proposed at Bicester is in excess of the current and planned employment areas within the area and will therefore result in individuals commuting out of Bicester to access employment opportunities • Others urged prioritisation of brownfield sites and the expansion of existing employment areas, whilst other queried the need for future employment space altogether	Comments noted. Consider that the additional employment allocations at Bicester will help to address a potential imbalance in the provision of jobs and housing. The Plan seeks to allocate land for the identified need for employment land and a criterion based approach to unallocated land.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - the Plan needs to have greater control over large employment developments • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - concern over the Plan's attempt to match other well-known areas to technology employment • Bourton Parish Council - industrial space should be located in existing industrial areas and development on Green Belt land and adjacent to good quality agricultural land should not be encouraged • Horley Parish Council - the Banbury site is too small and needs infrastructure to support it • Somerton Parish Council - the proposed approach seems reasonable • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the approach is appropriate • Shenington Parish Council supported the approach • Cropredy Parish Council welcomed the approach to encourage development on existing sites, with allocation to other uses only if non-viability has been proven	Comments noted.

• Banbury Town Council - support the Canalside and Higham Way allocations and noted that Core Policy 26 should promote the redevelopment of existing commercial sites • Launton Parish Council - Core Policy 26 seems sensible • Hanwell Parish Council - very positive	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby stated that "…if a mixed-use scheme is not viable, the extent to which the proposed use generates new employment will be considered" means	This will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis by the decision taker.
What the development industry said:	
• Comments included support for the approach to employment in the draft plan, that the consequences of the policy should be reflected in the need to allocate additional employment land, promotion for various sites for employment allocation, and that the 12-month marketing period for existing employment sites being reassigned for alternative use should not be the sole test	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sports England - wider perceptions of employment uses have been changing and that sport is often overlooked as an employer • The Woodland Trust supported the use of previously developed land for future development	Comments noted. It is recognised that the traditional approach to employment land has shifted to one of job generating uses and this can be considered on a case by case basis. Sports needs is assessed separately.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council - new housing developments should be high density (100+ dwellings/hectare) and mixed use with services and facilities within walking distance. Density requirements in the draft Plan are too low	Recognise the advantage of mixed-use development, though this will not be appropriate for all sites.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Limited - supported the 'levelling up' agenda and employment locations should result in reduced car journey times to work • Banbury Civic Society - any further allocated land should be protected for high-employment or high-tech uses. Land at Higham Way is suited for residential development • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - employment use should be protected within existing and allocated sites, and a full viability assessment should be required. There is a need to embrace mixed use developments in Banbury to a greater extent and the town centre offers	Comments noted. The evidence base suggests that a range of employment uses are needed through the lifetime of the Plan, not just high-tech. Higham Way provides one of the few opportunities for employment at Banbury and has been proposed for employment use. Policies within the Plan seek to protect

	opportunities for this. Bolton Road could support smaller units. New housing development could support some employment uses	employment land and a balance of uses is promoted where appropriate.

Question 12: What are your views on our proposed approach towards new employment development on unallocated sites?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 15 individuals objected to the Plan's approach to employment development on unallocated sites • Approximately 13 individuals supported and agreed with the Plan's approach to employment development on unallocated sites • 5 individuals - a brownfield first approach/re-use of existing buildings should be adopted. A further 2 individuals stated that small villages and open countryside should be avoided when developing land for employment uses • 3 individuals - there should be a clear strategy for limiting development on unallocated sites as the proposed approach is weaker than its predecessor (SLE1), whilst one other stated that there should be a compelling need for development on unallocated sites, which should be ratified by engagement with local business groups • 2 individuals - more details are required on cost benefits and infrastructure investment, whilst 3 others noted that highways (lowering congestion and air pollution) need further consideration in the context of this policy • 2 individuals - there should be a Green Belt review for potential employment sites, however, 3 individuals note concern for the inclusion of an 'exceptional circumstances' test. Instead, a more transparent, flexible and evidence-based approach should be introduced. • 1 individual - concern over the expansion of Bicester towards Junction 9, due to the level of congestion in the area • 1 individual - unallocated employment sites should be accessible • 1 individual - unallocated sites should be used for local small businesses • Unallocated employment sites are not needed in Kidlington; planners should take account of the views of those living adjacent to prospective sites and consideration should be given to market/what types of industry each site would appeal.	Comments noted. Taking a brownfield first approach to employment sites will not help to achieve the level of delivery required to provide for employment needs. The approach to development on unallocated sites has been strengthened. The plan will be supported by an infrastructure delivery plan which will set out details of investment. No Green Belt land release is proposed. The individual transport needs and cumulative impact of transport loaded onto the network will be modelled and any necessary mitigation identified. Note comment about accessibility and small business users for unallocated sites and neighbouring uses.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - the Plan's proposed approach towards new employment development on unallocated sites was too vague, with very little focus on prioritising brownfield sites • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - CP27 is a balanced policy	Do not consider the approach on unallocated sites is too vague. It is a criterion-based policy which allows development to take place.

• Bourtons Parish Council - industrial development should be sited on existing industrial areas and brownfield land. Applications in the countryside or small villages should be refused. • Horley Parish Council - unallocated sites should be used for small businesses • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the proposed approach to employment development on unallocated sites is appropriate and a third criterion to mitigate against any negative impacts on the local environment/infrastructure in small villages should be added • Cropredy Parish Council welcomed the additional criteria for any employment development in small villages • Somerton Parish Council - there should be a compelling need for development on any unallocated sites • Banbury Town Council - CP27 should be omitted as it encourages such development to prevent speculative development • Launton Parish Council - CP27 seems sensible • Hanwell Parish Council favoured policy 3.124 over 3.123, which does not seem to provide a check on unallocated site development	Unallocated sites might be suitable for both small and larger businesses. There is no cap on employment or housing development if it is an appropriate site. Businesses who wish to relocate into or within the district may have particular needs that cannot be met on allocated sites, and this provides a level of flexibility to support job growth.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby agreed that new employment opportunities should be "accommodated with least impact on the landscape through the re-use, conversion or adaptation of suitable existing buildings" and added that undeveloped land should not be compromised	Disagree. Businesses who wish to relocate into or within the district may have particular needs that cannot be met on allocated sites, and this provides a level of flexibility to support job growth.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 6 representations supported core policy 27 • Others comments promoted sites for employment development, suggested that the exceptional circumstances test should be replaced with more transparent criteria, suggested that core policy 27 needs a more positive approach to identify sufficient sites to meet the identified need, and that core policy 27 is inconsistent with the focus on employment at strategic sites and risks unplanned development in the countryside	The basis of the policy is for the decision taker to determine whether a proposal on an unallocated is suitable, so this would be at odds with the identification of more sites – this criterion-based approach would still be required.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sports England - the proposed approach towards new employment development on unallocated sites seems logical	Comments welcomed.

• Historic England - broadly supported the proposed approach	
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council - developments need to be mixed use wherever possible if transport decarbonisation targets are to be met	Comments noted.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - employment development on unallocated sites should be stopped as there is enough employment sites allocated • Banbury Civic Society – not in support, as the policy encourages employment-related development on un-allocated sites in contrary to the plan led principle • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - there is a need to encourage sites coming forward through regular engagement with businesses, including representation groups	Businesses who wish to relocate into or within the district may have particular needs that cannot be met on allocated sites, and this provides a level of flexibility to support job growth. There is no cap on employment or housing development if it is an appropriate site within the context of the spatial strategy.

Question 13: What are your views on allowing ancillary uses on employment sites?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 10 individuals - content with allowing ancillary uses on employment sites, with one individual adding that there should be reasonable opportunities for such e.g., training centres, education etc. • Approximately 1 individual opposed such uses • One individual stated that such needs/requirements should be looked at on a case-by-case basis, whilst others added that ancillary uses on employment sites should only be allowed as long as the site is fit for purpose and as long as the neighbouring community is in support of this • Maximum flexibility and new ideas are required	Comments noted. The premise of a criterion-based policy is that it will allow for proposals to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. It is considered that the proposed policy does provide sufficient flexibility.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Weston-on-the-Green, Launton, Horley and Shenington Parish Councils - allowing ancillary uses on employment sites as per CP28 is acceptable • Bourtons Parish Council voiced concern as such a policy would encourage expansion of existing industrial sites beyond its designated limits • Drayton Parish Council voiced concern over industrial growth in areas west of Drayton • Somerton Parish Council - allowing ancillary uses on employment sites as per CP28 is acceptable if it prevents developing on unoccupied land • Caversfield Parish Council - ancillary uses should include space for childcare facilities etc as well as food stores etc. • Cropredy Parish Council agreed that ancillary uses should be restricted as set out • Hanwell Parish Council - allowing ancillary uses on employment sites as per CP28 is a proportionate approach	Comments noted.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby voiced support for ancillary uses on employment sites on the grounds that it is increasingly important to provide nurseries, small food outlets, places of worship etc in employment areas.	Comments noted
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 4 representations supported allowing ancillary uses on employment sites	Comments noted

• Other comments - ancillary uses can assist in overall market attractiveness of employment sites, questioned the justification for the policy to exclude food store uses, and core policy 28 wording is unclear as to whether allocated employment sites only include those in core policy 25 or any site with employment land on it	The policy refers to existing and allocated sites.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sports England - allowing ancillary uses on employment sites is acceptable in some circumstances	Comments noted
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows questioned what ancillary uses are • Banbury Civis Society voiced support in principle • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - CP28 is acceptable in principle if the uses do not undermine the provision of services within the town centre	A list of potential ancillary uses has not been included as these will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Question 14: What are your views on our proposed approach to rural diversification?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 14 individuals supported the proposed approach to rural diversification. Some respondents supported the approach in principle, however, the following concerns would need to be considered and addressed: rural identity would need to be retained; the countryside, green belt and 'most important landscapes' would need to be conserved; and the proliferation of farm building conversions (change of use to residential) should be managed/well-balanced • Approximately 2 individuals objected to the proposed approach to rural diversification • 2 individuals - more details are needed to make a judgement on the proposed approach to rural diversification • Others voiced concern over the lack of supporting public transport and highways infrastructure to support rural diversification, the potential of inadvertently extending village boundaries through rural diversification and land-banking and the knock-on effects of it e.g. masses of vacant unused productive land across the district • One individual urged for all existing buildings to be used for rural diversification, even if this involved re-purposing of rural assets	It is considered that the policy does provide opportunity for the points raised to be assessed as part of any planning application. The details would be contained with any prospective planning application, and this is a criterion-based policy to allow the decision taker to arrive at a view based on the merits of a particular proposal. The policy follows national guidance which recognises that opportunities for rural diversification may not be locations well served by public transport. It may not be possible to re-use all existing buildings.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council supported the proposed approach and stated that there needs to be a very stringent approach to the size of proposed diversification projects • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council supported the proposed approach • Bourtons Parish Council - the principal that economic activities should be encouraged in rural areas is wrong until all current commercial/industrial brownfield sites fully utilised and that the undeveloped land/ the natural environment needs to be protected • Drayton Parish Council - concern over industrial growth in areas west of Drayton • Somerton Parish Council – supported the approach and added that consideration needs to be given to potential consequences such as additional traffic in rural areas • Shenington, Horley, Launton, Hanwell and Caversfield Parish Councils supported the proposed approach to rural diversification	Comments noted. Disagree that there should not be any rural diversification until all existing buildings are fully utilised – this would not accord with national policy. The policy follows national guidance which recognises that opportunities for rural diversification may not be locations well served by public transport.

• Croporedy Parish Council voiced support for the proposed approach to rural diversification, with the stated provisos to ensure based on existing viable businesses and there is no harm to existing buildings and landscape • Bletchingdon Parsh Council - it should be stipulated that diversification should not cause harm to the environment • Horton cum Studley Parish Council stated that CP30 is desirable but will cause negative consequences e.g. additional road traffic	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby supported the proposed approach to rural diversification	Comments welcomed
What the development industry said:	
• 2 respondents welcomed the proposed approach to rural diversification • 1 respondent - clauses v-vi of Core Policy 27 may conflict with Core Policy 30. Rural diversification schemes should not have to contribute to the viability of the holding and is contrary to national policy • 1 respondent requested clarification on the policy wording	Comments noted. The policy seeks to ensure that farm holdings can remain viable and support the rural economy.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sports England - rural diversification can bring benefits to sport through equestrian, off-road sports and shooting • Thames Valley Police welcomed the diversification of existing buildings but noted issues such as lack of security / easy targets for criminality. Recommended that a requirement for safety/security within developments is a requirement for this policy (Secured by Design Commercial 2023 guide document)	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows - better houses for workers in agriculture and countryside management are needed. Supporting infrastructure such as village pubs and coffee shops in rural areas will help the local economy • Banbury Civic Society supported the policy • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum supported the policy • Cotswolds National Landscape supported the policy provided it is compatible and positively contributes to conserving and enhancing the beauty of the Cotswolds National Landscape	Comments noted. Policy COM23 seeks to protect community facilities and Policy LEC8 refers to rural diversification.

Question 15: What are your views on our proposed approach to tourism development?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 8 individuals supported the Plan's proposed approach to tourism development • Approximately 4 individuals opposed the Plan's proposed approach to tourism development • Approximately 5 individuals - concern over the lack of supporting infrastructure (road network)/public transport provision in places to support tourism development and raised additional fears over potential traffic and congestion • Approximately 3 individuals questioned whether the Great Wolf development adheres to this proposed approach/policy • Others noted that future tourism development must be in sustainable locations; should be centred in Banbury and Bicester; should have low car parking fees; should bring a holistic array of benefits to the local area and should be redirected away from rural areas. • 1 individual - concern over the proposed Upper Heyford allocation and stated that a heritage impact assessment should be undertaken on the site to establish the heritage potential of the site for tourism purposes • 1 individual - opposition to Bicester Village on the grounds that it has eroded parts of Bicester's character e.g. the renaming of the trains station	Comments noted. Public transport and highway impact will be added to the policy. A heritage impact assessment has been undertaken to consider the proposed impact of housing and employment allocations. Further land for development at Upper Heyford is not proposed within this Plan. Should any proposal come forward for development at Heyford a Heritage Impact Assessment would need to be undertaken.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - concern over the recently permitted water park. There should be clearer wording on the future siting of future attractions/facilities • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council questioned how the Great Wolf resort complies with CP31 and stated that the policy would be fine if it was properly enforced • Bourtons Parish Council - tourism development should be used for its intended purpose. New applications for tourism development should consider any potential harm to biodiversity • Somerton Parish Council - whilst tourist development brings opportunities it is not all welcome due to impact on immediate/surrounding areas mainly due to traffic flow • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - supported the proposed approach to tourism development and added that the 5th and 6th criterion to be met by proposals for new tourism and visitor facilities in villages and the open countryside; *provide significant numbers of job opportunities*	Comments noted. New applications for (tourism) development will consider any potential harm to biodiversity. The plan should be read as a whole, so these policies exist, rather than be duplicated within this specific policy. Transport mitigation would be required where it is demonstrated that the proposal has created the need. The policy will not be amended to require job opportunities to be local as it is not for the local plan to request this. All elements of the

suitable for local people and; that any negative impacts from the proposed development on the local environment/infrastructure are explicitly mitigated. • Shenington Parish Council – opposed the expansion of motor cross adjacent to Hornton grounds and expanded go kart use in Shenington as this is contrary to environmental protection of both noise and use of fossil fuels • Caversfield Parish Council - support the proposal, provided it benefits the local community • Cropredy Parish Council agreed with the proposed approach and, in particular, support the provisos for development in rural areas. Any development should benefit village shops and other facilities • Banbury Town Council – the importance of tourism growth in Banbury needs to be recognised but the overall policy is supported • Launton Parish Council - CP31 does not specify if all items on the list should apply or only some • Hanwell Parish Council - the proposed approach seems reasonable but could be over-interpreted to favour development in rural areas	policy apply when considering development proposals.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - Banbury has never made enough of its Cross, an iconic image and added that provision of a tourist information centre near Banbury Cross might be viable once the Whately Hall and Banbury House hotels are available again	Whilst a laudable aim, this falls outside the Local Plan and may be best taken up with the tourism/economic development team.
What the development industry said:	
• 2 respondents supported the proposed approach to tourism development and the expansion of tourism development • 1 respondent opposed the proposed approach on the grounds that it is too narrow and because tourism is not isolated to town centres • 1 respondent - the policy should be updated to acknowledge the potential for rural tourism in the district to support the rural economy • 1 respondent - the final bullet point of the policy should make it clear that only those proposals which do not relate to an existing rural business should submit their plans to a test regarding location close to or within a town or service centre	Comments noted. The policy is not limited to the town centres and specifically references villages and the open countryside. The plan should be read as a whole, so this point regarding rural diversification will be caught by that relevant policy.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Canal & River Trust - tourism development for boating visitors such as marinas can only be located directly adjacent to the Canal. Supported the need to locate such development close to villages which can provide other facilities such as local shops and public houses	Recognise point about canal/river related development and respective locations – the

• Historic England recommended minor amendment to CP31 on tourism as follows: "Complement the rural ....., community, 'heritage' or nature conservation benefits"	policy does not preclude this in appropriate locations. Policy amended to include reference to heritage.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows - there are enough large hotel chains in the district and added that there should be greater emphasis on the history of Bicester and St Edburg's Church, the old St Edburg's Church of England School and Piggy Lane • Community First Oxfordshire - supportive of CP31 but noted that where tourism hot spots emerge (e.g. Bicester Outlet Village) visitor numbers may put pressure on housing supply and therefore policies which address second homes/serviced accommodation etc should be considered. Changes in Permitted Development Rights may weaken existing local centres due to need for planning permission for changes of use not being required. A sustainable tourism research study would be useful • Banbury Civic Society supported the proposed approach in principle • Cotswolds National Landscape supported the proposed approach to tourism development. Highlighted that new tourism facilities in the Cotswolds National Landscape should contribute to conserving and enhancing the landscape and should reduce private car reliance by integrating with public transport options • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - more up-market hotels are required in Banbury and the permitted hotel use on Southam Road has lapsed and the building is no longer suitable for use	Comments noted. Do not consider the level if second homes/serviced accommodation a significant issue to identifying housing supply in the district. There is no evidence to support the need for a different approach being required to permitted development. Permitted hotel use can be dealt with on an individual basis and not necessary for the plan to identify.

Question 16: What are your views on our proposed approach to retail development and town centres?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 11 individuals supported the Plan's proposed approach to retail development and town centres • Approximately 4 individuals - out-of-town centre retail developments should be resisted • Approximately 14 individuals - the district's town centres need revitalising • Approximately 8 individuals - the vitality of town centres would be bolstered by free parking/subsidised parking regimes • Approximately 5 individuals - developers should ensure that town centres and retail development are accessible via active modes of transport, with good permeability and accessibility • Concerns over the viability of retail centres and high vacancy rates in High Street shops	Comments noted. To ensure the long-term vitality and viability of town centres Policy applies a 'town centre first' approach that directs retail and other main town centre uses to Cherwell's defined town centres. The Council will apply the sequential approach set out in the NPPF for town centre proposals outside of the defined centres. Where appropriate an impact assessment will also be applied Comments noted. Car parking charges on privately owned land falls outside of the scope of the Local Plan. Other policies within the Local Plan seek to improve modes of active travel and public transport.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - it is important that we revive our town centres/High Streets with clear details on initiatives • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - no consistency between where business is supported and development of the town centres. Question how this policy will encourage town centre vitality when the model has already been established for out-of-town retail • Bourtons Parish Council - the recent trend of out-of-town retail sites must cease. Banbury proves such sites more attractive to developers/retailers and result in migration of retail facilities out of town. High levels of investment are needed to revitalise town centres, alongside robust marketing strategies to reduce vacancy rates in existing high street retail units	Comments noted. Initiatives including support for new permanent and temporary off-street markets and car boot sales will be supported subject to policy criteria. Tourism and new tourism and visitor facilities will also be supported with the 'town centre first' principles.

• Somerton Parish Council – supported the proposed approach to retail development and town centres and added that retail development needs to be close to housing to prevent private car use • Sibford Ferris Parish Council and Banbury Town Council supported the Plan's proposed approach to retail development and town centres • Shenington Parish Council - there should be a reduction of out-of-town retail park development. Paid parking in the town centre is losing significant business to out-of-town developments, where parking is free • Caversfield Parish Council - Bicester town centre needs support and its facilities need improving • Cropredy Parish Council supported the 'town centre first' approach • Launton Parish Council supported the Plan's proposed approach but noted that the approach needs to be enforceable • Hanwell Parish Council supported Plan's proposed approach but added that the policy should go further given the amount of vacant retail space in Banbury	To ensure the long-term vitality and viability of town centres Policy applies a 'town centre first' approach that directs retail and other main town centre uses to Cherwell's defined town centres. The Council will apply the sequential approach set out in the NPPF for town centre proposals outside of the defined centres. Where appropriate an impact assessment will also be applied.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - Banbury town centre's retail area should not increase, and that speculative out-of-town development should be resisted. Accessibility issues to/from town centres should be addressed	Policy applies a 'town centre first' approach that directs retail and other main town centre uses to Cherwell's defined town centres. The Council will apply the sequential approach set out in the NPPF for town centre proposals outside of the defined centres. Where appropriate an impact assessment will also be applied Other policies within the Local Plan seek to improve accessibility.
What the development industry said:	
• 3 respondents supported the hierarchy of town centres for new retail developments • Heyford Park has the potential to evolve with future development and its role in supporting neighbouring villages	Comments noted. Heyford Park is identified in the Draft Local Plan as a Local Service Centre, providing a level of facilities and services and local employment

• 1 respondent - support for the continued positive expansion of retail uses in Bicester and added that CP32 could benefit from explicitly recognising the existing retail offer at Bicester village	to provide the next best opportunities for sustainable development outside of the market towns. Further development at Heyford Park is not proposed within this Plan. Bicester Village functions as an Outlet Park, conditioned to limit competition with Bicester Town Centre. Due to its intended function, it would not be appropriate to include the village within the defined retail hierarchy.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Thames Valley Police - outdoor markets are a vulnerable target for crime/terrorism, deemed crowded places/publicly accessible locations - they must be sufficiently protected from terrorist threats. This policy should reference the Protect Duty legislation (going through parliament at present) which will put specific requirement on local authorities/owners of publicly accessible locations to make sufficient preparations/protections from terrorism	Comment noted. Additional criterion included in the Outdoor markets policy to reflect the Protect Duty Legislation for public safety.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG proposed to shut the gateway centre or impose high parking charges there to make it unattractive and generate business in town centres • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - town centres need more smaller shops • Banbury Civic Society - support in principle for the proposed approach to retail development and town centres • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - town centres should support a mix of uses, and not just a choice between retail and residential. In Banbury town centre there is a demand for small retail units, smaller office units and small light industrial units. Residential use in the town centre should include a broad mix of dwelling types	Comments noted. Car parking charges on privately owned land falls outside of the scope of the Local Plan. Policy supports a range of main town centre uses as defined in the NPPF.

Question 17: Do you agree with the town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries shown on the plans?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 14 individuals agreed with the proposed town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries • Approximately 5 individuals opposed the proposed town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries • Bicester could spread into nearby areas, there is potential to convert abandoned town centre shops to alternative uses, and Market Square and Deans Court needed to be incorporated within the town centre boundary • Some noted that the Plans could not be found or viewed	National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages. Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement. The Council commissioned a retail and town centre study in 2021, this project included a review of town centre boundaries. Recommendations made by Nexus in the 2021 Retail Study advised against any expansion of town centre boundaries and that Banbury and Bicester town centre boundaries should be condensed as a response to overprovision. The Council will consider planning applications for alternate uses, assessment will be made in accordance with planning policy criteria.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Sibford Ferris, Shenington and Cropredy Parish Councils agreed with the proposed town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries • Bourtons Parish Council - Appendix 10 not wholly legible. Supported more emphasis on High Street/Castle Quay/White Lion Walk/Market Place for more active retail development and voiced concern for reduction in size/scope of Banbury outdoor market	National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages. Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement. The Council

• Caversfield Parish Council – No. The shops at the front of the Claremont carpark should be included in the proposals (i.e. former Wilko store), even if the car park is to be converted to residential • Banbury Town Council - the western side of North Bar Street, Horsefair and South Bar Street could be included and the primary shopping area should include High Street from junction with Calthorpe Street • Launton Parish Council – noted that the Dean's Court shopping area in Bicester town centre has not been included	commissioned a retail and town centre study in 2021, this project included a review of town centre boundaries. The Council will consider planning applications for alternate uses, assessment will be made in accordance with planning policy criteria. Recommendations made by Nexus in the 2021 Retail Study advised against any expansion of town centre boundaries and that Banbury and Bicester town centre boundaries should be condensed as a response to overprovision.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby agreed with the proposed town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries	Comment noted. National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages. Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement. The Council commissioned a retail and town centre study in 2021, this project included a review of town centre boundaries.
What the development industry said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sports England agreed with the proposed town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries	Comment noted. National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages.

	Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement. The Council commissioned a retail and town centre study in 2021, this project included a review of town centre boundaries.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows - the plans look as expected for Bicester • Banbury Civic Society - the primary shopping frontage area in Banbury should include all of High Street to Banbury Cross • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - it is not restrictive enough, there is a strong demand for smaller commercial units in Banbury town centre. There are parts which could be allowed to become residential but should be carefully considered	Comment noted. National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages. Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement. The Council commissioned a retail and town centre study in 2021, this project included a review of town centre boundaries. Recommendations made by Nexus in the 2021 Retail Study advised against any expansion of town centre boundaries and that Banbury and Bicester town centre boundaries should be condensed as a response to overprovision. The Council will consider planning applications for alternate uses, assessment will be made in accordance with planning policy criteria.

Question 18: Do you agree that only within the primary shopping frontage area E use classes should be protected?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 15 individuals agreed that only within the primary shopping frontage area E use classes should be protected • Approximately 5 individuals - the primary shopping frontage area should include a mix of uses, in addition to E use classes • Other comments - there is insufficient help to attract new businesses; residential accommodation should be on the first floor with ground floor retail; and some flexibility is needed	National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages. The Council will consider planning applications for alternate uses, assessment will be made in accordance with planning policy criteria, to ensure the retail unit is actively marketed prior to considering alternate use. In addition, alternate uses can be considered at first floor such as residential.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Sibford Ferris, Shenington and Launton Parish Councils agreed that only within the primary shopping frontage area E use classes should be protected • Somerton Parish Council agreed and added that unnecessary light pollution should be avoided • Cropredy Parish Council agreed on the grounds that there is a need to concentrate retail/service uses and consider other uses in the wider town centre • Banbury Town Council agreed and added that class E should be defined in the glossary of the Plan	National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages. Development policy 3 addresses shopfronts and signage that includes visual pollution criteria. Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement. The Council commissioned a retail and town centre study in 2021, this project included a review of town centre boundaries.

	The Council will consider planning applications for alternate uses, assessment will be made in accordance with planning policy criteria, which could include other uses at first floor such as residential.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby questioned what use class E is and noted that it should be included in the glossary of the Plan	Comment noted. Planning Use Class E of the Use Class Order (2020) covers commercial, business and service uses.
What the development industry said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sports England - the proposed approach seems logical • Historic England - this approach supports Development Policy 3	National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages. Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement. The Council commissioned a retail and town centre study in 2021, this project included a review of town centre boundaries.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - yes, hairdressers, barbers, pharmacies, dentists etc are all active now and added that the town centre could benefit from more small clothes shops and a shoe shop • Banbury Civic Society - class 1 uses should be protected	National Planning Policy has removed the requirement for Local Plans to identify Primary Shopping Frontages.

• Banbury Chamber of Commerce objected on the grounds that town centres should support a mix of uses and that there is a strong demand for commercial units in Banbury Town Centre	Identification of the extent of Town Centre boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas remain a requirement.

Question 19: Do you have comments on the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 52 individuals - housing numbers are too high, and the standard method should be used • Approximately 5 individuals - there needs to be more affordable and/or social housing • Other comments - there needs to be enough infrastructure to support more development, brownfield sites should be utilised over rural villages, the need needs to be continually reassessed to avoid oversupply, Cherwell should not be taking Oxford's unmet need, small allocations should be made in the smaller villages to take pressure off of the larger villages, and support for scenario 3 of the HENA	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents. Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. The Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the additional infrastructure required by the increase in development proposed. This Local Plan Review has not identified land to help meet Oxford's future unmet housing need.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - the modelling used to establish future housing requirement was the HENA resulting in an increase in projected figures compared to the last plan • Bourtons Parish Council - concern that the trajectory envisages a population growth of 27% in Oxfordshire by 2040 compared to the ONS estimate of less than 5%. Also objected to taking Oxford City's unmet need	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs

• Horley Parish Council - concern that the HENA is larger than the government recommendation • Somerton Parish Council - the HENA assessment appears to over inflate the housing needs and objected to taking Oxford City's unmet need • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - it is appropriate • Shenington Parish Council - the focus should be housing on conurbations within easy access to employment and transport links with suitable infrastructure • Cropredy supported the selection of scenario 3 as the most appropriate in the HENA • Kidlington Parish Council - scenario 3 is unconvincing and there are not enough strong reasons to not use the standard method • Horton cum Studley Parish Council - the HENA assessment over inflates housing need, partially by accepting Oxford City's unmet need • Hanwell Parish Council - Cherwell should accept Oxford's unmet need	Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents. Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Tom Beckett - the process of the HENA is entirely untransparent and more details on the meanings of the analysis is needed • Councillor Ian Middleton - it appears as if Cherwell is trying to work along the lines of the 2050 Oxfordshire Plan despite it having been rejected by the majority of districts, and only Cherwell and Oxford City remain in partnership so the housing numbers for the other districts cannot be assumed. Stated that the figures are not based on the Standard Method and are overinflated and commented that Cherwell should not assume that growth will continue infinitely. Suggested that the Standard Method should remain the upper limit for housing growth as this will still place strain on infrastructure and the environment • Councillor Steve Kilsby - the methodology for assessing housing need is flawed and the current calculation devalues local people who should be put first • Layla Moran MP - CDC should be using the Standard Method as there are no exceptional circumstances to move away from this. The HENA should be dropped and assumptions about future growth and the attitude of other districts towards Oxford's unmet need should not be made	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents. Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 16 representations supported the HENA and not using the government's Standard Method	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed

• Approximately 23 representations - the HENA underestimates the overall housing need and the 25,860 homes by 2040 should be stated as a minimum • Other comments - additional sites should be allocated to ensure the housing need is met, support for taking Oxford City's unmet need, it is important a 5 year supply is demonstrated and it is unclear if this is being met, the assessment of affordable home ownership is simplistic and does not consider other barriers to home ownership e.g. deposit, and it should be updated to reflect a longer plan period	significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents. Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. This Local Plan Review has not identified land to help meet Oxford's unmet housing need. Agree that the use of a standard method or other does not provide a means to resolving deposit issue, but that is a matter for mortgage lenders/banking industry/government and not within the remit of the Local Plan.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Home Builders Federation - concerned that the council is being overly cautious with adopting the baseline growth scenario in the HENA and advocated planning for a level of growth between the CE baseline and economic led scenarios. Agree with the approach suggested based on the employment distribution at the end of the plan period. The number for Oxford City's unmet need may be higher than suggested	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents. Comments noted.

	The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. This Local Plan Review has not identified land to help meet Oxford's unmet housing need.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Vale of White Horse District Council - there is no need to make judgements for the whole of Oxfordshire regarding not following the standard method • South and Vale District Council - there is no need to use an Oxfordshire-wide study area in the HENA, and the employment need is very high. Core policy 25 does not explain which sites are retained and which are new from the employment land review. Concerned that the economic ambition in the HENA is realistic and achievable • Stratford upon Avon District Council - the housing need is above the standard method's requirement equating to 25,860 homes across the plan period 2020-2040 and so an additional 4,806 homes need to be identified to meet this need	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents. Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. This Local Plan Review has not identified land to help meet Oxford's unmet housing need.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - we need to expand more high-tech businesses which can function in smaller centres. Promoted solar panels being installed on warehouse roofs and car parks • Keep Hanwell Village Rural - the standard method should be followed, and Banbury should not take additional needs from other areas • Need not Greed Oxon - the housing numbers are exaggerated, and the supporting evidence is flawed. The housing numbers will result in pressure on the countryside, Green Belt and rural communities and environmental issues should be the focus for determining the sustainable level of growth	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents.

• GreenWay - there is no need for further housing allocations in the Kidlington area and requested that the housing figures should be no higher than the governments Standard Method and there should be no more Green Belt development • Oxford Green Belt Network - the HENA is inflated and promoted using the Standard Method instead • Banbury Civic Society - the methodology is flawed, and the statistics should consider homelessness and overcrowding. They would welcome self-build provision being encouraged • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum - the housing numbers have been exaggerated and should be lower. Questioned the proposed allocation of 1235 homes south of Heyford Park and requested justification for the 500 houses proposed for rural areas • Kidlington Development Watch - the HENA exaggerates the housing need and is causing issues in achieving a 5-year supply. Suggested that the Standard Method be used instead • Cherwell Development Watch Alliance - the Standard Method should be used, and the HENA figures are too high • Cotswolds National Landscape - the plan should acknowledge paragraph 11b in the NPPF, which identifies exemptions to the requirement to meet objectively assessed needs in full	Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. This Local Plan Review has not identified land to help meet Oxford's future unmet housing need.

Question 20: Do you have comments on our emerging housing distribution?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals - there is a lack of infrastructure to support new development • Other comments - it would be better to allow intensification of existing sites to prevent Green Belt release, there is not enough affordable housing allocated, brownfield sites should be used over rural villages, and too much housing is being allocated within Bicester	Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. The Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the additional infrastructure required by the increase in development proposed. No Green Belt release to accommodate residential development is proposed within this Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Caversfield Parish Council supported the emerging housing distribution • Fritwell Parish Council - the focus of development in Northwest Bicester is unsustainable and the area is poorly served by employment opportunities and infrastructure • Finmere Parish Council requested clearer identification of the sites and more detail on social rent housing figures • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - there is no justification for Cherwell District Council to take Oxford's unmet housing need • Bourtons Parish Council - all development must be sympathetic and appropriate for the local environment and by listening to the local opinion, the needs will be better recognised. Housing density measures are not appropriate in many villages and the focus for new development must be within Banbury, Bicester, Kidlington and Heyford Park. There should be a limit on rural development and coalescence must be prevented • Horley Parish Council - brownfield sites should be used and rural areas should remain rural • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the total for rural areas should be an upper limit to be exceeded in certain exceptional circumstances only. Housing in the rural areas should be at allocated sites in the most sustainable locations and development in smaller villages is limited to infill only	Comments noted. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. The Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the additional infrastructure required by the increase in development proposed. Further development is not proposed at Heyford Park.

• Cropredy Parish Council - support focusing development in existing urban areas and commented that the 500 dwellings distributed in the rural areas is sensible. It is essential that the existing supply is delivered in a timely way to prevent pressure for additional supply and in communication it is essential to be clear that the expected delivery is the 'existing supply' plus the 'new supply' • Deddington Parish Council – agree with the 500-home target for rural areas but that this should not be raised • Somerton Parish Council - the housing number is exaggerated so should be lower and development should be focussed on brownfield sites • Shipton-on-Cherwell & Thrupp Parish Council questioned how the planned ecovillage in Shipton Quarry would coexist with proposed houses at The Moors and questioned if the proposed housing at Southeast Woodstock would integrate into Woodstock or Kidlington • Launton Parish Council - concerned about the 800 houses southeast of Wretchwick Green due to the close proximity to Launton • Kidlington Parish Council - Oxford City's needs should not be ring-fenced • Horton cum Studley Parish Council - the housing requirement is too high and puts pressure on the countryside. Questioned how the 500 houses for rural areas would be distributed • Bodicote Parish Council - demands for housing should be constantly re-evaluated to keep development within what is strictly necessary, and the needs of local communities should be paramount • Hanwell Parish Council - the rural area allocation is too high, and the current plan is not prescriptive enough to curb speculative applications • Ambrosden Parish Council - it should be more evenly distributed to all villages and attention should be paid to the actual services in the village not what is supposed to be there. Objected to taking Oxford City's unmet need as this should be fairly met by other districts	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby – supported the approach towards housing supply	Comments noted
What the development industry said:	

• Approximately 6 representations - the large sites which are relied upon will take longer than anticipated to build out and contingency should be put in place with smaller sites which can deliver housing more rapidly • There is too much focus on Bicester and Banbury, the 500-dwelling allocation for rural areas should be increased, additional land at Kidlington should be released from the Green Belt and the overall housing number should be increased	Comments noted. Recognise that larger sites will often have longer lead in times but can provide a steady delivery rate over the life of the Plan. The spatial strategy provides a focus at the towns within the district as the most sustainable locations with some development attributed to the larger villages. Exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated for Green Belt release, and it is not considered that these exist to warrant the release of Green Belt in this plan.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Home Builders Federation - they are disappointed that the Oxfordshire JSP was abandoned	Comments noted
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Stratford upon Avon District Council - if development is identified in locations close to the district boundary, any potential cross boundary impacts should be considered and mitigation provided where possible	Comments noted.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - Graven Hill and North-West Bicester are enormous and impersonal places, and noted that the changed status of CP13 has not been mentioned highlighting that it is an important wildlife corridor and a LWS. Requested clarification about the reference for this land. Stated that the proposed housing number for North-West Bicester is too high and will be detrimental to wildlife. The map showing indicative green and blue infrastructure for LPR33 does not show any possible green or blue infrastructure which would increase biodiversity • Keep Hanwell Village Rural - the housing distribution should focus on brownfield development and town centre redevelopment • Oxford Green Belt Network objected to the housing distribution as it is not based on the standard method calculation, and opposed to 900 homes proposed in CP34 that are in and adjacent to the Oxford Green Belt • Banbury Civic Society - concerned about north of Wykham Lane	Comments noted. The presence of any Conservation Target Areas will be taken into account when determining planning applications. Opportunities for increasing Green and Blue Infrastructure will be promoted. Graven Hill and Northwest Bicester are large allocations and will deliver much needed housing with opportunities to provide higher levels of onsite infrastructure. There is a finite supply of brownfield and town centre sites, so greenfield releases are still

• Kidlington Development Watch - there is confusion between 'Kidlington' and 'Kidlington area' and as such there is little housing being provided in Kidlington itself. Noted that the partial review sites are to meet Oxford's need, however, this makes an artificial distinction as housing cannot be reserved for Oxford, so the 900 proposed homes are unjustified	necessary to ensure a housing land supply throughout the plan timeline. The proposed housing allocations have been reviewed following representations on the level of growth and site-specific comments. The standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. The Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the additional infrastructure required by the increase in development proposed.

Question 21: Are there any Parish Councils seeking a specific housing requirement for Neighbourhood Plans?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Comments included suggestions for specific Parish Councils, that Parish Councils are well informed but often not included in discussions and objection to any further development within or bordering Hanwell	Comments noted. Town and parish councils do have briefings on the Local Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Horley, Drayton, Caversfield, Cropredy, Launton and Hanwell Parish Councils - no • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - not looking for a specific housing requirement as the parish has already fulfilled its requirement up to 2031, but they will identify preferred sites if it manages speculative development • Bourtons Parish Council - they conducted a local survey with the intention of producing a 5-year vision for the parish alike a neighbourhood plan as the cost of producing a neighbourhood plan is currently prohibitive	Comments noted.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - Banbury should have a Neighbourhood Plan	Comments noted. It is for Banbury to determine whether they wish to pursue a Neighbourhood Plan.
What the development industry said:	
• The identification of housing allocations within the larger villages cannot be left to Neighbourhood Plans and should be done through the Local Plan, and the plan should include a trajectory setting out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites	Comments noted. The decision will be given to parishes who are preparing Neighbourhood Plan whether they want a number of for the Local Plan to allocate sites on their behalf.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Question 22: What are your views on our settlement hierarchy proposals?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 10 individuals supported the settlement hierarchy proposals • Approximately 2 individuals objected to the settlement hierarchy proposals • The larger villages cannot necessarily absorb more housing numbers, brownfield sites should be considered over rural allocations, and the categorisation should have the ability to be flexible if the situation of the settlement changes	Comments noted. The settlement hierarchy methodology has been refined to ensure that a proportionate approach has been applied. This approach has been sense-checked to include an assessment of settlement services and infrastructure provision to ensure that towns and villages can accommodate respective housing figures.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council supported the settlement hierarchy proposals • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - the smaller villages category should be specific regarding the type of development • Bourtons Parish Council - the description associated with smaller villages needs to be totally enforced to ensure there is no development outside the village boundaries, and this should be made clear at point of application submission by the automatic refusal of such applications unless it is clear there are significant benefits with zero harm • Drayton Parish Council supported the settlement hierarchy proposals but believe that Drayton should be reclassified as open countryside due to its size • Somerton Parish Council welcomed the plan to limit rural development and the re-categorisation of some villages • Sibford Ferris Parish Council welcomed the classification of Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower as smaller villages • Shenington Parish Council welcomed Shenington being classified as a smaller village with any expected development being in the existing built-up areas	Comments noted. The settlement hierarchy methodology has been refined to ensure that a proportionate approach has been applied. An accompanying Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper will be published. This will set out the approach taken and will provide a definition for each settlement classification.

• Caversfield Parish Council – it would be helpful to have clarification of the villages included within the open countryside category and for more detail as to how the plan intends to protect those villages • Fringford Parish Council queried what protection smaller villages have to oppose inappropriate windfall developments. The Local Plan should make clear that there is no public transport or services in the smaller villages to avoid speculative planning applications being submitted • Middleton Stoney Parish Council welcomed their classification as a smaller village • Banbury Town Council supported Nethercote being designated as open countryside • Launton Parish Council - the village designations should be reviewed regularly and meet a specific set of criteria. Requested a fixed definition on what constitutes each designation • Cropredy Parish Council welcomed the new hierarchy • Bodicote Parish Council objected to larger villages having to accept the bulk of rural housing, and decisions should consider previously approved developments, local needs, affordable housing, and infrastructure • Hanwell Parish Council supported the reclassification as long as settlement boundaries are not breached • Ambrosden Parish Council - many houses in Ambrosden are transient because of the MOD and should be considered	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby in full support	Commented noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 27 representations supported the proposed settlement hierarchy • Approximately 8 representations objected to the proposed settlement hierarchy, suggesting that specific villages should not be classified as they have been • Other comments - the hierarchy should avoid an approach of managed decline in the villages, the open countryside category is inappropriate as distinct settlements should not be included in this category, a distinction should be made in the hierarchy for larger villages which are satellites for Bicester - providing a key opportunity for growth, and there is no evidence for the new village categorisation	Comments noted. The settlement hierarchy methodology has been refined to ensure that a proportionate approach has been applied. An accompanying Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper will be published alongside the Regulation 19 Plan. This will set out the approach taken and will provide a definition for each settlement classification.

What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England - the proposals are logical • Historic England - supported the proposed approach but noted that it is predicted on an assumption that the status of local service centre for Upper Heyford will not result in an expansion of employment development there in a way which could harm the heritage significance of the site • The Woodland Trust - supported focusing development at urban centres and on previously developed land	Commented noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd supported the two largest towns taking the majority of the development and conserving the Green Belt. The list of smaller villages is good but questioned why there cannot be a Green Belt around Bicester to prevent amalgamation of the villages with Bicester • Community First Oxfordshire - there is an opportunity to redesignate the hierarchy considering sustainability. As it stands, policy risks being undermined and that it is not good planning to handle large numbers of new homes which overstretch infrastructure. There is scope for vacant buildings, conversions, second home restrictions to protect and enhance the community before new building is considered • Keep Nethercote Rural - there should be a specific reference to hamlets within the open countryside • Banbury Civic Society supported in principle • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum welcomed the re-categorisation of Fritwell as a smaller village and that Kirtlington is on the margin of being classed as a larger village due to its loss of a village shop • Cotswolds National Landscape - the proposed settlement hierarchy is appropriate, and the housing provision in the Cotswolds should focus on meeting the needs specific to the settlement. An up-to-date housing needs survey is required	Commented noted. As per paragraph 144 of the NPPF, 'new Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances. Paragraph 144a) of the NPPF requires strategic policies to demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate. The designation of new Green Belt would mark a departure from the overall spatial strategy and objectives of the Local Plan Review. An accompanying Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper will be published. This will set out the approach taken and will provide a definition for each settlement classification.

Question 23: What are your views on our suggested policy for affordable housing?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 15 individuals supported the policy for affordable housing • A 'refitting first' strategy by sub-dividing existing houses should be used to provide more homes at less of a cost, there should be different requirements for different parts of the district, developers must be held to account to ensure it is delivered, and the policy should be more ambitious	
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - recent developments have allowed the 30% figure to drop as low as 10% as providing both green eco homes and affordable homes were claimed by the developer to make the site unprofitable; more needs to be done to stick to the 30% figure • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council supported the policy but noted that affordable housing is the first casualty when there are economic pressures, which should be avoided • Bourtons Parish Council - there should be no exception to the affordable content of significant developments by off-site delivery or other financial contributions and the process by which level of rent is applied to affordable homes requires clarification to ensure landlords do not make excessive returns • Somerton Parish Council - concerned that the suggested policy does not go far enough to deliver sufficient affordable housing which is truly affordable and accessible • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the policy is appropriate, but wording should be included to preclude situations where planning permission has been granted and then the developer subsequently amends plans to remove or diminish the affordable housing provision • Shenington Parish Council - supported development of affordable housing in Cherwell but concerned at the sustainability of the business model to protect sites from misuse • Caversfield Parish Council - the allocation should be more than the statutory requirement • Deddington Parish Council objected. At least 30% of affordable rental properties should be social rent and the number of purchasable first homes should be raised to 50% of affordable homes in certain villages • Launton Parish Council - it should be no less than 30% and ideally more	Comments noted. The Plan's affordable housing policy is based on a robust Whole Plan Viability Assessment which assesses the viability of schemes using a 'policy-on' approach, therefore the affordable housing policy percentage reflects what is viable on each development site, taking into account the other requirements and policies in the Plan.

• Kidlington Parish Council - it should be a minimum of 50% • Hanwell Parish Council - there is no clarity regarding the overlap between first homes and affordable homes • Ambrosden Parish Council in support but questioned how it will be upheld	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Ian Middleton questioned what the trade-off between priorities would be and noted that CDC should be prioritising affordability and climate change. Energy efficient homes will make them more affordable but the barriers to entry (price and availability) should be dealt with first • Councillor Calum Miller would welcome more genuinely affordable housing including housing for social rent. Supportive of CP36 and noted that the circumstances to allow off-site provision or financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision should be genuinely exceptional • Councillor Steve Kilsby - the phrase should be 'social' and not 'affordable' housing	Comments noted. The Plan's affordable housing policy is based on a robust Whole Plan Viability Assessment which assesses the viability of schemes using a 'policy-on' approach, therefore the affordable housing policy percentage reflects what is viable on each development site, taking into account the other requirements and policies in the Plan.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 14 representations supported the suggested affordable housing policy • Approximately 3 representations - the policy is unclear and ambiguous • Other comments - concern that the policy promotes an inappropriate split between social and affordable rented housing, the policy needs to be subject to consistent viability assessment throughout the local plan preparation, and more housing is needed to enable more affordable housing	Comments noted. The Plan's affordable housing policy is based on a robust Whole Plan Viability Assessment which assesses the viability of schemes using a 'policy-on' approach, therefore the affordable housing policy percentage reflects what is viable on each development site, taking into account the other requirements and policies in the Plan.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sanctuary Housing - a policy of 25% first homes on every development could deter potential housing developers from Cherwell and it is important to acknowledge the ongoing rise in construction costs and the additional pressure on profit margins as a reduction in profits may be seen as financially unviable. Suggested that a flexible policy that adjusts the percentage of	Comments noted. The Plan's affordable housing policy is based on a robust Whole Plan Viability Assessment which assesses the viability of schemes using a

first-time homes per development based on development size could maintain developer interest, allowing delivery of first homes and encouraging developers to build in the area • Home Builders Federation - the first paragraph of CP36 needs to be amended to state that it does not apply to sites with an area of less than 0.5 hectares to be consistent with national policy. Amendments are needed to improve the policy's flexibility and allow for the overall contribution of affordable housing to be reduced if development is made unviable by the policy; the majority of sites where this would affect viability are brownfield which are a priority to bring forward	'policy-on' approach, therefore the affordable housing policy percentage reflects what is viable on each development site, taking into account the other requirements and policies in the Plan. The policy builds in flexibility by stating that permission won't be granted unless the Council agrees that there are site specific circumstances that provide sufficient benefit to depart from the requisite level /type/mix of affordable housing.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG - the council needs to build more social housing • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - more housing is required for young people which means fewer large houses should be built. Better designed houses needed to maximise the space available at all price levels, and houses should be designed for today rather than in the past when people had far fewer possessions • Community First Oxfordshire - where new affordable homes are provided, they are often a small proportion of those sold off over the same period and that monitoring of this is essential to test if the supply is actually falling over time. Developers should agree wherever possible to provide affordable homes through community land trusts, so to not weaken supply overall • Banbury Civic Society - the phrase should be 'social housing' to be clearer • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum – questioned if the market can deliver truly affordable housing and requested including a community land trust in CP40 • Bure Park FC - there should be more realistic affordable housing for first time buyers • Cotswolds National Landscape - supported the focus on affordable housing. CP26 should set a lower threshold of 5 units in rural areas in line with the NPPF. Recommended that CP36 is increased to 50% affordable housing especially in the Cotswolds National Landscape	Comments noted. The Council monitors the number of affordable units completed per monitoring year which are recorded in the Annual Monitoring Report. The Plan's affordable housing policy is based on a robust Whole Plan Viability Assessment which assesses the viability of schemes using a 'policy-on' approach, therefore the affordable housing policy percentage reflects what is viable on each development site, taking into account the other requirements and policies in the Plan.

Question 24: Would you support maximising the delivery of affordable housing, and in particular the delivery of more social rented housing, if sacrifices were made in respect of other requirements?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 20 individuals in support • Approximately 16 individuals - dependent on what other requirements were sacrificed • Approximately 10 individuals objected to this • Affordable housing should be provided through community land trusts with sites being allocated for that purpose, sacrifices should be made to the profitability of developers, there should be more social housing, and there needs to be more care facilities for elderly and disabled people	Comments noted. Policy COM2 (Affordable Housing) within the Local Plan Review accords with paragraph 34 of the NPPF, which states that affordable housing policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Fritwell Parish Council in support but questioned what sacrifices would need to be made • Finmere Parish Council in support • Bourtons Parish Council in support and noted that this is best provided in towns and larger villages served by a robust transport system with a full range of amenities • Somerton Parish Council in support but stated that the sacrifices need to be explicit with a clear rationale • Sibford Ferris Parish Council supported maximising the delivery of affordable housing, in particular the delivery of more social rented housing • Shenington Parish Council in support of social rented housing • Caversfield Parish Council - affordable housing should not be to the detriment of village hierarchy requirements • Cropredy Parish Council - no, as affordable home ownership is also important • Deddington Parish Council - it is difficult to answer without knowing what the sacrifices would be but stated that more social rented housing is important • Launton Parish Council - it cannot be answered without knowing the sacrifices being considered but are in support of maximising the delivery of affordable housing • Kidlington Parish Council in support but not at the cost of sustainability • Hanwell Parish Council - developers should deliver this in all areas	Comments noted. The Core Policy on affordable housing in the Local Plan Review accords with paragraph 34 of the NPPF, which states that affordable housing policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan. The Core Policy states that affordable housing is expected to be met on site unless there are exceptional circumstances and where off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified. As such, this policy shows clear support for affordable housing provision across the district and notes that non-adherence to this policy will need to be considered on a site-by-site basis.

• Ambrosden Parish Council in support but dependent on what the sacrifices would be	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - yes, subject to caveats but strongly objected to the housing mix percentages as the market percentages are too high	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 1 representation in support • Approximately 2 representations objected to this • Approximately 7 representations - would need to be subject to viability testing • The Local Plan should clarify what policy requirements will be prioritised where proposals are unable to achieve all requirements, and a higher delivery of housing would facilitate a higher level of affordable housing provision • Core policies 37 and 38 are unclear and a request for clarification of the specific elements of core policy 36	Comments noted. The Core Policy on affordable housing within the Local Plan Review accords with paragraph 34 of the NPPF, which states that affordable housing policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will form part of the Regulation 19 evidence and test the affordability ratio (%) to establish the viability of schemes within the district.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sanctuary Housing support maximising the delivery of affordable housing and would be in favour of providing social rented housing should it be accommodated by allowing more sales products on site to counteract the financial impact of social vs affordable	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG and Banbury Chamber of Commerce - yes • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd – yes, as long as it does not come at the expense of green spaces • Keep Hanwell Village Rural in support as long as it was within the existing town boundaries • Banbury Civic Society - the market percentages are too high • Cotswolds National Landscape support maximising the delivery of affordable housing and highlighted the need to look on a case-by-case basis at the extent sacrifices to other requirements would need to be made to achieve this	Comments noted. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will form part of the Regulation 19 evidence and will test the affordability ratio to establish the viability of schemes within the district. This Assessment will establish whether affordable homes, in addition to other Local Plan requirements, are viable on development sites across the district.

Question 25: Do you agree with our approach for assessing the suitability of sites for travelling communities?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 8 individuals objected to the approach • Approximately 11 individuals supported the approach • Local concerns should be considered and addressed, and sites should have very strict rules and conditions enforced	Comments noted. Policies on travelling communities will be informed by the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2024). Local Plan Review policy on travelling communities sets out the criteria which will be applied when assessing the suitability of sites for these purposes.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Somerton and Hanwell Parish Councils supported the approach • Bourtons Parish Council - regarding core policy 42, requested detail is added to the policy which considers the scale and appearance of the site in relation to its location. Sites should be assessed regarding availability of services to support the community, and the number of pitches identified for a site should be enforced • Horley Parish Council objected as there is a need for the relative size of the community to the size of the location area • Shenington Parish Council - cannot comment until a further report is available	Comments noted. Policies on travelling communities will be informed by the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2024). Local Plan Review policy on travelling communities sets out the criteria which will be applied when assessing the suitability of sites for these purposes. It should be noted that this includes the proximity of the proposed site to both healthcare facilities and schools.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby – yes, but is aware that the criteria can be used against such communities who use their initiative to purchase sites later deemed to be unsuitable by CDC	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England supported the proposed approach, specifically the inclusion of heritage related criteria	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG - rural villages are the best places for traveller sites as they are the best place to integrate these communities • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - there have been ingresses of travellers into Gavray Meadows Bicester, which appears to happen when they cannot find a pitch in the nearest designated site. Suggested that they should have better facilities and better means of rubbish disposal • Banbury Civic Society and Bure Park FC - yes	Comments noted. Policies on travelling communities will be informed by the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2024). Local Plan Review policy on travelling communities sets out the criteria which will be applied when assessing the suitability of sites for these purposes. The criteria-based assessment will establish optimal sites for travelling communities.

Question 26: Would you like to propose any sites for consideration as Local Green Space?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 40 individuals proposed the land behind The Moors, Kidlington • Approximately 14 individuals proposed Hanwell Sports Field and field behind St Peter's Church • Approximately 22 individuals proposed Banbury Lane, Nethercote • Other proposed sites included all canal and river side areas, land around Bucknell and Chesterton, all Green Belt areas, Burnehyll Woodland, land to the west, southwest and south of Bodicote, Graven Hill Woodland, Gavray Drive and Langford Community Orchard, land at Derwent Road Bicester, The Triangle Kidlington and Stratfield Brake, Kidlington • There is a general lack of green spaces, and more support is required for communities to bring forward local green spaces	Comments noted Local Green Spaces which were formally submitted as part of the Regulation 18 consultation have been considered and assessed accordingly.

What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - LPR A 211 • Bourtons Parish Council would like to preserve the green space around the village • Somerton Parish Council in support of the 3 sites proposed at Bicester • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the valley of the river Sib between Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower and the land south of Faraday House • Caversfield Parish Council - land south of Springfield Road and land north of Rau Court • Cropredy Parish Council would consider a separate submission • Shipton-on-Cherwell & Thrupp Parish Council - Thrupp requires investment to ensure its character is protected, and promoted green area in Canal Yard as a local green space • Horton cum Studley Parish Council - green spaces should be able to be identified without creating a neighbourhood plan • Bodicote Parish Council promoted land south and southwest of Bodicote where there is evidence of medieval ridge and furrow and to the west to maintain the rural aspect • Bicester Town Council - Bowmont Square, Browning Drive and Derwent Green, Bicester • Hanwell Parish Council promoted the field bordered by Hanwell Grange/Park Farm, the Churchyard and castle grounds and the sports field off of Muddy Lane • Ambrosden Parish Council - CDC should take more responsibility for them which are enforced in developments	Comments noted Local Green Spaces which were formally submitted as part of the Regulation 18 consultation have been considered and assessed accordingly.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby suggested the Mineral Railway in Banbury which runs between the Warwick Road and Southam Road, and the Neithrop Allotment and Boxhedge Road	Comment noted Local Green Spaces which were formally submitted as part of the Regulation 18 consultation have been considered and assessed accordingly.
What the development industry said:	
• Comments included support for designation of Gavray Meadows but that the boundary in appendix 7 requires amending, that the best way to deliver green space is through market led sites where green space can be delivered alongside local communities, that the criterion for selection is too tightly defined and so limits the number identified, and that ongoing maintenance agreements should be agreed not assumed	Comment noted Local Green Space criteria is set out in the NPPF, and this was utilised to assess sites formally proposed.

What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG suggested Banbury Gateway • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - Gavray Meadows LWS needs a green wildlife corridor into Launton and beyond to Marsh Gibbon now that land Southeast of Bicester may be passed for 800 dwellings which is against the green policies and proposals of BBOWT. BBOWT are proposing an area for nature recovery which extends from Oxford through the southeast of Bicester to Aylesbury which is interrupted by LPR21A. Stated that they previously objected to LPR-A-071 as it destroys a major wildlife corridor for Gavray Meadows. Suggested that there could be a new category of wildlife corridor which would be a wide linear space connecting LWS and Local Green Spaces and that all river and canal banks should be included automatically. Proposed LPR-A-071 as a new wildlife corridor and stated that they should be safeguarded areas which cannot be developed • Keep Hanwell Village Rural suggested Hanwell Sports field and the field next to the church • Keep Nethercote Rural supported the proposal for Banbury Lane, Nethercote • Banbury Civic Society suggested Nethercote and Huscote historic landscape • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum - strong support for the policy but they are disappointed about the low number. Suggested that additional text is added to encourage neighbourhood plan groups to nominate Local Green Spaces when they are able to do so • Kidlington Development Watch suggested Stratfield Brake and reconsideration for Bury Moor Fields and St Mary's Conservation Area green space • Bicester Community Wellbeing Garden suggested Bicester Community Wellbeing Garden	Comments noted Local Green Spaces which were formally submitted as part of the Regulation 18 consultation have been considered and assessed accordingly.

Chapter 3 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Our Strategy for Development in Cherwell Chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals objected to taking Oxford City's unmet housing need • Other comments - the plan should be subject to a whole life carbon assessment, villages cannot be defined as sustainable if local transport links are inadequate, public rights of way should be protected, extended and better signposted, settlement gaps should be protected more strongly to prevent coalescence of settlements, support for core policy 44 maintaining the Green Belt, request for swift bricks being installed in all new developments, and there should be a brownfield first approach to all new developments and renewable energy projects	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review does not allocate any land to help meet Oxford's future unmet housing need. Development has been directed to the more sustainable locations in the district and the availability of public transport has been considered as part of the settlement hierarchy. Public rights of way are protected though not through the Local Plan as such – and are the responsibility of the Highway Authority. The coalescence of settlements will be considered through the allocation of sites and incorporation of green gaps where necessary. There is a finite amount of brownfield land and adopting a brownfield first approach would jeopardise the ability of Cherwell to demonstrate a five-year housing supply.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - on core policy 58, the detail of the policy is not currently being implemented by CDC or OCC and for current discretionary issues planning permission should be mandatory to allow Parish Councils to assess the proposal with regard to the Neighbourhood Plan • Bourtons Parish Council - medieval ridge and furrowland has not been previously protected in the Bourtons, applications which encroach on settlement gaps should be refused at the point of submission, and it is important that policy on residential extensions is strongly worded to preserve historic village centres. Suggested an additional policy is introduced to ensure that future developments consider non-designated heritage assets	Comments noted. Policy COM 27 (as renamed) is not yet adopted, so the weight to be attached to it in decision taking, for Conservation Areas, is limited at this point in time. Parish councils should be applying policies in a 'made' neighbourhood plan when providing their responses to planning applications and the decision taker should take this into account too.

• Somerton Parish Council - concerned that brownfield sites do not appear to have been considered for development and rural villages appear to have been considered in preference which do not have the infrastructure to cope with developments • Launton Parish Council - core policies 43 and 45 are important for retaining the character of the villages and providing a buffer between settlements • Hanwell Parish Council - policies from previous plans have been amalgamated which weakens them, and there is no clear strategy for preventing coalescence	Non designated heritage assets are referenced within the Plan. Brownfield sites have been considered where there is a willing landowner who is promoting it so that we know it is available for development. The coalescence of settlements will be considered through the allocation of sites and incorporation of buffers where necessary.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Tom Beckett - on CP39, it should be ensured that on all developments 50% of space is unbuilt on to ensure climate resilience from storm weather events through natural drainage. Questioned why on CP46 the 20 Minute Neighbourhood principle should be adopted 'where appropriate' and suggested that the use of this term deliberately weakens the approach • Councillor Steve Kilsby - on CP58, allowing a historic building to be demolished if it is of no historic/architectural interest or is wholly beyond repaid flies in the face of the purpose of a Conservation Area as it appears to permit owners to demolish if they have neglected the building	Comments noted. The suggestion that 50% of all new developments to be unbuilt on is not practical and raises issues in terms of viability. To adopt such an approach would require a longer lead in/national approach. It may not be possible in every instance to adopt the 20-minute neighbourhood principle, although this will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. If there is no historic/architectural interest, then it is queried what the value in retaining the building would be. Such an approach offers the opportunity for a better building to be erected in its place.
What the development industry said:	
• Comments included objection to the proposal to require all new dwellings to achieve on-site net zero carbon which is challenging in terms of viability and feasibility and that a flexible policy should be utilised to ensure the Local Plan seeks the most up-to-date requirements throughout the plan period, that core policy 38 should be amended to remove the emphasis on extra-care housing and instead the policy should support and promote all types of specialist housing, and that core policies 2,3,4, 5, 43 and 46 are unclear	All development proposals need to be resilient to climate change impacts and we will use the energy hierarchy to assess proposals to inform the design, construction and operation of all new buildings. The revised policy seeks to incorporate the most up to date requirements,

• Furthermore, site allocation can ensure that housing trajectory is met and can provide opportunities for provision of local green space, that design code is not always required to shape a place, and that core policy 58 should reflect NPFF guidance surrounding safeguarding the fabric of historic buildings during retrofitting	though it is recognised that government targets may change during the course of the plan. Consider that the policy does provide sufficient flexibility and that a case by case basis can be applied.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England supported CP46 but suggested incorporating Sport England's Active Design within this. Also support CP47 but suggested there is a need to include readily accessible charging points for electric scooters and bikes, and support CP55 but noted that the evidence base should be referenced • Historic England - concerned that core policies 57 and 59 do not consider the heritage significance in enough clarity to support decision-making, which affects different types of heritage asset. Questioned the approach to provide separate policies for conservation areas and listed buildings but not for registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, and scheduled monuments. To underpin new site allocations, there is a need for a proportionate heritage impact assessment which should be added to the council's evidence base and recommended following a 5-step methodology for the HIA. Suggested minor amendments to wording of core policies 43,46,50, 57, 58 and 59 • Thames Valley Police Property suggested amendments to paragraph 3.287 • Thames Valley Police Designing out Crime - CP18 point III should be rephrased with regard to safety and should reference 'public safety' generally as opposed to narrowing down to highways only. On CP21, requested an additional point to be added to require cycle, motorcycle, and car provisions to be made in line with the standards of Secured by Design which will have a positive impact on reducing crime in residential and commercial developments. CP22 point III is unclear as to what is meant by 'limit motor vehicle trips' and how this would be achieved and requested that this is expanded on. It is important that all new freight developments are designed with crime prevention at the forefront. On CP24, density requirements can cause issues in terms of potential for crime and anti-social behaviour and requested that provision should be given for safe electric bike storage as well as scooter	Comments noted. Evidence base is referenced within the Plan and charging points covered in plan. Heritage section has been updated to reflect the concerns raised. Heritage impact assessments have been prepared to support the emerging Local Plan allocations. The Plan recognises the need for public safety to be factored into design. Reference to storage has been made within the policy.

• Anglian Water - on CP1, all BREEAM water assessment criteria should be satisfied on major employment sites	
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG - car travel needs to be deprioritised • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - it is too complex with too much information. There is too much development, and on CP11, if there is more greenfield building, there will be a decrease in biodiversity. Requested the implementation of more wildlife corridors and noted that there is no evidence that the plan has left room for increasing biodiversity through making connections between green spaces • Community First Oxfordshire - on CP19, former brownfield land may be contaminated and the removal of material during development may require replacement for allotments, gardens and biodiversity. Suggested that soils taken from greenfield sites being developed could be stored and reused on brownfield sites. On CP21, Neighbourhood Plans should be able to elaborate Local Plan policy by scoping where EV points are sited. On CP24, the minimum densities are supported but where public transport corridors need to be viable, the minimum should be 60dph close to routes to encourage take up. Regarding CP43, they noted that it is essential that design incorporates natural landscape features where possible and where there is a Neighbourhood Plan, they should be considered when an application comes forward in the area. In terms of CP46, an emphasis on design codes in Neighbourhood Plans is needed but in support of the focus on 20-minute neighbourhoods. On CP48, it is essential that large developments provide easy access to countryside and encourage active travel. On CP54, noted that valued community assets need to be considered under Asset of Community Value protection and prevented from conversion under new PDR rules • Greenway - in the period since the partial review, there has been an increase in demand for outdoor recreation and a greater understanding of the knowledge of combating climate change. Requested that PR6b allocation is removed • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - there are tensions throughout the plan which are inevitable but not acknowledged and these should be identified so solutions can be made	Comments noted. Recognise that the policy and text does provide a great deal of information but consider this is necessary to ensure that the appropriate policy context is available. There is opportunity to create biodiversity in this and other sites across the district. Recognise that brownfield land may be contaminated, and a remediation strategy may be required for some sites. It is for those preparing Neighbourhood Plans to determine what subjects they wish to capture within their plan, and this cannot be enforced upon NDPs. Parish and town councils can put forward proposals for assets of community value for consideration. PR6b was allocated, examined and found sound in a previous Local Plan. If there is an issue with the delivery of an existing adopted residential site that cannot be overcome, then this can be reviewed.

	Without knowing these tensions, it is difficult to assess this or to provide solutions or explanation.

Question 27: What are your views on our aspirations for the Banbury area?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 6 individuals supported the aspirations for the Banbury area • Other comments - more sites in Banbury need allocating, there is a lack of detail regarding traffic and infrastructure and no mention of the required investment in healthcare, focusing development on previously developed land is correct, town centre densities should be increased as much as possible before building on greenfield sites, out-of-town retail parks should be allowed, and there should be more active travel facilities	Comments noted. Banbury is generally constrained by environmental designations. Sites suitable for allocation in Banbury will be outlined in the emerging Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). Emerging evidence such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Transport Assessments will feed into the Banbury Area Strategy. Together, this evidence will highlight infrastructure issues and opportunities in Banbury in relation to transport and healthcare requirements.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Horley and Sibford Ferris Parish Councils supported the aspirations • Bourtons Parish Council - the drive to reduce levels of deprivation and traffic congestion levels in Banbury has long been a policy but there has been no sign of a reduction of this. South of Banbury needs another M40 junction and public transport in rural areas needs improvement • Somerton Parish Council - there needs to be support infrastructure to support the aspirations and there is a need for affordable public transport • Shenington Parish Council welcomed the vision and proposals. There should be an additional M40 access to the M40 constructed on the Aynho Road to relieve congestion • Cropredy Parish Council - welcomed core policies 57, 58 and 59 to protect the historic heritage of Cropredy. Further welcomed core policies 60 and 61 to protect the Oxford Canal • Hanwell Parish Council - healthcare needs to be improved • Bodicote Parish Council - there should be a greater densification of the town centre, and all properties should be occupied before new developments are considered	Comments noted. Emerging evidence such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Transport Assessments will feed into the Banbury Area Strategy. Together, this evidence will highlight infrastructure issues and opportunities in Banbury. Heavily congested roadways will be highlighted within the Transport Assessment alongside respective mitigatory measures/interventions.

What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - the need for a site for Banbury United FC is paramount and welcomed its recognition within the plan	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 4 representations supported the approach • Approximately 6 representations - more growth should be directed at Banbury • Comments included promotions for parcels of land, that a masterplan is needed rather than an overarching vision, objection to LPR52, and that there is a need for a new settlement edge on the southwest of Banbury to ensure future housing needs are met whilst protecting the countryside	Comments noted. Banbury is generally constrained by environmental designations. Sites suitable for allocation in Banbury will be outlined in the emerging Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The accompanying Area Strategy map and Local Plan Policies map provides a visual illustration of allocated sites in Banbury. The HELAA also includes Banbury-specific maps which highlight which parcels of land have been promoted and submitted through the Call for Sites process.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - regarding core policy 63, depending on the location of a new M40 junction, proposals should avoid harm to Hardwick House (Grade II*) as appendix 5 does not include land safeguarded for the scheme • The Woodland Trust supported the aspiration for more natural and semi-natural open spaces that are accessible to the public	Comments noted. A proposal for a new M40 junction would require supporting evidence to demonstrate that no harm to heritage assets would be caused through the development of the scheme.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Stratford upon Avon District Council - if development is identified in locations close to the district boundary any potential cross-boundary, impacts should be considered and mitigation provided where possible	Comments noted.

	Cross-boundary matters (including sites close to the district boundary) have been discussed in Duty to Cooperate meetings.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Oxfordshire Keep our NHS Public - Banbury needs a general hospital and Oxford and Northampton hospitals are not adequate to meet the needs of the district due to the length of the journey. Suggested that the Horton should not be downgraded but rather upgraded • Keep Hanwell Village Rural - Banbury town centre should be redeveloped for flat/apartment living and for small businesses/café-bar culture • Banbury Civic Society - in overall support but noted that active travel will not significantly reduce the towns through traffic. Support for brownfield development but questioned the suitability of the sites proposed • Bure Park FC - there needs to be more sports facilities • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - Banbury does not have its own identity and it being classed as a market town is an old vision. Rather, it is a large commercial centre and should be reflected in the vision	Comments noted. Emerging evidence such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Transport Assessments will feed into the Banbury Area Strategy. Together, this evidence will highlight infrastructure issues and opportunities in Banbury. Healthcare and sport and recreation requirements will be outlined in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan, with any associated planned capital schemes/works and/or requirements set out in the accompanying Project Schedule. The Core Policy covering the housing mix allows a certain degree of flexibility, whereby the characteristics of development sites will help to inform the housing mix. This will help to address matters raised in relation to the identity of Banbury town centre.

Question 28: Do you think these sites in the Banbury area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 1 individual agreed • Approximately 7 individuals disagreed • Approximately 3 individuals - more housing should only be allocated in Banbury if the infrastructure can allow it • There should be more brownfield development, more affordable and social rented housing, and the town centre area should be explored further	Comments noted. The emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan will highlight where there are existing gaps / a lack of supporting infrastructure. This information will inform the Regulation 19 site allocations and will highlight where infrastructure improvements are needed. The Local Plan Review takes a 'brownfield first' approach (as per Core Policy 24 of the Regulation 18 Plan). Affordable housing ratios ascribed within the Plan will be subject to viability testing via the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Potential town centre areas/sites were identified in the Draft Local Plan Review as 'Opportunity Areas' and have been explored further during the Regulation 19 process.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere and Sibford Ferris Parish Councils agreed • Horley Parish Council objected • Bourtons Parish Council - before any new sites are considered, an audit of all available brownfield sites in Banbury should be publicised along with specific plans for each to be developed for housing first • Somerton Parish Council - housing development within the town centre is the most beneficial and questioned how much consideration was given to development of brownfield sites	Comments noted. Cherwell District Council maintains a Brownfield Land Register (BLR) Part 1 which records sites that are considered to be suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The BLR is available on the Council's website. Commentary on each of those sites (including relevant planning

• Cropredy Parish Council - further consideration for housing development beyond the existing urban boundary should not result in adjacent villages coalescing with the urban area • Bodicote Parish Council - land north of Wykham Lane is unsuitable as the lane is narrow and unable to support a development of this size. Development would have a significant visual impact on the villages and is not consistent with core policies 30, 43 or the spatial strategy for Banbury. There are other areas in Banbury which are brownfield which should be developed first • Hanwell Parish Council objected, noting that redevelopment of the brownfield town centre is the only way forward	application references and HELAA references) are provided within the BLR spreadsheet. The Draft Local Plan Review takes a 'brownfield first' approach (as per Core Policy 24 of the Regulation 18 Plan). Affordable housing ratios ascribed within the Plan will be subject to viability testing via the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. With regards to the Land North of Wykham Lane site, sites have been objectively assessed within the HELAA. This assessment also considers landscape and visual impacts.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby – no, as there are plenty of brownfield sites	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Concern regarding the methodology underpinning the proposed spatial strategy and allocations, sustainable villages should have allocations for housing, support for LPR49 and LPR52 and there should be more development at Banbury	Comments noted. Housing requirements for the rural areas are apportioned based on technical evidence, including the Settlement Hierarchy. The Settlement Hierarchy highlights which villages have sufficient services and facilities to support additional growth. Banbury is generally constrained by environmental designations. Sites suitable for allocation in Banbury will be outlined in the emerging Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England – it seems logical	Comments noted.

• Historic England - both proposed sites merit a heritage impact assessment and understanding the contribution made by the setting of the farmhouses is important. Evidence on heritage impact offers scope to inform design of the scheme and the sustainability appraisal does not consider the setting of assets in detail or how the plan may respond to conserve significance • BBOWT raised concerns about a number of sites, noting concern over Withycombe Farm due to the proximity of the site to Sor brook and priority habitat lowland meadow which could be vulnerable to hydrological impact, air pollution, ecological isolation, and recreational impact. Further concern over Wykham Lane as it is close to the Northern Valleys CTA; it is important that the integrity of the CTA and its habitats and species are not negatively impacted. Positive action to support the CTA is required if the site is taken forward	A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was commissioned to assess heritage impacts on each of the proposed site allocations. The outcomes of the HIA informed the selection process of the Regulation 19 site allocations. The ecological and environmental impact of preferred site allocations are assessed within both the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal Report. The findings of these studies will inform the site selection process at Regulation 19 stage.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council commented on Banbury Canalside regarding the significance of ensuring provision of safe access to existing local service buildings	Comments noted.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society concerned about North of Wykham Lane and noted that an alternative road should be provided. Supported brownfield development but questioned the suitability of the sites chosen • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - allocations for housing should be a mix of sizes and questioned why Wykham Lane has been chosen when it does not connect to an existing settlement and will be a car-reliant new community • Tudor Hall School - there is opportunity to develop a denser housing mix at Canalside	Comments noted.

Question 29: Are there any alternative housing sites for Banbury you wish to suggest?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals - brownfield sites in Banbury • Comments included that no major housing should be built on rural fields which surround the boundary, the White Lady Bakeries and coffee factory site if they are supported to relocate, that there should be densification in Banbury itself, and a request for less development at Hanwell fields	Housing requirements for the rural areas are apportioned based on technical evidence, including the Settlement Hierarchy. The Settlement Hierarchy highlights which villages have sufficient services and facilities to support additional growth. Sites suitable for allocation in Banbury will be outlined in the emerging Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). North of Hanwell Fields (Banbury 5) is a saved allocation of the adopted Local Plan. The suitability, density and phasing of the allocation has been scrutinised in the previous Local Plan Examination. The North of Hanwell Fields allocation will be retained in the Local Plan Review.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - there are several piecemeal sites for small developments in Harwick and around the Warwick Road area. Otherwise, the main brownfield sites are around Canalside and the industrial estates	Comments noted. Sites suitable for allocation in Banbury will be outlined in the emerging Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The Local Plan Review includes a policy on 'effective and efficient use of land', which

	supports the redevelopment of previously developed land. Canalside is a mixed-use allocation in the Local Plan Review.
What the development industry said:	
• Representations proposed the following housing sites: land north of Drayton Lodge Farm/West of Warwick Road (LPR48), land at Hardwick Farm west of Southam Road, land at Broughton Road, Land north of Hanwell Fields (LPR62), Wykham Park Farm, land at Bloxham Road, 'The Bretch', Crouch Farm, east of Warwick Road and land between Calthorpe Street and Marlborough Road • The Local Plan must diversify its housing supply both district wide and in Banbury, and sites should be additional not an alternative	Sites suitable for development in Banbury will be outlined in the emerging Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). Sites deemed suitable will be considered further through the site selection process, with due regard for the supporting Regulation 19 technical evidence. Housing supply will be explored in full during the Regulation 19 stage. A key part of this work will be to ensure that the housing trajectory provides a steady supply of deliverable sites over the duration of the Plan period.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Thames Water - land at Bretch Hill Reservoir for residential use	Comments noted. This site was put forward through the 'call for sites' process and has been assessed as part of the HELAA. Its reference is HELAA382 (Land at Bretch Hill Reservoir).
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG - local rural villages could be easily absorbed into Banbury • Banbury Civic Society - the surface car parks on Southam Road • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - Banbury town centre for regeneration of housing and affordable housing provision	Comments noted. Site allocations in Banbury will have an accompanying concept plan to ensure that each follows a positive design rationale that

	ensures that sites have robust boundaries and play no role in the merging of settlements. Sites put forward through the 'call for sites' process within Banbury town centre have been identified and assessed within the HELAA.

Question 30: Are there other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Banbury?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 5 individuals - no • Other comments suggested land at Oxford Road to the M40 and ring road development, Canalside and country parks, that land should not be safeguarded for this but instead for wildlife, Banbury's disused rail infrastructure should be safeguarded from redevelopment to provide chance in the future for reopening the lines and land between Adderbury and Aynho or Bodicote and Twyford for an additional M40 junction	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review includes policies which seek to protect and enhance biodiversity and deliver biodiversity net gain. The process of formally safeguarding land for transport schemes requires a coordinated approach between the Council and Oxfordshire County Council. Further opportunities for transport-related safeguarded land will be explored at Regulation 19 stage, in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Horley Parish Council - there is need for another M40 junction south of J11 to support the proposed development • Hanwell Parish Council - there is no land which should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Banbury	Comments noted. The process of formally safeguarding land for transport schemes requires a coordinated approach between the Council and Oxfordshire County Council. Further opportunities for transport-related safeguarded land will be explored at Regulation 19 stage, in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - Banbury requires a lorry park as lorries have to park in residential streets due to tachometer requirements, and this should be recognised by the Local Plan	The process of formally safeguarding land for transport schemes requires a coordinated approach between the Council and Oxfordshire County Council. Further opportunities for

	transport-related safeguarded land will be explored at Regulation 19 stage, in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council.
What the development industry said:	
• Land near Southam Road should be safeguarded for M40 improvements or land north of the M40	The process of formally safeguarding land for transport schemes requires a coordinated approach between the Council and Oxfordshire County Council. Further opportunities for transport-related safeguarded land will be explored at Regulation 19 stage, in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Rail future Thames Valley - strongly supported CP56 as Banbury Station is vital for the local economy and public transport as it is the town's only link with the rest of the country. The area needs redevelopment to support predicted growth in jobs and housing • Banbury Civic Society - supported reducing cross town traffic through the town centre but this is only possible if alternative routes are provided. Also, the southeast link road should be committed to • Banbury Chamber of Commerce questioned if an extra motorway junction is viable and who would cover the cost. Proposed that land should be safeguarded for an enlarged bus station, for improving the Middleton Road/ Bridge Street junction to widen the road and river crossing, for cycle routes in/out of town, for a car park on the edge of the town centre and for a park and ride site further of town. Proposed land should be safeguarded for access to the canal from Southam Road and for additional and enhanced EV charging hub close to the M40 J11	Comments noted. The safeguarding of any new road schemes will be guided by the mitigation required to support the Plan and advise for the local highways' authority. Further opportunities for transport-related safeguarded land will be explored at Regulation 19 stage, in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council.

Chapter 4 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Banbury Area Strategy Chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 3 individuals - a new motorway junction on Southam Road will not be the best option • Comments included that there needs to be the right infrastructure provided for charging electric vehicles, that traffic congestion and pollution is a major problem for Banbury but to resolve this the focus should not be on building more roads but rather on reducing the number of vehicle journeys, that there should be a green corridor to link Banbury with the local villages and that a brownfield site first approach should be stated in relation to housing and employment development • Further comments in support for policies which prevent coalescence of Banbury with the surrounding villages, objection to proposed warehouse development near Nethercote, and that there should be more solar development on roofs	Comments noted. Infrastructure required to support the growth earmarked in the Local Plan Review will be set out in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Local Plan Review includes a policy on 'effective and efficient use of land', which supports the redevelopment of previously developed land. In terms of preventing coalescence between Banbury and neighbouring settlements, the Council has commissioned a Green Gaps Study to form part of the Local Plan Review evidence. Green gaps play an important role in maintaining the identity of settlements and preventing coalescence between settlements. As such, a green gaps policy will be included within the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. The proposed warehouse development at Nethercote is not a proposed allocation in the Plan and therefore falls outside the remit of the Local Plan Review.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	

• Bourtons Parish Council - the proposals within CP67 are too vague and the catchment population for The Horton are due to increase, so promoted the reinstatement of a consultant led maternity unit. CDC should support the retention of existing services at The Horton and the improvement of facilities • Drayton Parish Council - strong support for CP45 and suggested a settlement gap between Drayton, Hanwell, and Banbury rather than or in addition to that proposed at Bodicote. Strong support for preserving conservation areas and noted that there should be no building outside villages in conservation areas that are, for landscape reasons, relevant to Drayton	Comments noted. District-wide healthcare requirements will be set out in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will provide further clarity on healthcare requirements at Horton Hospital. The Council has commissioned a Green Gaps Study to form part of the Local Plan Review evidence. Green gaps play an important role in maintaining the identity of settlements and preventing coalescence between settlements. As such, a green gaps policy will be included within the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - Horse Fair and Bridge Street suffer from confusing and misleading signage and it is obvious that the marketplace is the true heart of Banbury's retail area, however none of the signs point towards it. A line about signage in the Local Plan could be effective in making parties alert to the need to improve it. In full support of proposals in CP69, that shrinking the retail footprint and residential use of part of Canalside, the George Street Area, Bolton Road and Marlborough Road make good sense and suggested that these are areas for future housing	Comments noted. The 'Banbury Areas of Change' policy makes reference to the need for public realm improvements, including the removal of unnecessary signage.
What the development industry said:	
• On CP87, the non-delivery of identified sites is an ongoing problem which should be addressed, land east of J11 of the M40 should be allocated for employment logistics use and there was support for redevelopment of Calthorpe Street/Marlborough Road. Noted that there is no explicit mention of housing land supply and what specific, measurable, and targeted measures will be undertaken to address a future shortfall in housing delivery	Comments noted. Land east of Junction 11 of the M40 has not been taken forward as a site allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. The Plan's housing trajectory has carefully considered the deliverability of sites and ensures that there is a steady supply of deliverable housing sites over the Plan period.
What national/statutory organisations said:	

• Sport England - Banbury United Stadium should be relocated and operational before redevelopment work starts • Historic England - In CP66, there is a reference needed to the Oxford Canal Conservation Area appraisal and this should be referred to when considering new schemes which could impact on its significance. Welcomed the reference to Grade II buildings in CP67 but objects to CP68 and sought clarification on the implementation strategy for the site. Welcomed the general criterion of CP69 but some concern around the extent to which underlying evidence has informed the proposed approach • BBOWT welcomed CP66 but considered that a reference should be made to maximising the wildlife value of the green spaces wherever possible for biodiversity value and as wildlife-rich green spaces have a positive role to play in mental and physical health • Thames Water promoted land at Grimsbury Reservoir, Banbury and at the Former Lagoon at Banbury Sewage Works for employment development	Comments noted. Policy wording updated in Policy COM30 on 'The Oxford Canal' to make explicit reference to the Oxford Canal Conservation area Appraisal. The Local Plan Review includes policies which seek to protect and enhance of biodiversity and deliver biodiversity net gain. Land promoted by Thames Water through the 'call for sites' process have been assessed as part of the HELAA.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Stratford upon Avon District Council - any housing allocations should be supported by appropriate infrastructure to mitigate against potential adverse impacts on Stratford upon Avon District. Supported the aim of sustainable connectivity providing that any cross-boundary effects are appropriately assessed and stated interest for the evidence behind the new M40 junction, requesting further information is provided • Oxfordshire County Council supported the focus on previously developed land and the aim to deliver schemes to reduce traffic congestion. There is a clear opportunity to enhance links between Banbury railway station and town centre through Canalside regeneration. CP64 should state a 'new' slip road not 'enhanced' as it does not currently exist, and this alongside improvements on Hennef Way will be considered as to if they should be considered as part of the Banbury area travel plan. The lack of active travel and bus access across the town will result in increased congestion unless mitigation is put in place and suggested that land is safeguarded for this. Supportive of DP6 and CP65 but noted that there is a need to improve the active travel connection between Tramway Road and Station Approach and requested that land is safeguarded for improved walking/cycling routes between Tramway Road and Banbury Station	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out infrastructure requirements to support the growth earmarked in the Plan. Cross-boundary matters will be discussed in duty to cooperate meetings. The County Council's concerns relating to transport infrastructure have been noted. Further discussions between the planning policy team at Cherwell District Council, Oxfordshire County Council and consultants have taken place as part of the Regulation 19 plan-making process to ensure that mitigatory transport measures are considered and included as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG proposed that the gateway centre should be closed, or higher car parking charges should be imposed there. Castle Quay should be converted to residential use and unused units should be offered to local community groups for free • Community First Oxfordshire - regarding CP66, the town centre would benefit from further investment into its public realm/quality of environment to create a more attractive space. Recommended a Public Realm Strategy to raise the profile of the centre. Also, the policy does not state a stewardship arrangement is needed but this is essential • Banburyshire Advice Centre - support services need to be adequately supported financially to support a larger population • Banbury Civic Society - Banbury's built heritage should be promoted and there is a need for a performance space with greater capacity than The Mill • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - CP6 discusses pollution on Hennef Way but proposes no solutions apart from a vague statement. Additional policies are needed for Hennef Way to reduce congestion and the subsequent pollution. The council has a duty to protect the 225 listed buildings in Banbury but there is no policy to back this up. Suggested that there is an opportunity for a heritage scheme for the backs of Parson Street	Comments noted. Some of these suggestions fall outside the remit of the Local Plan Review. The Local Plan Review makes reference to the Town Centre and Retail Study and is supportive of its recommendation for both town centre masterplanning and a public realm strategy. Infrastructure requirements, including requirements for support services and cultural space will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy BAN 3 of the Local Plan Review addresses comments relating to pollution on Hennef Way by resisting new accesses on the road, unless there is evidence to prove that a new access is essential.

Question 31: What are your views on our aspirations for the Bicester area?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals supported the aspirations • Approximately 16 individuals mentioned traffic congestion and the need for improvements to this • Approximately 11 individuals - there is too much development proposed at Bicester • Other comments - support for more development at Bicester, there should not be any more out of town retail, there should be more green spaces and cycling provisions, there should be more services at Bicester, and brownfield sites should be brought forward for development	Comments noted. Recognise the level of development directed at Bicester, though it is at Banbury where more development has been delivered in recent years. The plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the infrastructure required as a result of new development so this can be addressed through developer contributions/other funding sources to mitigate additional pressure – including on the highway network. Bicester has a unique out of town retail offer though any proposals for additional retail offer will be assessed against national policy. There is a finite supply of brownfield land and there are often challenges to be overcome in its delivery.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere and Sibford Ferris Parish Councils supported the aspirations • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - the aspirations are generally ok, but the green credentials are not delivered through CP73 and none of this can be achieved without an infrastructure delivery plan • Somerton Parish Council - the aspirations are good provided that they accommodate the needs of local people and do not encourage people to gravitate out of larger cities due to cheaper costs of living	Comments noted. The Plan will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the level of infrastructure that will be required as a result of the additional development proposed in the Plan, including additional transport and public transport infrastructure so that this can be

• Caversfield Parish Council supported the aspirations but queried if they are achievable • Middleton Stoney Parish Council welcomed the reference to improving active travel routes but noted that the Local Plan does not outline how this will be achieved • Launton Parish Council – it is aspirational and says the right things • Ambrosden Parish Council - people move to Bicester as they cannot afford to live where they work, which takes housing away from local people. Objected to more out of town shopping centres	funded by developer contributions/other sources of funding. The Plan seeks to provide sufficient housing to meet overall needs and for specialist and affordable housing, though there are some aspects of affordability which are beyond the remit of the Plan such as fiscal policy/lending etc. Any out-of-town retail proposals would need to demonstrate that they cannot be located within town centres in accordance with national policy.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 6 representations supported the strategy for Bicester • Approximately 1 representation opposed to more development at Bicester for reasons including a lack of jobs and facilities • Support for saving policy Bicester 13, employment should not be limited to 50 hectares, and not all retail development outside Bicester town centre should be resisted	Comments noted. The Plan provides for at least the level of employment required and includes a criterion-based policy so that further proposals can be assessed.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England welcomed the reference to protecting and enhancing areas of ecological importance and historic value but suggested that historic value is rephrased to 'heritage significance' to align with NPPF terminology. Further, redevelopment of Market Square needs to be done sensitively, acknowledging the conservation area and listed buildings present • The Woodland Trust supported the aspirations for an improved and enhanced green infrastructure network across the town	Comments noted and text updated.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the aspirations are great but questioned if they are achievable due to the constraints of clean water and sewage availability. Also, there needs to be	Comments noted.

more EV charging points and transport provisions for older people. If there are more rural and semi-natural open spaces, they will need to be maintained and there is a need for a better connection to Bicester Village • Bure Park FC - the aspirations are good	In the preparation of the Plan, we have engaged with the Environment Agency and Thames Water to understand their capacity for potable water and wastewater treatment. This is captured in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Rural and semi-natural spaces, if not included within an allocation, will be the responsibility of the landowner to maintain.

Question 32: Do you think these sites in the Bicester area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 3 individuals agreed • Approximately 18 individuals objected • Approximately 8 individuals - it depends on infrastructure present and there is a need for improvements • Other comments - objection to Dean's Court car park, that there should be a review and modelling undertaken of the traffic impact and options to mitigate this through public transport, promotion for current CDC depot to be used as flats, objection to plans for northwest Bicester and objection to the site at Chesterton	Comments noted. All sites submitted to the Council through the 'call for sites' have been assessed in terms of their suitability for development. Recognise that infrastructure is required to support new proposals, and this is set out in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan published alongside the Plan. The impact of the individual and cumulative impact of new development on the highway network is assessed and reported on as part of the evidence base required to support the Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere and Sibford Ferris Parish Councils supported exploring the sites at Bicester for potential housing allocation • Somerton Parish Council - opportunities within the existing town centre should be exploited before further sites are explored and opposed to the greenfield site at northwest Bicester. There should be a green buffer for Bucknell • Middleton Stoney Parish Council - concerned about northwest Bicester and promoted the idea of adopting a Green Belt around Bicester to prevent urban sprawl • Launton Parish Council - sites 1 and 3 are unsuitable as site 1 is not a part of Bicester and site 3 will have to be carefully designed to avoid coalescence with Bicester • Ambrosden Parish Council - the sites in Bicester should not be explored further for potential housing allocation and greenfield should not be built on	Comments noted. All sites submitted to the Council through the 'call for sites' have been assessed in terms of their suitability for development. There is no intention to provide a Green Belt around Bicester as it would not meet the purposes of demonstrating Green Belt.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	

• Approximately 3 representations agreed • Approximately 1 representation objected • Concern over the proximity of the northern boundary of LPR22 to the southern boundary of Bucknell due to the impact of traffic on Bucknell village which the road network cannot accommodate and the flood risk • Support for the proposed allocation at Chesterton, and there should be more allocations at Bicester	Comments noted. All sites submitted to the Council through the 'call for sites' have been assessed in terms of their suitability for development. The impact of additional traffic loaded onto the highway authority will be assessed as part of the evidence to support the Plan. Flood risk has also been assessed.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - a heritage impact assessment is needed to assess how the development of the sites would impact the historic environment. Noted that LPR37a lies between the Chesterton conservation area and Alchester roman site scheduled monument. The sustainability appraisal acknowledges the potential for master planning to support consideration of the historic environment and queried if this work will be conducted before Regulation 19- in support of this approach. Requested clarification on the boundary of LPR33 and noted that it is important to understand the contribution made by the setting of the listed barns at Himley Farm (grade II) and how development would impact that. Development of LPR21a has the potential to impact on Blackthorn Hill Windmill and suggested that there should be a discussion with the council's archaeological adviser to ensure the approach to all three sites is suitable • BBOWT - concern over the proposed site at Chesterton due to the impact of urban development on wildlife in a rural area, and concern over South-East of Wretchwick Green as it would take Bicester further eastwards towards the Upper-Ray CTA and BBOWT reserves in the area and that this presents a considerable risk to the CTA. If the proposed extension to North-West Bicester was taken forward it would present many of the same biodiversity challenges that the original site did, and the measures required for farmland bird compensation must also be required for any extension to the site • Natural England - LPR37a and LPR38 could have hydrological connectivity with 2x SSSI's and any potential Impacts should be identified and mitigated against. This could cause direct and indirect impacts to an area of ancient woodland which is an irreplaceable habitat. LPR33 is close to 2x SSI's which would come under increased pressure but welcomed the inclusion of 40% green infrastructure and 20% biodiversity net gain requirement at the site	Comments noted. A heritage impact assessment has been produced which considers the potential impacts arising from proposed allocations of housing and employment within the Plan. Ecological assessment has also been undertaken to determine any impacts of proposed development on wildlife.

What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council - CP70 should highlight the significance of safeguarding the amenity of the primary school and address noise, overlooking issues and transport to ensure the new residential development will not have an adverse impact on the use and amenity of the school facilities	Comments noted. These are site specific comments which would be better addressed through a planning application.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd – no, North-West Bicester is extremely isolated from Bicester and needs some sort of centre. LPR21A Blackthorn cuts of wildlife corridors and will cause more traffic on the A41. Highlighted the need for farming, farmland, and food self-sufficiency • Bure Park FC - not without consideration of the proper infrastructure first • North Oxfordshire Green Party - traffic flow through Bicester should be limited, and more walking and cycling should be encouraged	Comments noted. Recognise that NW Bicester is a significant sized allocation, and the SPD/Masterplan will need to be updated accordingly. A full infrastructure delivery plan has been drawn up to support the Plan and identify necessary infrastructure.

Question 33: Are there any alternative housing sites for Bicester you wish to suggest?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Land promoted included the MOD land, southwest Bicester close to the M40, brownfield land at Heyford Park, golf courses, at Graven Hill, north of Caversfield, expanding Bicester ecotown, land at Gavray Drive and paddocks at Fringford Road • Other comments - housing should be provided elsewhere than Bicester, there should be more town centre redevelopment, objection to any more housing at all, brownfield sites should be used, and objection to building at Chesterton	Comments noted. Development is focussed within and at the main towns in the district as the most sustainable locations. It is recognised that there are finite opportunities within the town centres. Brownfield sites will be used. Housing development at Chesterton is not proposed for allocation in the Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Somerton Parish Council questioned the extent to which brownfield sites have been considered • Caversfield Parish Council - there are no alternative sites • Ambrosden Parish Council - Graven Hill should be utilised to its full potential and building closer to the villages should be avoided to prevent them losing their identity	Comments noted. All sites submitted to the Council provided under the 'call for sites' have been assessed for their potential for development and suitability for including within the Plan. It is from these available, suitable sites that allocations are proposed. Brownfield sites have been included within the Plan and the Council maintains an up-to-date Brownfield Register.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Land promoted included land northeast of LPR33 adjoining the B4100, land at south Bicester, land at Dymock's Farm, land south of B4030, land off A4095 at Chesterton and land north of Green Lane and east of The Hale • Others suggested areas such as Ambrosden around Bicester	Comments noted. Reasonable alternatives to the Local Plan have been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
What national/statutory organisations said:	

• Secretary of State for Defence - there is scope for development including for services families housing on existing MOD sites around Bicester and that the provision of key local working housing for military in close proximity to operational facilities represents an ideal sustainable form of development • Thames Water promoted land at Buckingham Road, Bicester for residential development	Comments noted. Reasonable alternatives to the selected sites have been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Question 34: Do you agree with the employment sites we have selected at Bicester to accommodate new employment development?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 5 individuals agreed with the employment sites at Bicester • Approximately 8 individuals objected to the employment sites at Bicester • Other comments - support for expanding employment developments generally in Bicester, questioning how employees will access employment with the overstretched roads, a preference to having the sites grouped in a single area as opposed to having warehouses spread across the town, and if land east of the M40 J9 is to be allocated for employment than there must be improvements to J9	Comments noted. The potential impact on the highway network in and around Bicester has been assessed through the transport modelling work, so that appropriate mitigation, if required, can be provided.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council agreed with the employment sites at Bicester • Launton Parish Council - they make sense compared to the housing allocations • Ambrosden Parish Council questioned of they are needed and stated that warehousing should be closer to the motorway for access	Comments noted. The need for employment land is documented within the evidence base.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 4 representations supported the employment sites • Other comments - there is a need to identify more strategic allocations to ensure employment needs are met over the plan period, support for the proposed employment land east of M40 J9 and south of Green Lane, support for the identification of new employment land close to the road network, highlighting the barriers to progress at northwest Bicester, and there has only been 1 employment site identified for B8 uses	Comments noted. More employment sites have been identified in the Publication version of the Plan for a range of employment uses.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - relevant archaeological work is required to inform plans for LPR38 as there are likely to be significant archaeological and other heritage assets on the site. This means more evidence is needed to inform the allocation • The Woodland Trust objected to LPR38: Land east of M40 J9 and south of Green Lane as it contains an area of ancient semi-natural woodland. Also objected to the inclusion of areas of	Comments noted. The Local Plan has been informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment which considered the potential impact on heritage assets from proposed development. The presence of

ancient woodland within development sites and development which would result in a loss of or harm to ancient woodland, ancient or veteran trees	ancient woodland within the southwest corner of the overall allocation is acknowledged and development will be required to avoid this area.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the Bicester Area Strategy map includes Gavray Drive as all of the area, and the area designated as a local green space should be shown	Local Green Spaces will be shown on the Local Plan's policies map.

Question 35: Are there any alternative sites to accommodate housing and employment needs that you think are more suitable?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals - no • Suggestions included Graven Hill, MOD land, brownfield sites, land alongside employment corridors for housing, Upper Heyford, golf courses, land northeast of Bicester, land at southeast Bicester, • The HENA figures are too high which is causing the issue, and Claremont car park is very popular and shouldn't be closed	Comments noted. The HELAA has assessed sites which have been put forward for development through the 'call for sites' process and other sources. Regarding the HENA figures, the standard method is the approach that will be proposed in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere and Launton Parish Councils - there are no alternative sites to accommodate housing and employment needs which are more suitable • Ambrosden Parish Council - brownfield sites with better infrastructure and roads in place. The site north of the A41 will stretch from the built area to the villages and their identity should be kept	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review encourages the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations. Infrastructure requirements will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Suggested sites include land at Skimmingdish lane for employment, land south of the A41, land at south Bicester, land south of B4030, Symmetry Park Ardley and land at J10 of the M40 • The location of strategic employment sites is broadly supported but incorporation of smaller employment opportunities is encouraged	Comments noted. The HELAA has assessed sites which have been put forward for development through the 'call for sites' process and other sources.

	Theme 2 of the Local Plan Review focuses on the local economy and supports the delivery of a mix of small, medium and larger scale employment units across the district.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd – no, but a wildlife site is not a suitable area for more houses and questioned how biodiversity will be increased if LWSs are built on	Comments noted. Areas covered by environmental designations will be precluded from development unless there is a compelling and well-evidenced justification that outweighs those constraints.

Question 36: Are there any other transport schemes that you think should be delivered at Bicester?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 4 individuals - no • Approximately 3 individuals - Howes Lane realignment • Suggestions included turning the central road grid into a one-way system to encourage use of the ring road, making all bypasses 50mph, making all internal roads 20mph, more cycle routes and footpaths, a bridge for the road over the railway, better bus services and a new motorway junction	Comments noted. Howes Lane realignment is central to the effective delivery of NW Bicester. In preparing the Plan, there has been a working relationship with the Highway Authority who have helped to test the impacts on additional traffic on the highway network. This work has helped to identify what mitigation is appropriate to help deliver this additional development. The Highway Authority has not identified a one-way system or speed restrictions as proposed.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - no • Somerton Parish Council - transport schemes need to be affordable to everyone as well as being reliable and available at critical times of the day and to support connections to the rural villages. Questioned if a tram system had been considered • Caversfield Parish Council - there should be buses for northwest Bicester to connect with the stations and town centre • Launton Parish Council - the infrastructure for Sustrans Route 51 ends at the bridge for Launton and should be improved • Ambrosden Parish Council - the southeast link road goes through a SSSI, but Bicester needs a ring road. The road comes out on the wrong side of the M40 putting a bigger burden on J9	Comments noted. The price of public transport is not within the remit of the Local Plan. The potential for a tram has not been costed, though this option tends to feasible for larger cities and is unlikely to be a realistic option in Cherwell. Buses which serve Northwest Bicester should connect to the town centre and enable people to then access the train station. Infrastructure for a particular Sustrans route can be improved without the Local Plan. The cumulative impacts of the proposed development at Bicester have been tested through the transport modelling work to support the Plan. And appropriate mitigation sought as part of new development.

What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 4 representations supported CP71 and the transport strategy for Bicester • The proposed development at southeast Bicester would include the delivery of the southeast link road and support shown for the proposed southeast link road	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the JR Hospital and The Horton Hospital should be made easier to reach and that a study should be conducted to see if a minibus is a possibility and how often it should run	This falls outside of the scope of the Local Plan.

Question 37: Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Bicester?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 6 individuals - no • Suggestions included the current park and ride, that all roads should have cycleways on the roads, expanding the park and ride on Vendee Drive and install traffic lights rather than building a car park on Bicester Sports Field, land around East West Rail to create a rail hub, land for a future ring road or bypass and for a link from the A41 around Graven Hill	Comments noted. Providing cycleways on roads is supported and will be sought as part of new developments wherever possible. The highway authority will consider expansion for park and ride sites where this is feasible, and the demand exists.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Caversfield Parish Council - the proposal for the bus priority route is unclear • Launton Parish Council - no • Ambrosden Parish Council questioned the point of transport schemes when there is nothing to travel into the town centre for	The bus priority route is safeguarded at this stage so that development is not permitted which otherwise precludes its delivery in advance of more detail coming forward.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• The proposed site at southeast Bicester will deliver the southeast link road, welcoming the inclusion of the realignment of Howes Lane, and CP72 would be supported by the expansion of Heyford Park	Comments noted
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - when planning the route for the link road it is important to avoid and minimise harm to the Alchester Roman site Scheduled Monument and consider the impacts on its setting. Noted that Scheduled Monument consent would be needed if the resulting proposal affecting the site constitutes 'works' and that constructing the road there while following NPPF principles regarding designated heritage assets would be a challenge	Comments noted. The precise route of the southeast peripheral road will need to take into account potential harm to the Scheduled Monument. At this point a wide area has been proposed to be safeguarded.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	

• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - no	Comments noted.

Question 38: Is there other green and blue infrastructure that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Bicester?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 1 individual - no • Comments included support for more wetland habitats to minimise flooding and minimise water quality impact of new developments, support for creating green corridors, to create a green buffer zone between Bicester developments and existing communities, to create more woodland and hedgerow areas, and support for more cycleways and footpaths	Comments noted. The Plan is supported by Strategic Flood Risk Assessments Level 1 and 2 and a water cycle study. Buffers between Bicester developments have been created, though to provide full control additional land would need to be included within allocations to ensure the support of landowners.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - no • Launton Parish Council – no, nothing specific • Weton-on-the-Green Parish Council - CP73 fails to expand on the previous Local Plan with its urban edge park and that new designations for green space are small; the ambition should be to identify 2-3 substantial areas within Bicester town to be developed as open recreational space. The green infrastructure strategy lacks ambition and CP73 should go further than protecting what is already there • Somerton Parish Council - the proposal for a Bicester Green Belt should be reviewed, and areas of non-coalescence should be created to prevent Bicester sprawl into the surrounding villages • Ambrosden Parish Council questioned why Pingle Field was sold to Bicester village if there is a need for playing pitches and why the 800 houses for Symmetry Park are being put forward and not as a park area. Further, the parks already in place should be enhanced and greenfield should not be built on	The Plan is supported by a playing pitch strategy which considers the needs for recreational space. New development will be expected to contribute towards or provide open space and recreational land on site – depending on the scale of the development. The Plan seeks to protect existing green and blue infrastructure and to provide additional green and blue infrastructure. It is not considered that Bicester should have its own Green Belt, though there are opportunities for green planting, buffers etc.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	

• CP73 wording should be amended to avoid conflict and confusion; CP73 is limiting; the emerging playing pitch strategy identifies shortfalls of provision to meet football pitch need; and support for enhancing green and blue infrastructure	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England – on CP73, the greening of sheep street needs to be done while seeking to avoid harm to the historic environment. Welcomed the general criterion on CP74 but noted concern around sites 1,2, and 3 regarding the extent of underlying evidence on how development will impact on heritage, avoid/mitigate harm, and conserve/enhance heritage significance • The Woodland Trust supported the aim of establishing a green corridor containing a community woodland between Vendee Drive and Chesterton. Hedgerows and trees outside of woods provide vital connectivity between habitats, contribute shelter, and shade, and assist with water management • BBOWT welcomed the reference to green infrastructure in CP73 within the Bicester area strategy but considered that a reference should be made to maximising wildlife value of the green spaces where possible for biodiversity and the positive role they play in mental and physical health. There is an opportunity to create additional green and blue infrastructure that could overlap with the initiatives of Bernwood Forest and the Upper Ray BBOWT living landscape	Comments noted. Potential impact on heritage will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The benefits of green space are recognised elsewhere in the Plan.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - blue infrastructure must be maintained and that both green and blue infrastructure should be strategically planned and created to be wildlife corridors. Footpaths can be enhanced to be wildlife corridors and should not be submerged by housing development or warehouses. The flood compensation for Flanders Close next to Langford Park House requires protection and should be part of the blue infrastructure strategy for Bicester • Bure Park FC - yes, and there is a massive shortfall of sports facilities in Bicester	Comments noted. Recognise the importance of maintenance and this will be capture through legal agreements as appropriate. The availability of playing pitches is captured in the separate report – Playing Pitch Strategy.

Question 39: Duplicate of 38	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 3 individuals - no • The district should save and improve what currently exists, there is a need for new cycling lanes and more parks, and strong support for promoting and enhancing green infrastructure	Comments noted.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Support for the schemes proposed in the Local Plan Review, and the proposed masterplan for LPR34 could deliver enhancements to Ardley Cutting SSSI, provide space for nature recovery and opportunities along the Langford Brook	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Woodland Trust - for town centre schemes, design guidance should incorporate the protection or extension of green infrastructure including support for SuDS in all new developments and the encouragement of green links to frame residential areas and connect existing habitats	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - there are two reserves named Bicester Wetland Reserve but only one is on the TVERC list. The Community Orchard near Langford Park House could become part of an extended Graven Hill LWS	Comments noted.

Question 40: Are there any other measures we should be taking to improve Bicester town centre?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 1 individual - no • Approximately 2 individuals - allow more housing development • Approximately 2 individuals - there should be more shops • Approximately 4 individuals - there should be better parking provisions • Suggestions included that the history should be highlighted, the need for lower rents/rates, incentives for smaller shops, to use larger units for market type shopping centres, better leisure facilities, more police presence, more retirement villages, limit the growth of Bicester Village and more accessible spaces for young people e.g. youth centres	Comments noted. Some of these suggestions, whilst positive, fall outside the scope of the Local Plan and could be considered through other Council initiatives.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - mobile vendors who utilise the marketplace should be provided with a suitable alternative location if they are not able to use the market square after improvements have been made • Caversfield Parish Council - if the Claremont car park and market square car park are redeveloped there will be no disabled parking provision at that end of the town, which may exclude visitors • Somerton Parish Council noted the promotion of disabled friendly areas • Launton Parish Council - people will want to continue driving into Bicester so by removing parking facilities, this will threaten Bicester's viability • Ambrosden Parish Council - the plans for market square are worrying, and traffic should be able to pass through for access to Sainsbury's. Questioned if there is any scope for empty shops to open as co-operatives for smaller businesses to sell in a joint area. Queried if a larger building could house several eating establishments with open seating to allow purchasing from different outlets and eating together	Comments noted. The Council will work to support mobile vendors should it not be feasible to use the marketplace.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Tom Beckett - there should be limits to the traffic flow through Bicester and changes to the flow of traffic down Buckingham Road and Banbury Road, as both of the road's converging causes a lot of traffic. Also, there should be support for more walking and cycling	Comments noted. The Plan has been developed with support from Oxfordshire County Council as Highways Authority. Some of

	these specific initiatives fall outside the scope of the Local Plan.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 2 representations – no, as they are in support of CP74	Comments noted
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - CP74 title should be changed to the town's 'historic environment' and encouraged a reference to a medieval settlement as a Scheduled Monument. Bicester conservation area and listed buildings should be mentioned. Recommended that the text in CP75 is updated to reflect that English Heritage is now Historic England, but in support of the proposed policy approach. Stated that the text should note several designated heritage assets within the site which are currently on the heritage at risk register • The Woodland Trust - trees and urban hedgerows help to mitigate the impacts of climate change and make a valuable contribution to the quality of public realm. Recommended including a specific policy in support of new tree planting/hedgerows and urban woodland creation, as well as setting a target for tree canopy cover as part of the policy	Comments noted. Plan updated in part. Recognise contribution that new tree planting and hedgerows can make, and this will be sought for the proposed allocations.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - it needs regular sweeping and removal of rubbish • Bure Park FC - business rates should be made more affordable	Comments noted – this fall outside the remit of the Local Plan.

Question 41: What are your views on our proposed approach to development proposals at Former RAF Bicester?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals supported the proposed approach • Other comments - support for the conservation led approach, the proposals are too large, the location will cause more traffic on the ring road, the biodiversity on the site requires maintaining, and a request for an improved footpath to and within the site for residents	Comments noted. The potential impact on the highway network have been assessed as part of the comprehensive transport modelling undertaken to support the Local Plan. Biodiversity retained on the site should need maintenance as such.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Sibford Ferris, Caversfield and Launton Parish Councils supported the proposed approach • Somerton Parish Council - there is a risk that in the future there will not be any demarcations between towns and the surrounding villages and increased traffic in the rural villages will become dangerous • Ambrosden Parish Council - it is reasonable and expansion at the location can only be positive	Comments noted. The potential impact on the highway network have been assessed as part of the comprehensive transport modelling undertaken to support the Local Plan.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 4 representations supported the approach, due to it being conservation-led and because it is becoming a high-profile, high-quality centre of engineering excellence	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England broadly supported the proposed approach, but the plan should highlight that a number of heritage assets are currently on the National Heritage at Risk Register	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - noise from cars should be minimised • Bure Park FC - it is a good idea as long as the rent is affordable	Comments noted. It is not clear what steps the Plan should take in terms of minimising vehicular noise, but an acoustic survey can be

	requested to support development. The cost of the rent will not be a matter for the Local Plan.

Chapter 5 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Bicester Area Strategy chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 3 individuals - the infrastructure in Bicester requires improvements • Approximately 20 individuals objected to plans for northwest Bicester for reasons including a lack of services, destruction of green space and increase in traffic congestion • Comments included that more houses should be built, objection to building more in the villages, that public transport and active travel should be better promoted, concern over the non-completion of Howes Lane realignment and concern over the levels of growth	Comments noted. The potential impact on the highway network have been assessed as part of the comprehensive transport modelling undertaken to support the Local Plan. The need for services has been assessed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which is supported separately, though the outputs are contained a policy requirement.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Calum Miller supported the Bicester Area Strategy, but stronger emphasis is required on keeping London Road open after East West Rail development enforces permanent closure of the level crossing. Requested that the policy regarding this is strengthened	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Support for the strategy and focusing additional development at Bicester, for the higher capacity of dwellings and for the opportunity to create a permanent green buffer between northwest Bicester and Bucknell village	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England - there is a need to protect the gliding centre from any development which impedes the sport	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council supported the strategy to reduce the need for out-commuting and the strategy to redevelop Market Square, which is key for the area travel plan. Provision of high-quality walking, cycling and bus connections into the Market Square should be key considerations. Supported the need to deliver schemes to reduce transport congestion and	Comments noted. CDC and the highways authority have worked together to consider the potential for active travel routes in the Plan.

deliver improved active travel routes. Supported CP71 realignment of Howes Lane and noted that the three other listed schemes (south-east link road, London Road improvements and bus priority route on the Banbury Road) will be further considered through the area travel plan. Supported CP72	
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the land around Langford Park Farm has had very high numbers of wading and migratory birds on it but has since silted up, so queried if any checks have been made on the impact of Graven Hill on wildlife recently • Oxfordshire Keep our NHS Public - the Bicester area needs adequate access to primary care, dentistry, community services for mental health and old age services • Bicester Bike Users Group requested more information on how the currently cycling and walking network will be maintained like active travel corridors, and more detail on the Market Square development and how these plans will offer active travel provision • Community First Oxfordshire - major growth will occur in Bicester and the area strategy proposals will require substantial funding including under a stewardship scheme. The two new strategic sites risk coalescence with smaller villages which local residents do not want; suggested it may be preferable to deliver higher densities in Bicester instead. CP73 needs to be tested in terms of place shaping principles and the adequacy of community facilities. A biodiversity net gain of 10% or higher will be needed to underpin CP73 • Bure Park FC - there is a shortfall of suitable sports facilities	Comments noted. Check on wildlife would be made by BBOWT. The Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the level of infrastructure required to support the development proposed in the Plan. CDC and the highways authority have worked together to consider the potential for active travel routes in the Plan. There are opportunities to provide buffers and planting to reduce the potential/perceived impact of coalescence. There is a playing pitch strategy which supports the Local Plan and identifies the level of supply and therefore deficit/surplus in different sports across the district.

Question 42: What are your views on our aspirations for the Kidlington area?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 6 individuals supported the aspirations for the Kidlington area • Approximately 10 individuals objected to the aspirations for the Kidlington area • Approximately 15 individuals objected to The Moors • Approximately 3 individuals objected to the proposed football stadium • Other comments noted that the aspirations do not mention the football stadium and how that is to be integrated into Kidlington, that there are no details on infrastructure or transport, that there needs to be more services, that bus services require improvement, that there is too much housing and that there has been too much development proposed on the Green Belt	Comments noted. The Moors, an indicative site at Regulation 18 stage is not proposed for allocation. The Council has assessed Cherwell's needs for sports and recreation to inform the Local Plan. Planning applications currently in the planning system, including football stadium proposals, will be assessed on their own merits against adopted Local Plan policies. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out infrastructure requirements, including requirements for both the road network, public transport and community services.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Wooton-by-Woodstock Parish Council - it should be ensured that the Southeast Woodstock developer contributes to a better GP practice and pharmacy in Woodstock, a bus stop on the development site and a cycle lane • Finmere, Sibford Ferris Parish Councils • Ambrosden Parish Council - 4400 houses are disproportionate and questioned if this could be distributed to the brownfield site at Heyford Park • Woodstock Parish Council - concern over LPR2 Southeast of Woodstock as it goes against several aspirations within area strategy. It is not close to Kidlington village centre, and it is difficult to see how the dwellings in that location will meet the housing needs of Kidlington. The development will create an isolated village with no sense of belonging and will not protect the local distinctiveness of the setting of Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp as it will cause coalescence with Woodstock • Yarnton Parish Council supported the aspirations but promoted the area for investment	Comments noted. The 4,400 homes is a reference to commitments which have previously been scrutinised through the previous Local Plan Examination and have therefore been found sound. The Southeast of Woodstock site has been carried forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. Infrastructure requirements, including healthcare, public transport and active travel will all be identified in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Conceptual plans

• Somerton Parish Council - development in the Green Belt should be genuinely exceptional and stated that The Moors does not fall into that category • Kidlington Parish Council – in support, but noted that the plan should be supported by a Kidlington masterplan • Bladon Parish Council - LPR2 goes against the stated aspirations as it is not close to the village centre and stated concern that the development will be an isolated settlement	for the Southeast of Woodstock site are being developed as part of the Regulation 19 plan-making process and the site's overall design will address concerns relating to local distinctiveness and relationship with Kidlington. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Ian Middleton - confusion around the status of Yarnton, Begbroke, Gosford and Water Eaton; they need to be recognised as separate areas not under Kidlington and should have their own section in the plan	Comments noted. The Kidlington Area Strategy plans for existing and new communities in Kidlington, Begbroke, Yarnton, Gosford and Water Eaton and Shipton on Cherwell and Thrupp. Further explanation added to provide clarity. The role of each settlement is considered separately to this and each is acknowledged within the Settlement Hierarchy.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 10 representations supported the aspirations • Other comments included promoting intensification of PR6b, promoting additional sites for development, that there should be more allocations in the area, objection to southeast Woodstock, that it is unclear if exceptional circumstances apply to justify Green Belt release, that Kidlington should be recategorized as a higher order settlement and that the difference between 'Kidlington' and 'Kidlington Area' should be clarified	Comments noted. The Southeast of Woodstock site has been carried forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. Site allocations are selected through a robust site selection process. Suitable sites for development are highlighted within the accompanying HELAA.

	The 'Kidlington area' can be defined as the wider spatial area, including the parishes of Begbroke, Yarnton and Gosford & Water Eaton.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Woodland Trust supported the aspirations to protect and enhance areas of high natural capital value in the Cherwell Valley and the wider region, and to support increased access to nature, open spaces, and the Green Belt. Suggested including the trusts Stratfield Brake site as part of this and that the proposed new stadium should be reflected in the next draft of the Local Plan • Thames Valley Police Designing out Crime - on CP76 regarding the planned football stadium development for Oxford United, it is important that development is individually considered and acknowledged within the Local Plan for Kidlington. Recommended that the plan provides requirements for new residential developments to take into consideration this new development and should prescribe requirements for parking, travel and transport plans which consider the impacts match days will have	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review designates Stratfield Brake Nature Reserve as a Local Green Space.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society - strongly supported the aspirations • Kidlington Development Watch - enough homes are being provided through the partial review sites. Supportive of improvement to public transport and safer routes for cycling and pedestrians however noted that the council should acknowledge the need for car movements	Comments noted. Housing requirement figures will be derived from the standard method in the Local Plan Review. These figures will meet the district's needs over the Plan period to 2042. Road network, public transport and active travel requirements will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Question 43: Do you think these sites in the Kidlington area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 6 individuals supported exploring the sites further • Approximately 18 individuals objected, for reasons including that the sites already identified should be encouraged to build at higher densities to prevent taking more land out of the Green Belt, that there are too many houses already, that Oxford City's unmet need should not be met here, and that the existing allocations will already put pressure on the road network, infrastructure and facilities • Approximately 154 individuals objected to The Moors site for reasons including that it is in the green belt, for its recreational and wildlife value and the impact on infrastructure and services • Other comments included support for The Moors site and objection to South-East Woodstock	Comments noted. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation. Oxford City's unmet housing need will be met through the adopted Partial Review sites. The Partial Review sites have previously been scrutinised through the previous Local Plan Examination and have therefore been found sound.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - yes, excluding green belt areas • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the area should be explored further for potential housing allocation • Woodstock Town Council - if LPR2 is to meet Kidlington's needs then Woodstock TC cannot see how this will be achieved and requested that this site is removed from the plan. The constraints on the site need to be recognised, including the scheduled monument, impact on the setting of a world heritage site and the coalescence of settlements. The development will not integrate with Kidlington and cause infrastructural problems for Woodstock. Concerned that the affordable housing provision won't be available to West Oxfordshire residents • Yarnton Parish Council - concerned over the 450 houses proposed at South-East Woodstock due to the pressure on the A44 • Kidlington Parish Council - there are no exceptional circumstances for the proposed Green Belt revisions and objected to The Moors • Bladon Parish Council objected to LPR2 due to its isolated location and unlikely integration with Kidlington	Comments noted. The Southeast of Woodstock site has been carried forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. Infrastructure requirements for the site have been identified in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Conceptual plans for the Southeast of Woodstock site are being developed as part of the Regulation 19 plan-making process and the site's overall design will address concerns relating to local distinctiveness and relationship with Kidlington. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has assessed the impact of development on the existing heritage assets. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation.

• Ambrosden Parish Council - additional sites are not needed	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 1 representation - sites should not be explored further as it will involve Green Belt release • Approximately 3 representations objected to The Moors • Approximately 2 representations objected to South-East Woodstock • Other comments included support for PR6b, that any allocations should be in accordance with the plan principles and therefore be in sustainable locations with good access to infrastructure, that sites should only be explored further where exceptional circumstances exist, support for South-East Woodstock and support for The Moors	Comments noted. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation. The Southeast of Woodstock site has been carried forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. Infrastructure requirements for the site have been identified in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - LPR2 is sensitive due to its proximity to Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site, and it intersects with the Blenheim Villa Scheduled Monument. Stated that a proportionate heritage impact assessment needs to inform the approach taken at LPR2 and LPR8a to acknowledge its proximity to Kidlington Church Street conservation area and listed buildings. The archaeological potential of the site merits discussion with an archaeological advisor to ensure the approach is suitable and relevant assessments are taken at the appropriate stage • BBOWT – concern for South-East of Woodstock proposed allocation due to the value of some of the on-site habitat and proximity to the nearby SSSI, and concern and objection for North of The Moors proposed allocation due to it taking Kidlington further towards the Lower Cherwell Valley CTA and into the NRN Recovery Zone. The Moors presents a considerable risk to wildlife of the CTA, the river valley through increased recreational impact, hydrological impact, air pollution, ecological isolation and impacts of urbanisation. Concern regarding the potential expansion of Begbroke Scient Park due to the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI • Natural England - LPR2 is close to the AONB and should be subject to a landscape and visual assessment due to its proximity to multiple SSSIs	Comments noted. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation. The Southeast of Woodstock site has been carried forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has assessed the impact of development on existing heritage assets. Conceptual plans for the Southeast of Woodstock site are being developed as part of the Regulation 19 plan-making process and the site's overall design will address concerns relating to landscape value. This work will be informed by the supporting landscape sensitivity assessment evidence.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	

• Oxfordshire County Council - requested additional information on The Moors relating to the nature of the new connections proposed to link OCC land with the rest of the Green Belt. The proposed policy should not have an adverse impact on biodiversity, access to and amenity use of the OCC land. CP81 site 2 Watts Way Piazza does not refer to the need to safeguard the school and requests its inclusion	Comments noted. The Moors site allocation is not proposed for allocation. Policy wording has been amended to address school use safeguards.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• The Oxford Green Belt Network opposed The Moors, and the Lane Southeast of Woodstock proposed allocations • Kidlington Development Watch opposed The Moors and the Land Southeast of Woodstock sites on the grounds that The Moors site falls in the Green Belt and has high recreational and biodiversity value • Cherwell Development Watch Alliance - disagreed with the proposed development in the Kidlington Area and objected to The Moors site due to its Green Belt status and inadequate surrounding local road network. Also objected to the Land Southeast of Woodstock site • The North Oxfordshire Green Party objected to The Moors as it is valued by the community and should be retained as green belt and considered as a local green space. Requested that the Skoda Garage site is considered for the impact on the conservation area, that any development enhances hedgerows bordering it, and that Crown Road is made safer for pedestrians. Added that the Exeter Close development site is not an ideal venue for and should be reallocated	Comments noted. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation. The Southeast of Woodstock site has been carried forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review.

Question 44: Are there any alternative housing sites for the Kidlington area you wish to suggest?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 14 individuals - no • Suggestions included the town centre, shops on Banbury/Oxford Road, land opposite The Jolly Boatman, Freize Farm, Audi garage on the High Street, car park behind Tesco/High Street, Fire Station/Sorting Office, on the Bicester Road and the old St John's nursing home • The plan should densify the sites already allocated, concern over development to green belt land and suggestion to develop only brownfield sites • Approximately 4 individuals objected to The Moors	Comments noted. The HELAA assesses sites which have been put forward through the 'call for sites' process and sets out which of those sites are suitable for development.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Yarnton Parish Council promoted the need for Oxford City to identify alternative housing sites to meet their need • Kidlington Parish Council - there is capacity for high-density mixed development in the village centre and noted that major brownfield sites in the future may come forward for example the Skoda Garage	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review encourages the re-use of previously developed land.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 3 representations - no • Other comments - there is scope to increase density on PR6b, promoting 14-16 Woodstock Road, and there is potential to identify another single site within the village	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• The Oxford Green Belt Network noted the amount of development at Begbroke Science Park which is on Green Belt land.	Comments noted.

	Expansion of Begbroke Science Park already committed. Resolution to approve granted in September 2024. No policy proposed.

Question 45: Do you agree with the employment sites we have selected at Kidlington to accommodate new employment development?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 9 individuals agreed with the employment sites at Kidlington • Approximately 6 individuals objected to the employment sites at Kidlington • Other comments - new employment would bring more traffic and pollution, employment sites should be swapped for housing, and Begbroke Science Park should be limited to the original proposal	Comments noted. Infrastructure requirements for the associated employment allocations will be set out in in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Expansion of Begbroke Science Park already committed. Resolution to approve granted in September 2024. No policy proposed.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council agreed with the employment sites at Kidlington • Yarnton Parish Council – there are enough employment sites already at Kidlington • Kidlington Parish Council supported concentrating employment land along the innovation corridor	Comments noted.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 2 representations agreed with the employment sites at Kidlington • Other comments - additional land is required to meet the economic objectives, support for PR8, and the innovation corridor should be termed science north	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - proposals to expand Begbroke Science Park linked with LPR63 need to respond sensitively to the significance of Begbroke Hill Farmhouse, and listed buildings should be referenced in the text. A proportionate heritage assessment would inform the considerations. Further archaeological assessment may be needed	Comments noted. Expansion of Begbroke Science Park already committed. Resolution to approve granted in September 2024. No policy proposed.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Kidlington Development Watch - the Begbroke Science Park site has proposed an increase in floor space from 46,000 sqm to 155,000 sqm and suggests this should be taken into account due to a substantial increase in employment. Questioned if there is going to be a demand for such a large amount of floorspace and that the new development should be limited to the original proposal • Cherwell Development Watch Alliance concerned over the lack of information regarding the proposed floorspace or likely employment levels	Comments noted. Expansion of Begbroke Science Park already committed. Resolution to approve granted in September 2024. No policy proposed.

Question 46: Are there any alternative sites to accommodate housing and employment needs that you think are more suitable?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals - no • Car parks and existing buildings in the town centre could be repurposed, a greater density could be encouraged and development directed to Upper Heyford • There should be no more building	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review encourages the re-use of previously developed land.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Land south of Station Field Industrial Park, land north of Webb's Way, land west of A4260 Banbury Road, London Oxford Airport and an extension of Oxford Technology Park • Promotion of sites not in Kidlington	Comments noted. Strategic site allocations have been revisited as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review process.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Question 47: Should this Plan adjust Green Belt boundaries in the Langford Lane area in response to recently developed land?

Consultation Responses	Officer Response
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 14 individuals - no • Approximately 7 individuals - yes • Approximately 4 individuals objected to further development on the green belt • Houses should be built next to areas identified as employment hubs, and green belt boundaries should be returned to how they were before the partial review	Comments noted. The Moors site allocation (which falls within the Green Belt) has been omitted from the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - no • Somerton Parish Council - the proposed removal of land from the green belt at Kidlington is unjustified and should be dropped from the plan • Yarnton Parish Council objected due to the impact on wildlife • Kidlington Parish Council - no objection • Ambrosden Parish Council - green belt land should be untouched	Comments noted. The Moors site allocation (which falls within the Green Belt) has been omitted from the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 7 representations - yes, for reasons including that the boundary should be amended to reflect the edge of the existing settlement and so employment sites can be used for their full potential • This should also include land required for further development necessary to meet London Oxford Airports economic needs	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Thames Water supported reviewing the Green Belt boundary in the Langford Lane area as it is necessary to meet the identified employment needs at Kidlington	Comments noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	

• Oxford Preservation Trust - the Local Plan should seek to resist any further releases of Green Belt land over the next Plan period • Oxford Green Belt Network requested that the new Plan is strengthened to prevent large scale development on Green Belt land, which has occurred at Oxford Technology Park • Kidlington Development Watch objected to the development whilst it was in the Green Belt, but, as it is partially developed whether it is in Green Belt does not matter	Comments noted. The Moors site allocation (which falls within the Green Belt) has been omitted from the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review.

Question 48: Should land for employment use be identified at London Oxford Airport?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 13 individuals in support • Approximately 8 individuals objected - the airport should not be expanding due to the climate impact; it is in an inappropriate place, and it is too close to residential areas • It should only be identified if traffic is improved, and recent increase in air traffic has impacted quality of life for residents nearby	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has been amended, noting that London Oxford Airport benefits from permitted development rights which allow for airport related development on the airport's operational land. Any traffic/congestion will be identified within the accompanying Transport Assessment alongside recommended mitigatory measures.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Wooton by Woodstock Parish Council - the government is seeking for Local Plans to address climate control, and also there are conservation areas of water meadows which support wildlife that could stray into the airspace radius. Objected to increased noise activity • Somerton Parish Council - only if there is a convincing need and a cost/benefit study undertaken • Yarnton Parish Council - no • Kidlington Parish Council - it should be addressed in the framework for the area • Ambrosden Parish Council - it is a sensible place for further employment so long as the road network is improved	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has been amended, noting that London Oxford Airport benefits from permitted development rights which allow for airport related development on the airport's operational land. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review includes a policy which seeks to ensure that environmental and health impacts, including air quality and climate change are in compliance with other Development Plan policies.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	

• Approximately 3 representations in support for reasons including that a green belt review is justified and to support sustainable growth • It would result in encroachment into the green belt and risk coalescence with Woodstock	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has been amended, noting that London Oxford Airport benefits from permitted development rights which allow for airport related development on the airport's operational land.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Question 49: Do you have any comments on the transport schemes proposed for the Kidlington area?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals supported improving active travel (walking and cycling measures) and proposed schemes including a cycle path along the A4260, more footpaths and cycle lanes to connect rural areas, footpaths and cycle links to/from the proposed football stadium and investment in the canal path • Approximately 6 individuals - concerns over traffic congestion within Kidlington, particularly regarding the impact of the proposed OUFC stadium and localised traffic around The Moors • Concerns regarding the lack of bus services and lack of railway station between Kidlington and Begbroke	Comments noted. The Moors site allocation has been omitted in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review. Transport requirements, including active travel measures, will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Wootton by Woodstock Parish Council voiced support for a park and Ride at Oxford Airport and a village cluster bus service to enable villagers to access this hub easily. The small plot of land opposite Judd's garage for cars gets full and is a long walk for young children/elderly • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - supported the transport schemes proposed • Woodstock Town Council - concerned over traffic impacts of proposed developments within Kidlington Area Strategy (ie Transport Hub/Park & Ride) not being acknowledged on neighbouring towns/villages outside Cherwell District's boundary, and the strategy only refers to improvements along the A44/A4144 and A4260/A4165 corridors/delivery of Kidlington LCWIP. It is not clear if A44 improvements include Woodstock, and this may mean Woodstock does not receive any mitigation for increases in traffic • Yarnton Parish Council noted the importance of Sandy Lane and objected to its closure. Also, active travel measures are not as feasible for the elderly population • Shipton-On-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council - the local transport infrastructure is poor and requires investment for benefits to be fully realised • Kidlington Parish Council - mitigatory measures and bus service improvements are needed • Bladon Parish Council queried whether proposed developments in Kidlington take into account traffic impacts for neighbouring villages outside Cherwell's boundary	Comments noted. The A44 P&R/mobility hub will continue to be considered as a strategic transport infrastructure requirement in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out transport requirements over the Plan period. This will address current traffic/congestion and will ensure that the local road network has adequate capacity.

What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 5 respondents supported the transport schemes proposed in the Kidlington Area • London Oxford Airport site offers unique ability to accommodate strategic public transport infrastructure to support sustainable housing growth due to its location along the A44, and push for transport schemes to be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Comments noted. The A44 P&R/mobility hub will continue to be considered as a strategic transport infrastructure requirement in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include a project schedule that details transport schemes required to accommodate the growth earmarked in the Plan.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Woodland Trust - additional proposals may be needed to support safe and sustainable transport to the proposed new OUFC stadium • Thames Valley Police Designing Out Crime - noted football traffic impacts, new pedestrian crossing facilities required, roads may close during entry and egress phase of football matches and impact this will have on road infrastructure e.g. A4165 and A4260/Park & Ride should be explored further	Comments noted. Transport requirements, including active travel and road measures, will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Oxford Preservation Trust - the Oxford North development is located immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the district. With such a large employment and housing site close to Oxford Parkway station, the Council should consider including potential pedestrian/cycle routes from the edge of this site, northwards, towards Oxford Parkway and onwards towards Kidlington • Banbury Civic Society supported the re-opening of Kidlington Railway Station on the Oxford-Banbury route	Comments noted. Cross-boundary matters, including large development sites, have been discussed with Oxford City Council and other neighbouring authorities.

	Transport requirements, including active travel and road measures, will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Question 50: Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes in the Kidlington area?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• The A44 scheme will have little impact on Kidlington village centre and improvements should be made within Kidlington such as cycle access along the canal and from Bunkers Hill to Shipton-Thrupp and Kidlington. Other proposed ideas include placing new housing near transport hubs, improving the strategic cycle network and installing a European-style tram from Kidlington to Oxford • Concerns over the impact of development and associated congestion and public safety issues in Kidlington	Comments noted. A number of A44 road improvements have been retained as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. Transport requirements, including active travel and road measures, will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Yarnton Parish Council - Sandy Lane should be safeguarded for vehicular traffic and the closure does not support the Kidlington Area Strategy • Kidlington Parish Council proposed the provision of a canal side path for pedestrians and cyclists from Kidlington into Oxford, separate from the existing towpath	Comments noted. A canal side path would be supported by Policies in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• One respondent stated that priority bus routes should be safeguarded	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society - land for a new Kidlington railway station should be safeguarded	Comments noted.

Question 51: Do you have any comments on the green and blue infrastructure proposed for the Kidlington area?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 4 individuals objected to The Moors proposed allocation • Approximately 4 individuals objected to Green Belt release • Approximately 2 individuals – concern over the existing community facility offering in Kidlington and stated that there is potential to expand the existing medical centre, nursery and youth centre. There is potential to develop further dentist practices and improve the Oxford Canal and River Cherwell corridors • Support for Kidlington Parish Council's proposed local green space designations, and solar infrastructure should be confined to brownfield and residential rooftops	Comments noted. The Moors site allocation has been omitted in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review. Community infrastructure requirements, including provision for healthcare and community facilities will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Plan includes a policy on renewable energy which states that renewable energy proposals will be supported provided that issues can be satisfactorily addressed.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Yarnton Parish Council - the Plan misrepresents the Yarnton Parish boundaries. They welcomed the extension of health care services and sports facilities at the planned secondary school • Shipton-On-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council - supported transitioning to renewable energy but objected to large scale solar farms on green belt land • Kidlington Parish Council - more emphasis on the Green Ring around Kidlington is needed if the development at The Moors is withdrawn; then, there will be a request for the LGS designation to be reassessed. Improvements to the Oxford Canal would be supported	Comments noted. The Plan includes a policy on renewable energy which states that renewable energy proposals will be supported provided that issues can be satisfactorily addressed. The policy adds that a locally significant issue is the Green Belt (particularly visual impacts on its openness). The Moors site allocation has been omitted in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review

What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• The green and blue infrastructure plan is incorrect for LPR8a and opposition to future changes brought about by CP80 that would increase footfall	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - reference to Oxford Canal Conservation Area Appraisal in CP80 is needed, specifically acknowledging the need to refer to the appraisal when considering new schemes that could impact on its significance/recognise opportunities for delivering positive outcomes. Historic England objected to CP81 and stated that reference to the Conservation Area Appraisal for Kidlington is needed • The Woodland Trust - supported measures to protect/enhance access along the Oxford Canal Walk to Stratfield Brake, and improved footways and canal crossing points. Encouraged better linking of habitats across the area and noted that trees and hedgerows can play an important role in improving connectivity/resilience/environmental quality of the new neighbourhoods • BBOWT welcomed CP80, but reference should be made to maximising wildlife value of these green spaces wherever possible, both for biodiversity reasons and the positive role they play for mental and physical health	Comments noted. Policy wording amended to make reference to the Oxford Canal Conservation Area Appraisal. Improving connections between wildlife corridors and protected sites is a key requirement of the Regulation 19 policy which seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Oxford Green Belt Network supported Kidlington Parish Council's aim to form a ring of green spaces around Kidlington • Kidlington Development Watch welcomed the projects proposed and promoted the reference to the green ring promoted by Kidlington Parish Council	Comments noted.

Question 52: Do you have any views on the proposed changes to the village centre?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 4 individuals would like to see lower vacancy rates in existing retail premises and a more diverse array of shops in Kidlington • Proposals for more nighttime/evening uses and pedestrianised areas (extended to Co-op corner) in Kidlington, and others proposed to lower business rates to encourage businesses into the area • Concerns over the impact of the proposed football club proposals on evening leisure uses at weekends	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review seeks to improve the cultural and leisure/night-time economy offer in Kidlington. The Area Strategy also seeks to deliver safe and inclusive routes that facilitate car free movements.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Somerton Parish Council - it is unclear why the change to the village boundary is necessary • Shipton-on-Cherwell & Thrupp Parish Council - despite Kidlington being designated as a service centre, it has lost many services, and these should be encouraged • Kidlington Parish Council welcomed the regeneration of the village centre and requested more emphasis on the development on the west of Oxford Road plus traffic calming measures. Objected to more shops in the village centre but advocated for a better planned and attractive mix of shops	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review seeks to promote an enhanced role for Kidlington as a local service centre with new businesses.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• One respondent - there is scope to improve the village centre	Comments noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Question 53: Do you have any views on the areas of change identified?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals objected to The Moors proposed allocation and cited concerns regarding the release of Green Belt land, potential road congestion and localised flooding • Approximately 3 individuals objected to the level of development proposed in the Plan for Kidlington. Concerns regarding potential traffic congestion, the coalescence of Kidlington with Oxford and Yarnton, and the need to develop brownfield sites first (to preserve greenfield sites) • Concerns over the potential loss of Exeter Hall and potential incompatibility of proposed uses at the Skoda Garage next to adjacent quiet residential areas	Comments noted. The Moors Regulation 18 stage indicative site is not proposed for allocation. No Green Belt releases proposed. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out road improvement requirements to mitigate against local congestion. Opportunity areas in the Kidlington area will be subject to a criteria-based policy to guide the development of these sites.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Kidlington Parish Council - the village centre plan needs extending	Comments noted.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• One respondent welcomed The Moors proposed allocation	Comments noted. The Moors Regulation 18 stage indicative site is not proposed for allocation.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - more nuance is merited regarding Exeter Close and the potential impact on Kidlington Crown Road Conservation Area - reference is needed to the Conservation Area Appraisal for Kidlington (Crown Road Conservation Area)	Comments noted Reference to the Kidlington Crown Road Conservation Area Appraisal in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	

• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Question 54: Are there any other opportunity areas or sites that we should be including?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Land off Yarnton Road (by the canal) and the Skoda Garage site should be considered further	Comments noted. Opportunity areas in the Kidlington area have been carried forward in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review and will be subject to a criteria-based policy to guide the development of these sites.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Kidlington Parish Council - the back of the shops and adjacent lane on the northwest of the High Street needs to be upgraded, with parking provision at the back of the shops	Comments noted. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review seeks to promote an enhanced role for Kidlington as a local service centre with new businesses.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• The expanded Oxford Technology Park at Langford Lane and Land North of Webbs Way sites should be considered • No further opportunities for sites in Kidlington due to the highly constrained nature of the area and associated infrastructure capacity issues	Comments noted. All sites submitted through the HELAA process have been assessed through an agreed methodology in determining the most appropriate sites to allocate in meeting the overall local plan strategy and housing requirement.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Chapter 6 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Kidlington Area Strategy chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals objected to developing housing on green belt land • Approximately 20 individuals objected to the proposed Moors allocation. Reasons cited included inadequate access, potential congestion issues, loss of wildlife-rich area, loss of dog walking area, insufficient details on supporting infrastructure, the loss of historic setting at St Mary's Church and potential on-site flooding issues • Concern over infrastructure capacity – particularly the local road network, the scale of development planned or proposed at Kidlington, the loss of commercial land and potential climate change issues in relation to (failing to) develop energy efficient homes	Comments noted. The Moors has not been included as an allocation in the Plan. Transport requirements, and road measures, will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Draft policies address the requirement to build energy efficient homes
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Wotton by Woodstock Parish Council - the Southeast Woodstock site should be considered as a Woodstock development and enhance its services/infrastructure rather than a Kidlington site	Comments noted. All sites submitted through the HELAA process have been assessed through an agreed methodology in determining the most appropriate sites to allocate in meeting the overall local plan strategy and housing requirement.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Ian Middleton - large parts of Begbroke Science Park are in Yarnton and Begbroke and there is opportunity in the new plan to correct the error. The 14.7ha of land that was 'reserved' in the LPR now appears to be 'allocated' and this represents planning creep. Oxford City is promoting an excessive level of growth and the overall level of housing proposed for Cherwell is 36% higher than required by the Government's Standard Method	Comments noted.
What the development industry said:	
• Respondents queried what the requirements/obligations are of policy wording in CP78 that "all developments in the Kidlington area will be required to contribute", and others requested a	The requirements of policy CP78, now Policy KID3, are set out within the policy that is explained within the supporting text and

Green Belt review of land around the Airport and Langford Lane to allow for employment needs to be met in and around Kidlington	Planning Obligations SPD, that will be reviewed and updated as necessary.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England - Stratfield Brake sports ground is constrained, and other sites should be considered for a sport hub. In the long term, Stratfield Brake could be developed for housing • The Woodland Trust – it is important to review the area strategy in light of the new stadium proposals with associated impacts on biodiversity, environmental management, landscape, transport, leisure provision and the local economy	Comments noted. The Council has commissioned a Playing Pitch Strategy to assess the requirement for enhancement to existing provision and requirement for new provision. Habitat assessments will be required (as necessary) as part of any formal application for new development. The Local Plan includes policies to support and enhance the environment and biodiversity net gain.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council - CP76 should be supported by the Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP); reference to the August 2023 version of the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan should be referenced in CP78; the safeguarding of land for the A44 P&R/Transport Hub and proposed cycle and walking route network in Kidlington's Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plan (LCWIP) are supported; and policies CP80 and CP81 are supported. OUFC's proposals for a new stadium on the Triangle site in Kidlington are not included within the Plan consultation, and they would be interested in commenting should a draft policy for the site be prepared	Comments noted. The supporting text of policy KID3 'Delivery of Transport within the Kidlington Area' makes specific reference to the Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plan.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Oxfordshire Keep our NHS Public - the Kidlington area needs adequate access to primary care, dentistry, community services for mental health and old age services • Community First Oxfordshire - there is significant growth area north of Oxford and more housing is planned, which may mean Kidlington becomes a congested suburb. Losses of character will need substantial investment in blue and green infrastructure, the 20-minute neighbourhood and healthy place shaping, and there is limited comment on the latter. Service	Comments noted. The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule to assess the suitability of existing infrastructure and the impact that new development would have on infrastructure

charges are not a recommended way forward when trying to integrate a place and that once a plan for placemaking is established, the items can be costed, and an endowment basis worked out. Noted that CIL and S106 will need to be applied • Greenway objected to the loss of green belt north of Oxford in the partial review, particularly development of the North Oxford Golf Club as the course occupies an important part of the strategic 'Kidlington Gap'. Remaining green belt is even more under threat, contributes to biodiversity, woodland, hedgerow cover and as a carbon/pollution sink as well as being of critical importance to physical and mental health. If reluctant to develop the suggestion, it is important to secure reprovision on allocated PR6c (Frieze Farm)	provision. This data is then used to understand what will be required and can be delivered through planning obligations, infrastructure provider planning and funding bids. The Partial Review has been assessed through the public examination process and found sound. The Green Belt is not being altered through this Local Plan process.

Question 55: Do you have any views on our aspirations for Heyford Park?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 5 individuals raised concerns over the scale of development proposed at Heyford Park and added that it is too large • Approximately 5 individuals concerned over the lack of existing and planned transport infrastructure at/linking to Heyford Park, particularly with regard to the cumulative impact of development on Junction 10. • Some agreed with the aspirations of Heyford Park and welcomed the 'brownfield first' approach • Approximately 4 individuals - insufficient development planned on brownfield sites in Upper Heyford • Concerns over the impact of development on Cold War-era heritage assets at Heyford Park and concerns regarding future development boundaries and the coalescence of land to the south merging into Caulcott and extension into Rousham Conservation Area	The comments are noted. The Regulation 18 Local Plan indicative sites for Heyford are being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Lower Heyford Parish Council - the strategy does not recognise that to deliver further transport investment the impacts on surrounding rural network may be unavoidable and that the rural roads would be unsuitable for large volumes of traffic • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - the aspirations for Heyford Park are appropriate and welcomed • Somerton Parish Council - the allocation for 1235 dwellings should be changed/removed until traffic issues have been addressed. Supported brownfield first as long as the infrastructure (particularly health/education/recreational/transport can support and the impact on nearby villages are considered • Middleton Stoney Parish Council objected to further development at Heyford Park until traffic issues are resolved	The contents of the comments are noted. The Highways Authority – Oxfordshire County Council are objecting to any new allocations for Heyford due a range of transport related reasons. The Highways Authority and CDC are fully aware and acknowledge the existing traffic and highways issues impacting Middleton Stoney and adjacent villages which they highlighted in their response to the most recent Regulation 18 CDC Local Plan consultation.

	It is acknowledged that there were local objections to the previous proposal for the provision of a bus gate at Middleton Stoney. The existing planning permissions at Heyford including planning permission ref 18/00825 still need to deliver the required mitigation in relation to that development as detailed in the relevant permissions and associated legal agreements.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 2 respondents supported the aspirations for Heyford Park • Approximately 4 respondents - concerns over the phasing and delivery of the existing allocation at Heyford Park and the dependencies of the proposed allocation on the delivery of the existing allocation • Approximately 2 respondents - concerns over Heyford Park's position in the proposed settlement hierarchy and stated that there are more sustainable sites in higher order settlements	These comments are noted. The existing allocation at Heyford Park is subject to the requirements of the existing planning permissions, planning conditions and the relevant legal agreements.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - the strategy should recognise the importance of the flying field as being of international interest (only Cold War airbase in country to survive in Cold War form) and recommended making this explicit in the strategy for Heyford Park. They provided 2 potential policy wording changes to address the above point • The Woodland Trust - it is disappointing that the aspirations for Heyford Park are silent on opportunities to improve the natural environment. The quantity and quality of blue and green	The comments are noted. CDC acknowledge and agree with Historic England regarding the importance of the flying field and its historically context.

infrastructure should be improved, key habitats should be protected/enhanced, and peoples access to nature should be improved	CDC have commissioned a Landscape Impact Assessment, and a Habitats Regulation Assessment which form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society - ensuring preservation and interpretation of the site's heritage assets is needed • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum – objected to the proposal for future development to be located on greenfield land, which is against the council's brownfield first policy	The comments are noted

Question 56: Do you agree with the local service role for Heyford Park proposed in Core Policy 35 (Settlement Hierarchy)?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 4 individuals agreed with the local service role for Heyford Park • Approximately 5 individuals disagreed with the local service role for Heyford Park • Concerns over planned infrastructure not yet being delivered and a lack of supporting existing and planning public transport. One individual noted that Heyford Park should retain its status as a rural area	The comments are noted. We are aware that planned infrastructure still needs to be delivered in relation to the existing planning permissions for Heyford Park

What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere and Sibford Ferris Parish Councils agreed with the local service role for Heyford Park • Somerton Parish Council objected on the grounds that further work is required before it is possible to making an informed comment on this matter. More community facilities are needed at Heyford Park, and transport issues need to be addressed	The comments are noted.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 2 respondents agreed with the local service role for Heyford Park • Approximately 2 respondents - Heyford Park should be classified as a 'larger village' • Concerns over the lack of reference to heritage assets at RAF Upper Heyford, and the proposed development would place additional strain on routes around Bicester	The comments are noted, and Historic England has also raised the importance of the flying fields and reference to the past heritage.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England acknowledged that the scale of proposed development merits consideration of Heyford Park as a local service centre but objected to development within the former airfield (linked with employment use) if the service centre expands beyond current ambitions. Welcomed the local plan commitment (in paragraph 7.10) stating "we do not consider that intensification should be considered at the expense of protecting the environmental and heritage value of Heyford Park."	The comments of Historic England are noted. It is noted that Historic England support the local plan commitment in paragraph 7.10 of the Regulation 18 version that states, "we do not consider that intensification should be considered at the expense of protecting the environmental and heritage value of Heyford Park." The Regulation 18 Local Plan indicative draft site for Heyford are being removed from the Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team from Oxfordshire County Council.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	

• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society and Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum agreed with the local service role for Heyford Park	The comments are noted. It should be noted that Heyford Park now has its own designated Neighbourhood Area.

Question 57: Do you think we should be considering employment uses alongside the potential allocation for more homes in the longer term at Heyford Park?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 10 individuals agreed • Approximately 2 individuals disagreed • Approximately 2 individuals - the allocation at Heyford Park should be employment focused, with less residential uses allocated • Other comments - development at Heyford Park is already too big and creates lots of traffic congestion, the site is well-located with good transport links to the north and east – with potential benefits deriving from the opening of Ardley Station, and the heritage potential of the site could create heritage-related job opportunities	The comments are noted. Aside from the employment land that already has planning consent, there is no further employment land proposed to be allocated for Heyford Park.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - possibly • Lower Heyford Parish Council objected to further employment at Heyford Park due to the impact on the environment of commuter and goods traffic on rural roads and villages which are seen as unsuitable for heavy traffic, and routing agreements do not provide sufficient protection • Somerton Parish Council - no, not in the absence of further evidence being made available. Development on the site should be employment focused rather than predominantly residential • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - employment uses alongside potential allocation for more homes in the longer term at Heyford Park should be considered • Middleton Stoney Parish Council objected to further development at Heyford Park until traffic issues are resolved	The comments are noted. There are no employment land allocations proposed at Heyford Park within this draft Local Plan. The Local Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and CDC are aware acknowledge the traffic congestion and environmental problems for Middleton Stoney and adjacent villages. The consented schemes at Heyford Park including 18/00825/HYBRID need to deliver their planned and agreed mitigation packages including those relating to highways and sustainable transport.
What the Ward Councillors said:	

• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 2 respondents agreed • Approximately 2 respondents - sufficient transport infrastructure needs to be implemented to make this site a sustainable location • Others queried how a vision for an expanded Heyford Park would relate to the 20-minute neighbourhood principle	These comments are noted. The consented schemes at Heyford Park including 18/00825/HYBRID need to deliver their planned and agreed mitigation packages including those relating to highways and sustainable transport.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - to fulfil commitment in paragraph 7.10 they would not support employment uses if they are implemented at the expense of the heritage significance of Heyford Park	These comments are noted. Aside from the existing planning permissions for Heyford Park including 18/00825/HYBRID, there are no new employment allocations proposed for Heyford Park within this draft Local Plan.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society – yes, but shouldn't be very large sheds • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum objected to further logistics and employment uses at Heyford Park which generate HGV use until new road infrastructure can be delivered. However, recognised that there may be opportunities for small scale employment at Heyford Park	These comments are noted. There is no new employment allocations proposed for Heyford Park within this draft Local Plan. Heyford Park already has consent for 35,175 sqm of employment as part of the previously consented planning permission reference 18/00825/HYBRID. The Regulation 18 indicative draft residential site for Heyford is being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by

	the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team.

Question 58: Do you have any comments on the potential allocation at Heyford Park?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 7 individuals supported redevelopment of brownfield land at Heyford Park • Approximately 4 individuals raised concerns over the large scale of development proposed at Heyford Park • Others raised concerns over the impact of further development on supporting transport infrastructure, whilst others made reference to the site's Cold War heritage and noted that an allocation should be subject to a heritage assessment	The comments are noted The Regulation 18 indicative draft residential site for Heyford known as H1 and H2 are being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Lower Heyford Parish Council - an additional 1,250 houses would constitute unsustainable development • Somerton Parish Council - brownfield first and the 1,235 proposed dwellings should be removed or reduced. There is a need for improvements to pedestrian access around Somerton, The Heyfords, Ardley and the Astons • Heyford Park Parish Council strongly objected to plans to develop greenfield land at Heyford Park for additional housing	These comments are noted. Currently an existing development for 1,175 dwellings and 35,175 sqm and associated other matters has planning permission and construction has been started at Heyford Park planning application reference number 18/00825. This also includes associated Section 106 and Section 278 legal agreements which details the planned and agreed infrastructure and mitigation requirements.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	

• Respondents queried how wider transport improvements will be delivered and funded, and suggested there is scope for more housing and employment at Heyford Park in addition to what is already proposed	The comments are noted. The Regulation 18 indicative draft site for Heyford known as H1 and H2 are being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team. The comments submitted by Historic England regarding the historic flying fields are noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England supported the potential allocation but raised several concerns including the need for a proportionate heritage impact assessment, clarity on what the proposed massing of buildings will be on-site and the potential impacts on the Rousham Conservation Area. The strategy map should reflect the historical significance of the site • The Woodland Trust – concerns over LPR42a (Land south of Heyford Park) as it is adjacent at the northeast corner to an area of ancient semi-natural woodland (Kennel Copse.) Objected to the inclusion of areas of ancient woodland within development sites and where they are adjacent to ancient woodland. Recommended a precautionary 50m buffer between developments and ancient woodland including through the construction phase. Buffers create new habitat/native woodland around existing ancient woodland, help reverse historic fragmentation, contribute to biodiversity net gain and provide accessible green space for nearby residents • BBOWT - concerns over Land south of Heyford Park as the area is rich in high value wildlife sites and species. The cumulative impact along with the potential nearby proposed NSIP as well as continuing development at Heyford Park is of great concern. Additionally, the site is adjacent and possibly overlaps with the CTA • Natural England – concerns over the cumulative impact of development on the SSSI and the potential increased recreational pressure	The comments are noted. The Regulation 18 indicative draft site for Heyford known as H1 and H2 are being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team. The comments are noted in relation to the area of ancient semi-natural woodland known as Kennel Copse. The comments are noted in relation to the fact that the area is has a high value area of wildlife sites and species and the cumulative impact of any development in that area.

	The consideration for the impact on the SSSI is noted.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society - 1,235 appears to be enough housing and objected to the landowner's brownfield first campaign to allow allocation of land for a further 500 houses	The comments are noted. The Regulation 18 indicative draft sites for Heyford known as sites H1 and H2 are being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team. Alongside the comments received from Historic England.

Question 59: Do you have any views on the principle of phased development at Heyford Park subject to implementation of the approved masterplan and the delivery of transport infrastructure?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 3 individuals – concerned over the lack of supporting transport infrastructure and added that congestion to M40 J11, J10 and J9 is an issue, there is a lack of bus routes to Oxford and improved pedestrian access around Somerton/Heyfords/Ardley/Astons is required • Approximately 2 individuals - concern over the large quantum of development proposed at Heyford Park • Other comments - larger infrastructure should be delivered now to accommodate the development, the Council should not ignore a sustainable brownfield site in favour of rural villages, and support for CP83 and CP84	The comments are noted. The Regulation 18 indicative draft Heyford sites are being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team. In addition to the comments received from Historic England concerning the historic context of the flying fields.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Somerton Parish Council - concern over the lack of supporting infrastructure at Heyford Park (particularly healthcare/transport/education facilities and recreational uses). Questioned how S106 is being utilised, and there should be a greater focus on protecting pedestrians from traffic	Heyford Park has a range of current planning permissions. One of the main application references 18/00825/HYBRID along with the associated Section 106 and Section 278 Agreements sets out the currently agreed Infrastructure package and the triggers for the delivery of that infrastructure and/ or the payments related to that infrastructure. Heyford Park has also now formed its own Neighbourhood Area and will be looking to produce its own Neighbourhood Plan.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	

• Some noted that infrastructure should be in place prior to residential development coming forward, whilst others questioned the pace of delivery/build out rates and noted that careful monitoring should occur. One noted that the local plan does not provide framework for future development past current masterplan (2022) and that a phased approach should be adopted pre-2030 to support the delivery of transport infrastructure	The Regulation 18 indicative draft site for Heyford is being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team. This is also due to the objections raised by Historic England in relation to the historic flying fields.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury Civic Society supported phased development at Heyford Park	These comments are noted.

Question 60: Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes in the Heyford area?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals supported a new train station, provided it is well-integrated and sensitively designed with cycling and walking links • There should be a transport hub, schemes should be integrated with community services, and the canal towpath should be made usable in all-weather to encourage walking to the train station	The comments are noted. The Oxfordshire County Councils Local Transport and Connectivity Plan and associated strategies detail all of the policies for Oxfordshire. This includes a Rail Strategy, a Cycling Strategy and a Walking Strategy. Network Rail are currently responsible for decisions in relation to the rail network and work in partnership with the various rail franchises. There is currently no proposed train station and new rail proposals for Heyford. The Canals and Rivers Trust are the responsible organisation in relation to the Canals. The principle of sustainable travel in the appropriate, accessible and safe locations across Oxfordshire including by rail, cycle and walking is promoted and supported by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council. It is recognised that sustainable forms of transport and movement reduce air pollution, improve air quality and improve health and well-being and social cohesion.

What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• There is a need for flexibility regarding safeguarded land, transport improvements could undermine the delivery of Policy Villages 5, and the evidence supporting Ardley Station is unclear – particularly regarding land ownership. One supported the bus spine road, commuter cycle link, junction improvements at B430 and J10 and Ardley Station	The comments are noted.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Chapter 7 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Heyford Park Area Strategy chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals - the delivery of public transport schemes is critical in this area – particularly the connections to Bicester and Oxford and installing a bus stop at Caulcott turn • Concerns over the lack of consultation questions on Upper Heyford's Cold War heritage and the Plan's intention to build more homes adjacent to an existing allocation (Upper Heyford)	The comments are noted. Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire County Council Highways Authority agree that public transport schemes are critical in this area including in relation to the existing approved development. In relation to Upper Heyford's Cold War Heritage, Historic England and a number of individuals have submitted consultation comments raising these facts and seeking to protect that heritage.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Heyford Park Parish Council - there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the proposed development at Heyford Park	These comments are noted. There is a range of infrastructure that forms part of the mitigation package that was approved as part of planning application 18/00825 and is also detailed specifically in the associated Section 106 and Section 278 Legal Agreements. Heyford Park is now a designated Neighbourhood Area, and they are now going to produce their own Neighbourhood Plan.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

What the development industry said:	
• 1 respondent supported the LPR42A site development template but noted that constraints listed have since been addressed	The comments are noted. The Regulation 18 Local Plan draft site allocations for Heyford are being removed from the draft Local Plan due to the objections raised by the Highways Authority of Oxfordshire County Council and due to objections raised by the Minerals and Waste Team.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sport England - disappointed that the proposed sports hub is missing from the Heyford Strategy Map and is not referenced within the document • Historic England supported CP85 • County Water - the Heyford Park Sewage Treatment Works (HPSTW) should be considered as critical infrastructure and the plan relating to LPR42 includes the HPSTW within the proposed site. They advised that the HPSTW should be removed from the proposed site boundary and clearly delineated on the amended plan. Requested that CDC consider the requirement for a Cordon Sanitaire around the HPSTW	The comments are noted from Sports England in relation to the sports hub. The comments from Historic England are noted. The comments from County Water are noted in relation to Heyford Park Sewage Treatment Works which needs to have capacity to serve the currently consented development at Heyford Park and existing development which it serves as well as allocated development with the current adopted Cherwell Local Plan. County Water will need to provide details of their current landownership in relation to Heyford Park Sewage Treatment Works, any current details of plans for the Sewage Treatment Works including extensions, what land needs to be safeguarded. County Water need to provide further details in relation to their proposed cordon sanitaire boundary that they propose to have around the works so that

	Cherwell District Council can consider this proposal and whether they will add a policy and amend the Local Plan proposals map in relation to this.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council - supported CP83 and the requirement for further transport investment as this is a challenging location to deliver sustainable transport connectivity. Supported the safeguarding of the following schemes in CP84 - a new spine road, a commuter cycle route to Bicester linking to an improved bridleway to Bicester to the east of Heyford Park, capacity upgrades to M40 Junction 10 along with wider highway capacity improvements and Upgrading of the access road to the B430 to the east of Heyford Park. Additional development at Heyford Park would need to incorporate the expansion of primary and secondary school. They anticipate the need for a 2.22ha site for a new primary school and possibly additional sports provision for the secondary school	The comments and Infrastructure requirements are noted. The Council note the requirements of the Highways Authority. There could be additional requirements which are a result of outputs from transport modelling. The Council note the current requirements of the Local Education Authority in relation Education and associated additional sports provision.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Oxfordshire Keep our NHS Public - the Heyford Park area needs adequate access to primary care, dentistry, community services for mental health and old age services • Community First Oxfordshire - as a new settlement, Heyford Park has already had substantial development and land allocated in the current Local Plan, and it is not sensible to allocate further land for development. If there is a case for more housing, a new station at Ardley should be facilitated by the developer through contributions ahead of development and if not feasible the settlement should be limited in scale. Additionally, it does not merit more housing to support more infrastructure as this would be contrary to the usual needs-based approach to infrastructure provision. Suggested car borne traffic be restricted through measures such as safe walking routes and segregated cycleways; 20-minute neighbourhood principles should apply in all placemaking here	The comments are noted. The Council are consulting the local Integrated Care Board and Oxfordshire County Council in relation to the current and future health related services and have requested that they provide details of their current strategy and plans. These discussions are ongoing. All statutory and formal health care providers are able to submit their formal representations (consultation comments) to the next Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation which contains a health section and health policies and organisations and individuals will be able to review and comment on the associated evidence base which will include an

	Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out details of the required and proposed health infrastructure. There is an existing railway station in Lower Heyford but we understand the frequency of the service is very limited. Land for a station at Ardley is proposed to be safeguarded in the Reg 18 plan. Currently there is not a railway station proposed at Heyford Park. Oxfordshire County Council are responsible for producing the Rail Strategy which forms part of their Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.

Question 61: Do you have any views on our aspirations for our Rural Areas?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 5 individuals objected to the Plan's aspirations for rural areas • Approximately 5 individuals supported the Plan's aspirations for rural areas • Other concerns on specific matters that form part of the aspirations in the rural areas, such as the need for the following: to address public transport issues in rural areas, enhanced active travel infrastructure provision in rural areas, the implementation of a brownfield first approach, protection of rural areas and wildlife, development of green buffers, inclusion of a definition of 'important' landscapes are, conservation of farmland for food security, preservation of settlement boundaries and the Green Belt, protection of village character/identity • Concerns over the proposed developments at Chesterton Bucknell and Nethercote Lane/Banbury Lane, and over inadequate supporting infrastructure and the encroachment of settlements	An assessment of services/infrastructure in rural areas has been undertaken, this assessment has informed a Rural Areas Strategy that will be included within the Regulation 19 Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will form part of the Local Plan Evidence base its role is to assess existing infrastructure and future requirements that may be necessary as a result of additional development. The Local Plan includes policies that will protect settlements from merging. CDC have commissioned a Landscape Impact Assessment, and a Habitats Regulation Assessment which form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. No Green Belt releases proposed
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - the Green Belt should be protected • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council queried how 'important' landscapes are defined and stated that parish councils should be involved in the development of the Rural Areas Strategy • Bourtons Parish Council welcomed the change in the classifications of the villages and hope that the 500 rural housing figure will prevent speculative developments. For the policy to be effective and address speculative development in rural locations, they would prefer if all sites	No Green Belt releases propose. Criteria is set out in both the Local Plan and National Policy to project Green Belt land. Landscape character appraisals form part of the evidence base work for the Local Plan with some areas being designated and protected.

were identified through the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan process, with an added opportunity to discuss the merits of each site put forward • Drayton Parish Council supported the Rural Areas Strategy but hold concerns over the 500 rural housing figure and would only support rural exception sites within the village • Horley Parish Council - only infill sites should be accepted in rural areas • Somerton Parish Council - rural spaces should be protected as much as possible and the number of homes proposed in rural areas is a concern • Shenington Parish Council supported the 500 rural housing figure provided that they are concentrated on the larger villages utilising brownfield sites. Objected to building on greenfield or in small villages without infrastructure to support, or solar farms on arable land • Caversfield Parish Council welcomed the element of the strategy that requires areas to be specifically included in the local or neighbourhood plan before development is allowed • Cropredy Parish Council supported the Rural Areas Strategy • Fringford Parish Council - smaller villages should be looked at on a case-by-case basis to ensure future development is about right properties in right places. Supportive of plans to assess capacity potential at Heyford Park • Bletchingdon Parish Council supported the Rural Areas Strategy, particularly the protection of the Green Belt Middleton Stoney Parish Council - rural areas should be underpinned with strategy to reduce road traffic through villages • Launton Parish Council objected to the Plan's proposal of directing development 'solely' to larger villages • Horton cum Studley Parish Council - broadly supported the Rural Areas Strategy but questioned how protection of the Green Belt will be achieved • Bodicote Parish Council questioned the detail regarding where the 500 houses for rural areas will be allocated and calls for the rural periphery of Bodicote to be protected • Stoke Lyne and Stratton Audley Parish Councils - 'avoid unplanned development in the open countryside' policy wording is too weak, and there should be more emphasis on sustainable transport and active travel. Stratton Audley Parish Council welcomed clarification on a definition of 'local' and what 'local and community needs' are.	The Council cannot stop applications for speculative development being submitted, however all applications are assessed again adopted Local Plan and National Planning Policy. A rural area strategy is included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan that sets out the proposals for development in rural areas. Neighbourhood Plans can allocate development sites in their plans. Where a Neighbourhood Plan is not in place, or the Parish does not wish to allocate sites the Local Plan through an appropriate assessment of local services and infrastructure will make an allowance for some development in suitable rural settlements. Policies in the Local Plan promote active travel and sustainable transport.

• Hanwell Parish Council - settlement boundaries should be clearly defined to prevent unchecked development	
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - the rural areas strategy should also apply to Nethercote and the area should be protected explicitly in the rural area strategy of the local plan	Nethercote falls within Category C Villages 'All other Villages 'of the Settlement Hierarchy of the Regulation 19 Local Plan. Only infill development within the built-up limits of the settlements, conversions and development in accordance with Policies RUR 2-5 may be appropriate.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 7 respondents requested further clarification on what the spatial strategy is for rural areas, particularly for smaller rural settlements • Approximately 6 respondents objected to the aspiration to limit development in the rural areas by directing development largely to the larger settlements. All stated that rural areas could provide additional housing • Approximately 4 respondents objected to the policy wording of 'tight management of speculative development and...' on the grounds that it is too restrictive and does not promote innovation • Approximately 3 respondents - the rural housing figure of 500 new homes is too low and should be increased • Approximately 2 respondents - the rural housing figure of 500 new homes is arbitrary • Others commented that the rural area strategy is negatively phrased, would fail to meet strategic objectives, fails to refer to building on previously developed land and warrants a separate chapter/section to state the importance of rural areas within the district	The Spatial Strategy is defined at Policy SP1: Settlement Hierarchy of the Regulation 19 Local Plan. Settlement categories and types of development that may be appropriate for all areas in the district including rural areas is set our here. Chapter 8 of the Regulation 19 Local Plan sets out the Rural Area Strategy, and specific policies for rural areas.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - the overall spatial strategy aligns with the language of CP46. Heritage assets form a subset of environmental assets • The Woodland Trust supported the aspiration for protection and enhancement of environmental assets	Comment welcomed

What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - regarding CP86, rural areas are part of lowlands habitats associated with farms and farming, and they must be supported with minibuses so people can reach town centres. A bus to and from a supermarket twice a day, two days a week would be helpful • Banbury Civic Society and Cotswolds National Landscape supported the aspirations for rural areas • Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum supported the strategy but questioned the justification for the 500 houses for rural areas	The Local Plan supports proposals for sustainable travel and active transport, however the specific requirement for a minibus is outside of the scope of the Local Plan.

Question 62: Do you support our preliminary proposals for housing in our rural areas?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 25 individuals objected to the preliminary proposal. Objections to the inclusion of proposed development on land at Shenington with Alkerton, sprawl from J9 towards Chesterton, land between North West Bicester and Bucknell and land north of A41 in the Plan • Approximately 7 individuals supported the preliminary proposal • Other concerns - the need for careful management of affordable housing in rural areas, need to rejuvenate smaller villages with some housing/social mobility (areas such as Piddington), objection to the Hawkwell development on the edge of Bucknell, objection to the development of executive homes on rural greenfield sites, concern over the quantum of development being placed on Category B villages, concern over the inclusion of rural exception sites in the Plan's policies, concern over the lack of strategic direction on where the 500 homes will be distributed in the rural areas and the need for a brownfield first approach	Since the Regulation 18 consultation of the Local Plan additional work has been undertaken in assessing the availability of services and infrastructure in rural settlements. The settlement hierarchy has been revised (Policy SP1) Chapter 8 provides a Rural Area Strategy and supporting policies. The Local Plan supports appropriate development on brownfield sites.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere, Horley and Sibford Ferris Parish Councils supported the preliminary proposal. Finmere Parish Council also objected to the site earmarked for development in Finmere • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - their Neighbourhood Plan's preferred allocation should be acknowledged • Bourtons Parish Council supported the outline as currently defined but question Development Policy 8's application of 30 dph as basis for development on the grounds that this density figure is more reflective of urban developments • Drayton Parish Council supported the proposals but expressed concern over rural exception sites and the 500 homes rural figure • Wardington Parish Council supported the proposal to classify Wardington Parish as a 'smaller village'	Neighbourhood Plans can allocate development sites in their plans. Where a Neighbourhood Plan is not in place, or the Parish does not wish to allocate sites the Local Plan through an appropriate assessment of local services and infrastructure will make an allowance for some development in suitable rural settlements. Policy on housing density has been revised since the Regulation 18 Stage of the Local Plan. Oxford unmet need allowance /Partial Review (4,400) has undergone the examination process and subsequently adopted. It is not

• Somerton Parish Council - the proposal for housing in rural areas would be more palatable if Cherwell was not required to take Oxford overspill/a needs assessment review were to be commissioned • Shenington Parish Council supported the proposal to classify Shenington Parish as a 'smaller village' • Caversfield Parish Council supported the preliminary proposals and stated that the smaller villages and open countryside categories should be strongly protected • Cropredy Parish Council supported housing developments being directed to larger settlements and more sustainable villages with good public transport services • North Newington Parish Council – concerns over the Withycombe Farm allocation on the grounds that it is adjacent to development at West of Bretch Hill – an area deemed to have high levels of ASB. It is important to protect the view of Saltway ridgeline and maintain North Newington's integrity and setting as a rural village. • Bletchingdon Parish Council objected to development in Bletchingdon due to the parish's conservation area. • Somerton Parish Council - this would be better received if there was not the expectation of taking Oxford City's overspill • Launton Parish Council supported the preliminary proposal, subject to an additional consultation being held with the larger 11 villages to discuss the rural housing figure of 500 homes • Hanwell Parish Council supported in principle but noted the challenges in delivering sites that have not yet been identified Stratton Audley and Piddington Parish Councils questioned if any specific rural sites can be ruled out	proposed that further unmet need for Oxford City will be allocated in this Local Plan. Any proposal for development in a conservation area will take into consideration heritage policies and conservation area appraisals, to ensure that any new development meets strict criteria and not harming the conservation area. All sites submitted through the HELAA 'Call for Sites' process have been assessed against specific criteria to assess their suitability and some sites have been ruled out on this basis.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby supported the preliminary proposals	Comment welcomed
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 7 respondents - the 500 homes in rural areas figure should be increased • Other comments - larger villages could accommodate further development (potentially of strategic size) as they have a good range of services and facilities and are well-connected and	Since the Regulation 18 consultation of the Local Plan additional work has been undertaken in assessing the availability of services and infrastructure in rural settlements.

that Heyford Park should not be deemed 'rural' due to its function of providing services and facilities to neighbouring areas, whilst others raised concerns over the lack of rural site allocations	The settlement hierarchy has been revised (Policy SP1) Heyford Park is categorised as a local Service Centre.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - any sites that are to be allocated at Regulation 19 stage should be subject to/informed by a proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)	A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been undertaken as part of Local Plan Preparation and Sites Allocation.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG - no more social housing should be added in rural areas but that traveller sites and refugee resettlement sites could be easily added to villages • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd supported proposals and people born in the village should take precedence over others • Banbury Civic Society supported proposals but only if over 50% of the 500 homes for rural areas are first homes and social housing • Cotswolds National Landscape supported DP's 7,8 and 9 but requested that the aspiration for DP6 should be 100% affordable housing on the rural exception sites	All proposed residential developments to meet Cherwell's needs (10 or more dwellings) will be expected to provide a percentage of affordable housing in accordance with Policy. A joint Oxfordshire gypsy and traveller assessment has been commissioned to understand what requirements there are for all districts including Cherwell. Sites will be allocated according to need. Affordable and social housing will be delivered in accordance with Local Plan policy, need and national policy.

Question 63: Are there any potential rural housing sites you wish to suggest?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• A brownfield first and infill-centric approach should apply; development should be located right alongside the motorway and questions regarding why Bicester needs to expand • There are potential rural housing sites in Merton, Thrupp and Heyford Park	The Local Plan supports the development of appropriate brownfield sites. Development will be located in accordance with the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - their Neighbourhood Plan's preferred allocation should be acknowledged • Bletchingdon Parish Council - there is a potential site (suitable for 20 dwellings) that will be included in the emerging Bletchingdon Neighbourhood Plan • Launton Parish Council - not in Launton	Neighbourhood Plans can allocate development sites in their plans. Where a Neighbourhood Plan is not in place, or the Parish does not wish to allocate sites the Local Plan through an appropriate assessment of local services and infrastructure will make an allowance for some development in suitable rural settlements.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Respondents referred to a number of potential rural housing sites, including: land south of the recent permission at Hook Norton Road (Sibford Ferris), three sites under the control of Abbeymill Homes (all subject to live planning applications), Land off South Newington Road (Bloxham), Land North of Wimborn Close (Deddington), Grove Fields (Deddington), Land off Duns Tew Road (Radwell Hill, Hempton) ,Land South of The Lane (Hempton), Ell's Lane (Bloxham), Land at South Lodge (Caversfield), Land West of Springwell Hill and North of Sand Furlong (Bletchingdon), Islip Fuel Depot site, Land North of Merton Road, Land off Arncott Road (Ambrosden), Land West of Church Ley Field adjacent to Blackthorn Road (Ambrosden), Land at Station Road (Bletchingdon), Land East of Barford Road (Bletchingdon), Land off Tadmarton	All sites submitted through the HELAA 'Call for Sites' process have been assessed against specific criteria to assess their suitability and some sites have been ruled out on this basis. Neighbourhood Plans can allocate development sites in their plans. Where a Neighbourhood Plan is not in place, or the Parish does not wish to allocate sites the Local

Road (Bloxham), Land East of Adderbury, Land South of Green Lane, Land at Sugarswell Lane (Shenington), Land at The Old Dairy – off School Lane (Cropredy), :and North of Grove Road (Bloxham), Land East of Claydon Road (Cropredy), Site 400m East of Cottisford, Land West of South Newington Road (Bloxham), Land North and South of Milton Road (Bloxham), Land at Painters Farm (Bloxham), Site to Eastern side of Milcombe to South of Bloxham Road, Land North of The Bourne (Hook Norton), Lower Heath Farm (Cottisford) and Land around Stoke Lyne, Merton Stud (Merton), Land at Banbury Road (Deddington), 2 parcels of land at Blackthorn, Land off A41 and Ploughley Road (Ambrosden) and Manor Farm (Islip)	Plan through an appropriate assessment of local services and infrastructure will make an allowance for some development in suitable rural settlements.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Question 64: Do you know of any potential new rural employment sites?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• A range of potential new rural employment sites submitted, including Bunkers Hill and down the A41 from Junction 9/expand the A41 opposite Ambrosden • 2 individuals - rural exception sites should be removed • Other comments - existing employment sites have put pressure on the Vendee Drive roundabout; that there are no rural sites available in the north of the district and that sites with single lane access should be excluded	All sites submitted through the HELAA 'Call for Sites' process have been assessed against specific criteria to assess their suitability and some sites have been ruled out on this basis. Existing employment sites adopted in the Local Plan have been assessed through the previous local plan and examination process.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - the parish has several employment sites, not all of which are fully occupied • Bourtons Parish Council - there aren't any obvious sites available within Bourtons but voiced support for cottage industries as they lend themselves to rural settings • Bletchingdon Parish Council - opposed rural employment sites within Bletchingdon	The Local Plan Policy encourages appropriate rural diversification. Employment site allocations will be directed to the most sustainable locations across the district and in accordance with the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• A range of sites promoted, including Land North of Evans Automotive (Bunkers Hill), Land to the Rear of Uplands Cottage and Part Fewcott Farm, East of Station Road (Ardley), Islip Ful Depot site and Wroxton Ironstone Works Others welcomed the emphasis on smaller rural employment sites, the need for rural diversification and the annual monitoring commitment	Employment site allocations will be directed to the most sustainable locations across the district and in accordance with the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. The Local Plan Policy encourages appropriate rural diversification.

What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Keep Hanwell Village Rural - rural exception sites should be removed, and policies put in place to prevent coalescence and enhance the landscape	The Local Plan Policy will only encourage appropriate rural diversification. A Landscape Character Assessment forms part of the Local Plan evidence base. Policy will provide protection for important landscapes.

Chapter 8 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Rural Areas Area Strategy chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Individuals commented that the rural strategy should reduce under-occupation and enable downsizing; that a 10-20% increase in housing for villages across Cherwell every decade is unsustainable; that a 'brownfield/rooftop' first approach should be stated in relation to renewable energy; that rural exception sites should be removed; maintaining bus services between Oxford and Bicester with rural stops is vital; objection to further development in Nethercote and that 400 homes (rather than 500) would be a more appropriate rural housing figure • Some commented that that village boundaries should be protected and that the environment should be protected and conserved; that speculative development should be prevented; that protecting the character and identity of villages is vital; dark skies policy should be strengthened; coalescence between settlements should be prevented and concern that the Grade II listed windmill at Blackthorn Hill needs to be conserved	Since the Regulation 18 consultation of the Local Plan additional work has been undertaken in assessing the availability of services and infrastructure in rural settlements. The settlement hierarchy has been revised (Policy SP1). A rural allowance will only be allocated to the most sustainable rural locations. Sustainability Appraisal, Heritage Impact Assessment and Habitat Regulation Assessment has been produced to inform the Local Plan. Outcomes of the studies have been included in planning policy to protect and enhance local environments and heritage buildings. The Council cannot stop applications for speculative development being submitted, however all applications are assessed against adopted Local Plan and national planning policy.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Somerton Parish Council - concerned over the impact of rural employment on rural roads/bridges • Adderbury Parish Council would like to discuss their Neighbourhood Plan with Cherwell District Council's planning policy team, particularly with regards to the rural strategy. Also welcomed	Allocations and proposals for new employment will be assessed by the County Highways Authority to assess impact of additional transport movement.

the Plan's intention to protect/preserve gaps between the south edge of Banbury and Adderbury • Shenington Parish Council supported the Plan's intention to protect villages, heritage assets and conservation areas and noted the importance of maintaining a sustainable village that is capable of supporting pubs, shops and other services • Launton Parish Council - an additional consultation phase with the eleven larger villages should be a pre-requisite of the Regulation 19 consultation Hanwell Parish Council - rural exception sites policy should be revised as they are currently an unmitigated threat to small communities	The Council are happy to support Parishes/Town Councils with the delivery of Neighbourhood Plans. Rural exception policy is designed with strict criteria so that any new development does not harm small communities.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• One respondent objected to the rural area strategy, whilst one other queried how the rural allocation figure of 500 homes was calculated and stated that the 500 homes figure should be met through allocations	Since the Regulation 18 consultation of the Local Plan additional work has been undertaken in assessing the availability of services and infrastructure in rural settlements. The settlement hierarchy has been revised (Policy SP1) Parishes with made neighbourhood plans can allocate sites if they wish. Rural allowances have been allocated to the most sustainable locations.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire County Council suggested policy wording amendments to CP51, namely, to include provision to recover monies where forward funding has been provided (such as the wording	The comments are noted and have been considered in drafting the Reg 19 Plan.

currently in the Partial Review Policy PR11 Infrastructure Delivery) and supported CP85 as Oxfordshire County Council are supportive of the principle of reopening Ardley Station	
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - on CP24, MOD land like Graven Hill and Arncott are classified as brownfield sites but they are superb wildlife sites as people and dogs cannot walk around them. Graven Hill had much wildlife and before development was classified as SSSI Graven Hill Woods but has now been downgraded. Most MOD sites should be removed from 'brownfield' classification as they often have lots of wildlife and the army has always carried out some conservation work. Also, CP30 has good points • Oxfordshire Keep our NHS Public - rural areas need adequate access to primary care, dentistry, community services for mental health, and old age services which must include adequate public transport • Community First Oxfordshire - the provision of new housing across existing villages should highlight affordable housing and that a cap on growth in larger villages should be introduced where they have delivered may units in the past. Where new homes are proposed they should be residential sites/higher level of affordable housing. Schemes below 10 dwellings, including infill, should be assessed as part of the overall supply in testing acceptable levels of growth but that nowhere should be growth of 10% or more of the existing village. Design codes should determine the size and scale of proposals set in Neighbourhood Plans • Deddington Development Watch - there should be a policy to reject applications which affect existing services or facilities for the existing community where there is little or no prospect of those facilities being improved	Brownfield/Greenfield classification is determined by national policy. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been produced as part of the Local Plan evidence, which assesses existing infrastructure/services and the impact that new development would have on existing services. Since the Regulation 18 consultation of the Local Plan additional work has been undertaken in assessing the availability of services and infrastructure in rural settlements. The settlement hierarchy has been revised (Policy SP1) Parishes with made neighbourhood plans can allocate sites if they wish. Rural allowances have been

Question 65: Do you have any comments on these measures?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 4 individuals - the proposed measures need to be more stringently enforced and monitored • Approximately 3 individuals - the Council needs to communicate more clearly with local residents on Plan-making matters and processes • The Council needs to be more transparent on its failures, but support for the flexibility of the contingency measures within the Plan to allow the Plan to move forward in a sensible manner	The comments are acknowledged and noted. The Council undertook a period of 6 weeks consultation on the Regulation 18 Consultation Draft of the Cherwell Local Plan (2040). This was advertised in the local paper, on social media, on the Council's website and copies of the documentation were available to view at the local libraries and at the Council offices. All of those persons and organisations who had requested to be on the Council's Planning Policy Consultation Database were consulted including statutory consultees. Previous to this the Council undertook 2 previous public consultations a) Planning for Cherwell to 2040 – A community involvement paper (July 2020) b) Planning for Cherwell – Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options (September 2021 Note: Certain types of previous consultation will have been limited between 2020 to 2023 due to the relevant restrictions that were in place during the Covid Pandemic.

	The Council also produces a range of monitoring reports which are available on the Council's website which include the following documents: a) Annual Monitoring Report which reviews the progress in preparing the Council's planning policy documents including the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Development Plans and the report assesses whether its existing development policies are effective. This report includes monitoring on housing, employment and the natural environment. b) An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) with annual IDP updates. This document contains a list of projects and provides an update on the progression of each project c) Housing Supply Update Statements
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Finmere Parish Council - if the numbers decrease then the need for all proposed sites must be mitigated • Weston-on-the-Green Parish Council - implementation goes beyond how many houses have been built on a yearly basis and should also include how Council will implement specific policies with current staff and funding shortages, particularly regarding health /policing/education infrastructure • Somerton Parish Council - measures need to include local input/feedback • Shenington Parish Council urged the Council to adopt the Plan as soon as possible to ensure protection from speculative development	These comments are noted. It is a legal requirement that developers mitigate the impact of their development. As part of the Local Plan production and as part of the formal consultation process the Council's Planning Policy Team contact and engage with the various statutory consultees including the health providers, the Police and Oxfordshire County Council who are the Local Education Authority.

• Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council - often S106 proposals are delayed or do not occur so recommend that S106 schemes are started before or with development to ensure they are delivered • Launton Parish Council - there is no information on the phasing of housing delivery over the life of the Plan	It is nationally recognised that there is a national shortage of staff in relation to some professions and that funding issues relating to a range of specialist statutory services. Section 106 Agreements set out the details of the agreed Section 106 planning applications and the timetable for their delivery. Applicants/ developers do have a right to apply for a variation to a Section 106 Agreement. Larger scale developments are phased in order ensure that some development can take place which can fund the required infrastructure. The next stage of the Local Plan known as the Regulation 19 stage will provide indicative phasing for developments, but this is subject to change and based on many external factors including the economic environment, outcome of ground investigations, supply of building material and transportation costs, availability of construction staff, sales of dwellings, availability of mortgages etc.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - officers need to be proactive in driving the requirements of the plan	The Council's Development Management Team within the Planning Department are responsible for the assessment of pre application inquiries in conjunction with the consultation of relevant internal teams/ depts and external organisations The Council's Development Management Team is responsible for the assessment of planning

	applications and undertaking consultation with the relevant statutory consultees and undertaking consultation with those who it determines would be impacted by prospective development proposals in line with legislative requirements. Landowners, developers, applicants are required to consider and meet the requirements of the Government's latest National Planning Policy Framework and the requirements of the Council's Development Plan which includes the latest adopted Local Plan, and any made Neighbourhood Development Plans. This includes the Planning Policy requirements within the adopted Local Plan. In relation to Planning Appeals the Council will be consulted and will produce and submit the required representations and will give evidence at the required public inquiries. Any required and requested planning obligations that are requested by the Council have to meet the legislative requirements whilst ensuring that the development is financially viable.
What the development industry said:	
• Approximately 2 respondents supported the Council's intention to monitor progress of the Local Plan Review on an annual basis • Approximately 3 respondents - there needs to be clear and explicit language on contingency measures, particularly with regard to identifying alternative suitable sites	The comments are welcomed. The Council has identified and assessed a range of sites including the sites that were proposed

	by a range of site promoters which started with the first consultation which is known as the 'Call for Sites'. Some of the sites have been carried over from the current adopted Local Plan as they have not yet been developed. Each of these potential development sites have undergone a comprehensive assessment in line with the legislative requirements. A list of these assessments is included within the evidence base documentation which is available on the Council's website.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Sanctuary Housing welcomed the vision/objective of ensuring growth/delivery of housing and noted that the main enabler to achieve targets is a streamlined planning/permitting process. Improved processes/procedures will reduce the delay and costs for developers and assist Cherwell's commitments. Questioned what CDC is implementing to ensure developers are able to assist in delivering homes and achieving climate targets. Recommended that cross-departmental collaboration is implemented, and a single point of contact is implemented for developers. Suggested that affordable housing funds are established and expanded to provide financing, that priority in approvals should be given to affordable housing and that adaptive policies are implemented for County Council controlled infrastructure e.g. highways	The comments are noted. The delivery of affordable housing is a priority for the Government and for the Council which is set out in the following documents a) The Governments National Planning Policy Framework (that is due to be updated by the newly elected Government) b) The Council's Corporate Plan c) By the Regulation 18 version of the Cherwell Local Plan (September 2023) on pages 72 onwards and specifically on pages 82 to 86 including Core Policy 36. In line with required legislation each planning application proposal will be assessed on its own merits and against the relevant legislative

	national and local planning policy and any relevant materials considerations which may include viability. In terms of climate change the draft Local Plan contains a variety of planning policies that contribute towards climate change including Policies CSD1-7. These policies meet the national legislative requirements including that of the Environment Act, these policies complement those in the current Government National Planning Policy Framework and they meet the requirements of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan and the related associated strategies including those for public transport and reducing air pollution. These policies also meet the requirements of the Council's Air Quality Management Plan and the legislative requirements relating to Environmental Protection.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd questioned how the public can read the representations and suggested that key points should be picked out for the public to read • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - the plan requires regular monitoring and there should be a regular review process with local businesses, commercial agents, and other stakeholders to ensure business needs for expansion can be accommodated	Comments Noted. The Council are required to read and assess all the submitted representations that are submitted in relation to the consultation questions that were asked and the draft list of sites that were proposed in 2023 Regulation 18 Cherwell Local Plan 2040 consultation documentation and associated evidence base. The Council are required to publish a Consultation Statement summarising the main

	representation responses and the Councils responses in relation to those. The Council undertakers regular monitoring and it produces a range of monitoring reports.

Chapter 9 Summary Question: Do you have any additional comments on the Implementing the Plan Chapter?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 2 individuals - monitoring and enforcement of the Local Plan are critical to its success • There should be a larger-scale Plan that focuses on people's needs and greater consideration of community infrastructure is required	Comments noted. The Council carries out a range of annual monitoring in relation to the Council's Local Plan. Further information can be found on the Council's webpage Annual monitoring reports | Monitoring reports | Cherwell District Council The Council produces an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and the Council publishes an annual update each year. Infrastructure Delivery Plan Updates | Monitoring reports | Cherwell District Council The infrastructure Delivery Plan details the infrastructure that is required to support the development set out in the Local Plan and involves ongoing engagement with the various infrastructure provides including the Integrated Care Board, the Local Education Authority and the Local Highways Authority. The Local Plan does focus on people's needs, and these are considered throughout the text and policies within the Local Plan.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	

• Somerton Parish Council - implementation/effectiveness should be communicated along with being explicit how this is being measured/judged • Cropredy Parish Council - the most important priority now is to deliver the Local Plan through the next stages as soon as possible so that is adopted and has full impact on future development	The Comments are noted, and the Council agrees with these comments. The Council carries out a range of annual monitoring in relation to the delivery of the Local Plan including the delivery of Infrastructure and the delivery of Section 106 Agreements. Further information on the Council's annual monitoring can be found on the Council's website Annual monitoring reports | Monitoring reports | Cherwell District Council
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Respondents welcomed the need to monitor the Local Plan but voiced concern over the lack of triggers or deliverable actions in CP87 • Others stated that contingencies should include suitable reserve sites and a buffer that is above the housing requirement figure	HA The comments are noted. The Council carries out a range of annual monitoring in relation to the Local Plan which is detailed on the Council's website. Annual monitoring reports | Monitoring reports | Cherwell District Council The Council's annual monitoring reports include: a) The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which includes including information on housing, employment and the natural environment. b) Infrastructure Delivery Plan Updates c) Housing Land Supply

	The Council also monitors and manages the delivery of Section 106 Agreements. The Council note the comments relating to the reserved sites and a need for a buffer A buffer percentage is currently dependent on past delivery and is reviewed on an annual basis as part of the monitoring process. In relation to reserved sites in some areas within the district this will be reviewed as the Local Plan progresses and delivery of sites is monitored.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - implementing the plan will be a huge task, and they hope the different threads can be reconciled, especially green and blue infrastructure with development • Oxford Preservation Trust - the Local Plan should resist any further release of the green belt and exceptional circumstances need to exist to justify any changes • Need not Greed Oxon - where new builds are required, they should be genuinely affordable, well-designed, high-density developments to reduce the carbon impact. GDP driven scenarios to maximise the number of larger more expensive market homes is no longer a viable option. The HENA conclusions are not compatible with the Oxfordshire Strategic Vision which commits all authorities to plan for good growth and requested that CDC revisit the evidence base and considers all environmental, social and economic implications of the proposed policies	The comments are noted. The Plan is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which assessed the social, economic and environmental effect of the Plan, its strategy and its policies. The Plan strategy aims at sticking a balance between meeting development needs in the most sustainable locations and the protection of the historic and natural environment.

	No Green Belt land is proposed to be released.

Question 66: Do you have any comments on the appendices? Please indicate the appendix number in your response.	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Comments included that there is no appendix relating to the calculation of upfront and operational carbon, that a large amount of information is within the appendices and it is unlikely many residents will look at them, that there are too many appendices, on appendix 4 that the green belt boundaries should not be reviewed, on appendix 2 that LPR52 should not be developed and on appendix 7 that communities would benefit from assistance to understand the benefits of Local Green Space designation and NPPF criteria	Comments noted. The appendices support the Local Plan Review policies and therefore deemed necessary. Local Green Space designation and associated criteria are set out in National Planning Practice Guidance available online.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Bourtons Parish Council - regarding appendix 9, they are keen to establish a Conservation Area in Great Bourton • Sibford Ferris Parish Council - regarding appendix 8, they welcome the inclusion of Sibford Ferris within the wider landscape zone of the draft Oxfordshire Nature Recovery Network • Launton Parish Council - the maps are of poor quality and difficult to read. There should be an explanation comparing the timescales involved in categorising deliverable and developable sites. There is no Launton Road in Launton and the definition of Launton is incorrect	Comments noted. Mapping outputs are being refined as per of the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review process.
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Steve Kilsby - there is no definition of social housing in the glossary. Surprised to see development flanking Wykham Lane, west of Salt Way as whether access is provided or not, resident will use the lane which would increase traffic on the dangerous and narrow road. Noted that there are no protected green spaces in Banbury	Comments noted. Additional evidence, including transport assessments, will be available at Regulation 19 Plan stage and will inform the site selection process and policy wording.
What the development industry said:	
• On appendix 2 the public right of way on The Moors is inaccurate, and on appendix 2 the key is not readable on the Heyford Park template	Comments noted. Mapping outputs are being refined as per of the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review process.

	Both Heyford Park and The Moors site allocations have been omitted at the Regulation 19 Plan stage.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - LPR49 Withycombe Farmhouse needs to be mentioned within the key constraints section and CP14 mentions 'historic buildings and clarity is needed on this. On LPR37a, a reference should be made to archaeological remains within key constraints and to Begbroke Hill Farmhouse	Comments noted. Greater emphasis on listed assets has been made in the Regulation Plan, including the supporting site allocation maps.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the subjects in appendices 4,7 and 8 overlap as they affect each other. Some points on the 19th of January 2023 Appendix 1 in the Emerging Draft Local Plan 2040 Agenda supplement are very good but are not as well presented in the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040. The lack of GP services in Bicester is worrying and the failure to build the Alchester Super Surgery is regrettable • Bure Park FC questioned where the playing pitch strategy document is	Comments noted. Capacity issues at GP practices will be identified and addressed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Playing Pitch Strategy forms part of the Local Plan Review's evidence.

Summary Question: Do you have any comments on the supporting technical evidence? Please indicate which document you are making comments on.	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Comments included queries if the sustainability appraisal explains how the development allocated and approved through the plan will be carbon negative, concern over developing green belt land, that the housing targets are flawed and too high, that Environmental Impact Surveys should be included, that no evidence has been considered for transport uses and that the maps are not detailed enough	Throughout the local plan preparation process policies and proposed site allocations are tested through the sustainability appraisal process. The Local Plan does not allocate Green Belt land for development. Active travel and transport policies are included in the local plan
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the Ward Councillors said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the development industry said:	
• Comments included that the plan should harness the full potential for growth and the HENA growth scenario chosen limits this, that key pieces of evidence is missing e.g. strategic land availability, landscape, gypsy and travellers, flood risk and infrastructure, and evidence to support exceptional circumstances for green belt release • Promotion of land for development	Note: Following the examination into the Oxford City Local Plan 2040, where the Government appointed Inspectors expressed significant concerns in respect of the jointly commissioned Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, prepared by consultants Iceni, Cherwell District Council has chosen to withdraw this report from its evidence base documents. Evidence base documents have been prepared alongside plan preparation.

	A HELAA has been produced alongside plan preparation that has included several calls for sites.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• Historic England - broadly supported the Sustainability Appraisal including the focus on growth scenarios, but the different scenarios make it challenging to retain the thread of key details between options. Work is needed to take account of the setting of heritage assets in more detail, non-designated heritage assets and archaeological potential. Suggested wording amendments to various policies. The relationship between South-east Woodstock and Blenheim Palace should be mentioned as a key consideration and greater clarity is merited on the conservation area relating to Upper Heyford. Broadly supported the proposed allocation and should seek to avoid further intensification within the Upper Heyford conservation area, including preventing development on the flying field	The comments are noted. The Reg 19 Plan addresses the comments made.
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• No comments were received on this question	N/A

Do you have any additional comments on the Draft Local Plan Review?	
Consultation Responses	**Officer Response**
What members of the public said:	
• Approximately 3 individuals objected to Northwest Bicester • Approximately 4 individuals objected to green belt changes • Comments included that there should be a greater focus on achieving net zero, that the volume of information is too large in the Local Plan, that development should be in appropriate locations, objection to The Moors, objection to a new M40 junction off of Southam Road, that the housing numbers are too high and objection to development at Chesterton	The North-west Bicester site is allocated in the adopted local plan and so has already been tested at examination. The Local Plan does not allocate Green Belt land for development. Policies within the draft plan support achieving net zero carbon development and improving energy and carbon performance in existing buildings. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation. The proposed housing numbers have been reduced from that proposed at Regulation 18 stage.
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Bourtons Parish Council - disappointed that the plan does not include detail for the rural area strategy. There are areas within the plan where they would welcome a change, strengthening or addition of policy. Their main concerns are land use, housing numbers, services, infrastructure, renewable energy and flood risk • Somerton Parish Council - it is inevitable that the plan is large, but it discourages people from becoming involved and suggested a summary of key points to encourage engagement • Shenington Parish Council objected to LPR-A-229 proposed submission of housing on Stocking Lane, Shenington • Bodicote Parish Council requested to be kept informed on the future of Bodicote House	Chapter 8 of the Regulation 19 Local Plan will include a Rural Area Strategy. The document is quite lengthy, and we have sought to use illustrations to help break up the text. The plan can be accessed electronically in an accessible format.

What the Ward Councillors said:	
• Councillor Ian Middleton - the plan does not consider proposals for a revised NPPF e.g. a replacement duty to cooperate. Oxford City should have taken into account housing need relevant to Oxford only, and the number is inflated for their need • Councillor Calum Miller objected to The Moors, South-East of Wretchwick Green and South of Chesterton Nort-West of A41. The need for additional housing is not justified. There are no exceptional circumstances for green belt release and site 3 would extend the boundary of Bicester beyond the current boundary, reducing the settlement gap between Bicester and Ambrosden. Concerns on site 1 due to the impact on traffic that suitable infrastructure should be provided before completion. There is a need for clarity on renewable energy sites	In meeting the tests of soundness, the Local Plan has to be produced in accordance with current National Planning Policy Framework and regulations. The Oxford Unmet Need of 4,400 homes to be delivered by Cherwell has already been tested examined and adopted by the Council. It is not proposed at this time for Cherwell to take any additional unmet need for Oxford City. The Moors and South East of Wretchwick Green Regulation 18 stage indicative sites are not proposed for allocation. The plan does not propose the release of Green Belt land.
What the development industry said:	
• Comments included that CP38 does not incorporate all types of specialist housing, support for the strategic objectives of CP's1-5, that smaller sites should be allocated in category A villages as they will come forward faster, that CP's1-5 need considering to ensure that they are deliverable in line with the NPPF, that a full green belt review should be caried out and that the CIL and Local Plan timetables should be coordinated	Policy COM4 of the Regulation 19 stage of the Local Plan provides for delivery of a range of specialist housing. A rural area strategy will be included at Regulation 19 stage of the Local Plan It is anticipated that an updated LDS will be published in December 2024 that will include an updated CIL and Local Plan timetable The plan does not propose the release of Green Belt land as it is considered there are no

	exceptional circumstances that would warrant release of Green Belt land.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• The Woodland Trust would welcome the opportunity to engage with development of core policies as they relate to ancient woodland protection, woodland conservation, trees on development sites, tree replacement policies and access to nature. CP11 section iii 'development which would result in damage…' is weak compared to the NPPF requirements for irreplaceable habitats and recommended rewording in line with the NPPF. In strong support for CP15, and it could be useful to set a % canopy cover target for development sites and to make recommendations on using native species from UK sourced/grown tree stock to support biodiversity and biosecurity. Recommended that an explicit reference is made in CP16 to nature-based solutions such as green walls and urban trees and noted that they would welcome adding a reference to planting woodland/trees/hedgerows in CP43. Additionally, they suggested that a specific reference should be made to the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Oxfordshire and that the Natural England Accessible Green Space Standard and the Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standard is added to CP55 • Secretary of State for Defence suggested a policy on MOD establishments to include that new development at military establishments that helps enhance or sustain their operational capability including new military housing would be supported, that redevelopment/conversion of redundant MOD sites and buildings would be supported and that non-military/non-defence development within or in areas around a MOD site would be supported where it would not adversely affect military operations or capability or it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a defence or military need for the site • BBOWT - prior to adoption of any site, a full initial assessment of the ecological value should be undertaken to inform allocations of sites to determine whether they are appropriate in terms of biodiversity impacts and that they would expect planning applications for sites to be robustly judged against policies of the Local Plan and NPPF. Impact on protected species, designated sites, and any species and habitats of principle importance for conservation in England that may be affected will need to be assessed in relation to planning applications on these sites and will require a full suite of surveys/assessment to be submitted with any actual development planning application. On some sites, wintering bird surveys will be needed in addition to breeding bird surveys and that the most recent ecological records should be sought from TVERC in addition to ecological surveys being carried out in the right survey season. Some sites	The comments are noted and welcomed. They have informed the revised policies for the Reg 19 Plan. These include policies on design, landscape and biodiversity. Article 4 directions are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.

proposed for allocation include priority habitats or have priority habitats nearby and that where the site is taken forward, priority habitats must be retained in full or managed in perpetuity for their wildlife and impacts must be avoided for those on/off site. Priority habitat should be buffered by seminatural habitats and hedgerows should be retained in developments • NHS Property Services Ltd - some sites within the NHS property portfolio are, or may become, outdated and are no longer suitable for modern healthcare without significant investment. In those cases, and where NHS commissioners can demonstrate that healthcare facilities are no longer required for the provision of services in that location, a more flexible approach for public service providers should be applied when considering a change of use to non-community uses • Battlefields Trust requested that CDC consider including restrictions on permitted development rights under an article 4 direction for National Important Registered Historic Battlefield of Cropredy Bridge. Not all permitted development rights should be restricted, but they are concerned regarding specific areas within General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) and that restrictions on schedule 2 part 6 activities within GPDO are the main priority • Natural England - concerned about Ardley Train Station proposal due to it being in the centre of a SSSI, which would result in a significant loss of habitat and potential indirect impacts	
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• Oxfordshire City Council look forward to working in partnership to deliver the policies	Comment welcomed – regular engagement through the duty to cooperate and work on joint studies and programmes continues.
What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• Banbury CAG - all crossings should be replaced with zebra crossings as they give better priority to pedestrians • Gavray Community Meadows Ltd - the plan is too long and complex, the appendices create a lot of information, the photos are unnecessary making the document even larger in file size and the maps need to be more easily accessible with a link in the questions • Banbury Civic Society - CP57 is sound but not comprehensive and the numbered list should be expanded. It would be useful for the policy to state that proposals that do not deliver a buildings optimum use will not normally be allowed. CP58 should be strengthened to comply with the NPPF and CP59 is too weak • Cotswolds National Landscape - supported CP6 but highlighted that the policy does not specify 'suitable areas' for renewable energy, and recommended that the plan should identify suitable	Comments are noted. Where applicable and relevant to the local plan they have been considered in policy drafting. Our evidence suggests that there is no scope within the district for an allocation for wind energy. Solar applications will be considered against a criteria based policy.

areas for wind and solar energy production. Recommended that a solar energy evidence report is commissioned. Supportive of CP11 but suggested that the policy addresses irreplaceable habitats separately and highlights these habitats. Supportive of CP43 but highlighted the need for the Cotswolds National Landscape to have its own policy due to its importance as a designation • Banbury Chamber of Commerce - there are too few questions on policies in chapter 3. Supported the drive to a net zero economy and for all buildings to have excellent energy efficiency standards. Supported the strong policies on green and blue infrastructure. Other consultations occurred at the same time and the results of them should've come first to set the policies and priorities for the Local Plan review, rather than the other way around	

Summary comments

Consultation Responses	Officer Response
What members of the public said:	
Site/scheme-specific responses: • Approximately 52 individuals - brownfield land at Heyford Park should be prioritised for development • Approximately 5 individuals objected to The Moors proposed allocation and the site is highly valued as a biodiverse area that is used for recreational purposes • Approximately 7 individuals objected to the NW Bicester allocation • Approximately 6 individuals - 'ecotown' principles need strengthening to ensure that these principles are properly conformed with when delivering the NW Bicester allocation • Approximately 6 individuals concerned over the Plan's proposed developments and associated flood risk impacts – notably that surface water flooding would be exacerbated due to the development of the following areas: sites further upstream of Wendlebury or Islip, NW Bicester and Chesterton.	Comments noted. The Moors site is not proposed for allocation. The Plan commits to deliver the approved masterplan for Heyford Park under saved Policies Villages 5. A strategic green gap is proposed between the NW Bicester allocation and Bucknell. All sites taken forward in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan will be underpinned and informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP will outline infrastructure requirements to support growth earmarked in

• Approximately 4 individuals - the proposed gap between Bucknell and the proposed NW Bicester site is insufficient and would result in the merging of Bucknell and Bicester. Others stated that the proposed development would result in a loss rural character in Bucknell and a reduced sense of visual separation between Bicester and Bucknell. There were also concerns that the proposed NW Bicester allocation would put pressure on surrounding infrastructure, particularly the local road network and local community services • Approximately 3 individuals objected to the SE perimeter link road proposal • Concerns over the lack of supporting infrastructure in villages, the lack of supporting infrastructure in Ambrosden to support the 'Land at Merton Road' site and objected to the proposed development at J9 M40, whilst others advocated for a feasibility study to re-evaluate the options of expanding Heyford Park • Concerns over the impact of development on existing services and facilities in Merton and raised flood risk issues associated with the proposed development at Chesterton • Concerns over the omission of the previously proposed link road between Vendee Drive and Bucknell Road and that there is a need for a solution at the level crossing on the East-West rail line at London Road • The proposed development at Chesterton does not constitute minor development and there is a need for a community hospital and cemetery at Heyford Park and a Saturday bus service from Bicester to neighbouring villages. **In relation to the appropriateness of proposed locations for development:** • Approximately 191 individuals supported the Plan to support a brownfield first approach • Approximately 25 individuals concerned over the existing congestion and traffic across the district and that further development will exacerbate traffic issues, particularly in Bicester, Kidlington, Adderbury and smaller villages • Approximately 7 individuals - development of Green Belt land should be resisted • Approximately 4 individuals - smaller and larger villages are over-saturated and do not have sufficient infrastructure to accommodate further growth	the Local Plan Review, including mitigatory flood risk measures, transport schemes, community facilities, healthcare facilities and bereavement services. Part of the scope of the IDP is outline where there are existing infrastructure capacity issues and to ensure that schemes/measures are put in place to alleviate these issues where possible. The Regulation 19 Plan continues to support the redevelopment of previously developed land through its policy on making 'effective and efficient use of land'. An audit of available Council-owned land and buildings was undertaken as part of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). Assets or land available for redevelopment were considered as part of the HELAA process. The settlement hierarchy has been refined as part of the Regulation 19 Plan process to ensure that the hierarchy reflects the level of services and facilities available at that settlement. The housing requirement of the Regulation 19 Plan is underpinned by the Government's standard method with Oxford's unmet need factored in. The Regulation 19 Local Plan

• Approximately 4 individuals concerned over the impact of development on traffic and congestion on the local road network • Approximately 6 individuals - it is critical for infrastructure to be delivered in parallel with new housing • Approximately 5 individuals objected to developing on greenfield land and that any development within the open countryside and/or green spaces is unjustifiable • Approximately 2 individuals - there needs to be further consideration of the social implication of proposed developments, particularly in villages and rural areas • Approximately 23 individuals concerned over existing infrastructure capacity, particularly in villages. Services and facilities are already strained, and further development will exacerbate this issue • Individuals concerned over how water resources (supply) will be provided for to accommodate the proposed developments, and brownfield should be prioritised as it has existing gas and electricity supplies in place • Council-owned buildings were lying empty and could be utilised/redeveloped • There is an excessive allocation for employment; these areas need to be sited in appropriate, sustainable areas which reduce the need for commuting via private car **In relation to the housing requirement, HENA and/or housing mix, type and tenure:** • Approximately 10 individuals - the housing figures in the Plan are too high • Approximately 6 individuals - the Plan's housing figure should have derived from the standard method as opposed to the method applied in the HENA • Approximately 3 individuals objected to the principle of addressing and accommodating Oxford's unmet housing need through the Plan • Approximately 3 individuals - sufficient affordable/social housing should be delivered • Affordable housing should cater to a variety of local people	Review has departed from the housing figures outlined in the HENA. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review consultation will run for a period of 8-weeks to ensure that respondents have sufficient time to respond in full.

In relation to climate change impacts: • Approximately 4 individuals - sustainable modes of transport – namely electric bus, cycling and walking infrastructure should be prioritised in the Plan • Approximately 2 individuals - developments, particularly all commercial developments, should incorporate solar panels • Approximately 2 individuals - new developments should incorporate 'swift bricks' • Concerns regarding poor air quality at Hennef Way and the impact of further increased private car use and associated pollution at NW Bicester and nearby villages **Other comments:** • The Plan's consultation period of six weeks is insufficient and urged for the Council to produce a more accessible and shorter Plan	
What Town and Parish Councils said:	
• Kidlington Parish Council - CP1 requires a 5x increase in solar generation but it is unclear what the base level is and how this will be measured. Questioned why CP2 only includes developments over 1000m^2 and requested that where significant developments are proposed, air quality assessments are carried out and appropriate infrastructure is implemented to prevent flooding. Change of use to sui generis hot food takeaways in the village centre should not be permitted • Chesterton Parish Council objected to the spatial strategy due to it subsuming Chesterton into Bicester, and it should be treated as a small village. Also objected to LPR47a as it will harm Chesterton's identity. Promoted improvements to J9 of the M40 • Bucknell Parish Council challenged the need to extend Northwest Bicester due to a lack of justification and intrusion into Bucknell. There should be highway improvements and traffic calming introduced	Comments noted. '5x increase in solar generation' has associated references (namely the OxLEP Energy Strategy) which can provide further detail on what the base level is and relevant methodologies. Further site analysis work is being undertaken on the sites being taken forward, with careful consideration for the gap between the NW Bicester allocation and Bucknell. A standalone green gaps policy is being prepared for inclusion in the Regulation 19

• Horton cum Studley Parish Council – there is no clear policy on solar farms but there should be. There should be a requirement for all new builds, including housing and employment, to install solar panels • Stoke Lyne Parish Council - there is a need to incorporate specific policies on solar installation on new buildings and the infrastructure this creates. The proposed zoning of employment and residential development will not support the aim to reduce car use and theme three should recognise that some residents have health needs which need to be accommodated. CP70 should acknowledge that there is a need to ensure new development does not affect the water table and cause more flooding and CP71 should recognise that rural areas around Bicester have little public transport which is necessary for elderly residents. Questioned the allocations for rural sites and suggested that specific allocations are made in the plan for gypsy and traveller sites • Claydon with Clattercote Parish Council welcomed Claydon being classified as 'open countryside' rather than a satellite of Cropredy but concerned that this may cause a rush of planning applications. The statement 'development will not be appropriate unless specifically support by other local or national planning policies' may create loopholes and a more precise statement such as 'infill and conversion only' would be better • Stratton Audley Parish Council – there is a need for specific policies on solar installation on buildings and the infrastructure which it generates. The proposed zoning of employment and residential development will not support the aim of reducing car use. Regarding CP70, new developments must not cause more flooding, and on CP71, it must be acknowledged that private car use if a necessity for many. Any new development should contribute to delivery of flexible bus services to connect rural communities to towns suggested in the County Council's bus improvement plan and an urban edge park around Bicester would result in commuting in and around Bicester becoming a necessity. The playing pitch strategy confirms that the plan should support upgrading parish owned facilities • Piddington Parish Council - there is a need for specific policies on solar installation on buildings and the infrastructure which this generates. The proposed zoning of employment and residential development will not support the aim of reducing car use. On CP70, new	Plan. The policy will address concerns regarding the coalescence of settlements. None of the site allocations included in the Regulation 19 Plan require Green Belt release. All sites being taken forward in the Regulation 19 Plan will undergo assessment via the supporting Sustainability Appraisal. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will highlight what infrastructure is required (including any road network improvements) to support the Plan's site allocations. The settlement hierarchy has been refined as part of the Regulation 19 Plan process to ensure that the hierarchy reflects the level of services and facilities available at that settlement. Achieving net zero carbon and mitigating and adapting to climate change are key priorities for the Regulation 19 Plan. The Plan's policy on mitigating and adapting to climate change promotes the use of decentralised energy and renewable energy where appropriate. As an update on Bodicote House, the site has been assessed as part of the HELAA process as HELAA530.

developments must not cause more flooding, and on CP71, it must acknowledge that private car use is a necessity for many • Wendlebury Parish Council - LPR37a and LPR38 do not fulfil SO12 as their location is not sustainable, will require car access and will not protect or enhance the landscape. LPR37a will remove public rights of way. On CP7, the proposed development at Chesterton will put Wendlebury at risk of flooding and cause coalescence of Bicester with the surrounding villages • Bicester Town Council - there is a need for a green buffer between Bicester and all neighbouring villages and the ecotown development is being compromised by the proposals. Concerned that active travel is not embedded through the plan enough and that this should prioritise Howes Lane and Northwest Bicester. Requested more sports pitches in the plan for the exclusive use of Bicester and neighbouring villages. They would like to see more B2 and less B8 employment development and that future development should be contingent on J9 of the M40 being improved. The London Road crossing must be kept for vehicular access, the current Bicester town boundaries are not representative and should be redrawn and all new developments should have their own health facilities on site • Bloxham Parish Council - there should be a period of time where a road map can be developed to address the shortfall in amenities and infrastructure as a precursor to future development. Requested an explicit acknowledgement that villages are no longer able to support new housing developments • Milcombe Parish Council - Milcombe should be classified as a small village and there should be no further developments due to a lack of facilities. There is no safe footpath between Milcombe and Bloxham • Bodicote Parish Council requested a more positive use of natural resources such as PV and ground source heat built into development plans. There should be no development without the corresponding infrastructure. Requested to be kept informed and consulted on the progress of Bodicote House • Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council - there should be no more development in the Kidlington area, particularly Gosford and Water Eaton, and no more Green Belt release	
What the Ward Councillors said:	

• Victoria Prentis MP agreed with the objectives and found it a comprehensive plan. In broad agreement with CP's1-20. There have not been improvements in bus services since the last plan and highlighted that sustainable transport should be at the forefront of considerations for new development as cars will remain important in their needs. States that the justification for the need above the standard method is not satisfactory and welcomed the move of villages into the smaller village category. Additional allocations should be accompanied with justification, which is lacking for south of Chesterton, North-West Bicester and Heyford Park • Layla Moran MP - CDC should clarify the approach on the green belt and only propose further incursions if there is no other alternative. The Local Plan should balance housing and employment in each area, reducing the need for travel. If the alternative approach is adopted, there should be no need to identify additional housing around Kidlington and Yarnton • Councillor Donna Ford - LPR31 and LPR32 will encroach on Caversfield which is categorised as open countryside and should be protected. Objected to further development at North-West Bicester until infrastructure issues are resolved	Comments noted. All sites taken forward in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan will be underpinned and informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP will outline infrastructure requirements to support growth earmarked in the Local Plan Review, including public transport schemes. Part of the scope of the IDP is outline where there are existing infrastructure capacity issues and to ensure that schemes/measures are put in place to alleviate these issues where possible. For clarity, an extended NW Bicester is being taken forward as a site allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review. Sites at Chesterton are proposed for allocation for employment uses. Associated infrastructure requirements are set out in the IDP. None of the site allocations in the Regulation 19 Plan involve Green Belt release. A standalone policy on green gaps is being included as part of the Regulation 19 to, in part, address concerns on encroachment and the coalescence of settlements. The settlement hierarchy has been refined as part of the Regulation 19 Plan process to ensure that the hierarchy reflects the level of

	services and facilities available at that settlement. The housing requirement of the Regulation 19 Plan is underpinned by the Government's standard method with Oxford's unmet need factored in. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has departed from the housing figures outlined in the HENA.
What the development industry said:	
Interest in/reference to specific site • Representations promoted land for development including: land off Ploughley Road, Ambrosden, land south of the A41, Bicester, land west of Sibford Road, Hook Norton, land south of Milton Road, Adderbury, land south of Banbury Rise, Banbury, land at south lodge, Caversfield, land at Frieze Farm, proposed allocation PR6a, land at south Bicester, land off Akeman Street, Chesterton, land at Loop Farm, Peartree, Symmetry Park, Ardley, LPR34 as an extension of northwest Bicester, proposed allocation PR6b, proposed allocation PR8, land at Painter's Farm, Bloxham, land to the east of Milcombe, land east of M40 J11, land southwest of Graven Hill, land adjacent to Symmetry Park, Bicester and land at Overthorpe Road, Banbury • Concerns over these proposed allocations: land at Woodstock, Heyford Park, south of Chesterton, south-east of Wretchwick Green and an objection to LPR-A-071 • Other comments - if The Moors allocation led to increased footfall over their landholding, then they would require financial support to facilitate the additional maintenance this would cause and that the site extent of the Bicester Gateway existing allocation is larger than the existing allocation due to planning permissions and this should be shown in the Local Plan **Settlement hierarchy**	Comments noted. Sites promoted and put forward through the Council's 'call for sites' process have been assessed as part of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). Indicative development sites at Heyford Park and the Moors at Kidlington are not taken forward for allocation. The settlement hierarchy has been refined as part of the Regulation 19 Plan process to ensure that the hierarchy reflects the level of

• There is no evidence base to support the new classification and categorisation of villages and support for focusing development at Banbury and Bicester **Housing requirement/HENA/standard method** • Comments included that CP38 does not provide a strategy to meet the needs of older people and that sites should be specifically allocated to meet that need, questioning the number proposed as Oxford's unmet need, non-support for HENA conclusions, that CP36 should recognise and support affordable housing for Oxford University staff , support for taking Oxford City's unmet need, that CP24 should clarify housing densities as a minimum average across the whole site, that CP45 should make specific reference to settlement gaps as opposed to a blanket policy, that there should be additional allocations for employment and housing, that the HENA figure for specialist housing is underestimated and that the housing trajectory should consider realistic build rates and propose reserve allocations **Housing mix/tenure/typology** • Approximately 2 representations - sites should be identified for development in the villages • Self-build should only be required on CP40 site if there is a clear market need in the Banbury area and there may be circumstances where the 30% affordable housing target needs to be reduced **Environment** • Approximately 8 representations supported CP1 • Approximately 6 representations - CPs 2-5 are unclear • Approximately 4 representations - the policy for net-zero developments Is untested, go past the government policy, and the implications are unknown • Other comments - CP's 1-4 should not be applied to sites already with planning permission, the 20% biodiversity net gain policy for urban extensions is not justified, CP5 is restrictive to future development and so should be removed, 20% biodiversity net gain should not apply to	services and facilities available at that settlement. The housing requirement of the Regulation 19 Plan is underpinned by the Government's standard method with Oxford's unmet need factored in. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has departed from the housing figures outlined in the HENA. Different levels of affordable housing have been tested via the Whole Plan Viability Assessment to ensure that the level of affordable housing does not undermine the overall deliverability of sites. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review is taking forward a minimum figure of 10% BNG on development sites and an elevated 20% BNG figure on strategic allocations and sites within the Nature Recovery Network Core and Recovery zones (unless exemptions apply). The policy on 'mitigating and adapting to climate change' is supportive of decentralised energy

employment development, the nature recovery network is not clear, on CP11 that the provision of green roofs and walls are not always possible and this should be recognised in the policy, the requirement to provide green roofs needs to be balanced with the provision of solar panels and roof lights, and concern as to how CP15 would be put into practise	and renewable energy sources on residential schemes.
Transport impacts • Support for CP21 • Other comments - CP21 and CP22 make no reference to freight and logistics, support for reopening Ardley station, CP21 needs to recognise the need to give priority to the movement of people and goods, support for CP23 minimising freight trips on the road network and that developments unallocated employment sites should be supported where it can be demonstrated that proposals comply with the requirements of CP23	Transport impacts, including road congestion, have been considered further in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Landscape impacts • Approximately 1 representation requested clarification on CP43 regarding the process behind landscape character assessments and how this may affect draft policies	The Landscape Character Assessment, which includes a summary of the approach and methodology used, is available to view on the Council's website.
Green Belt • There are exceptional circumstances to justify a green belt review in and around London Oxford Airport and scope for exceptional circumstances for green belt release should include other forms of commercial and community facilities **Hot Food Takeaways** • Approximately 1 representation - the policy of Hot Food Takeaways is unsound, too restrictive and objected to the policy, noting that the 5-minute exclusion zone is inconsistent with national planning policy, examination of other plans have found similar approaches to be	The Council has proactively engaged with neighbouring local authorities as part of the 'duty to cooperate' process and has discussed cross-boundary matters with representatives from relevant Councils. The Council's approach to cross-boundary engagement is documented in the Plan's accompanying 'Duty to Cooperate Statement'.

unsound and noted that there needs to be further exploration into policies which are more positive with a reputable evidence base **Evidence** • Approximately 3 representations - a viability assessment has not been published so comments cannot be made on whether the objectives and policies are deliverable • Approximately 1 representation - key evidence is not yet available, including strategic land availability, landscape, gypsy and travellers, flood risk and infrastructure **Other** • Approximately 3 representations - there should be greater cooperation with other local authorities on cross-boundary matters • Approximately 2 representations requested consideration of the CIL timetable alongside the local plan • Other comments - concern for CP87 as it does not define measurable triggers which would lead to the council identifying alternative deliverable sites, request for consideration of the timetable to see if time-saving measures can be identified, the plan is lengthy and could be reduced in size, the plan period should be extended beyond 2040, and all existing policies should be replaced	All supporting evidence will be published on the Council's website as part of the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review consultation. Noted also re Plan timescales – the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has a Plan period end date of 2042.
What national/statutory organisations said:	
• **Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership** - request reference to biodiversity in SO9 and nature-based solutions should be prioritised in approaches to climate mitigation and adaptation. CP11 regarding irreplaceable habitats should be strengthened. Recommend the 20% BNG is expanded to cover all developments, • **Thames Water** supported CP's 1 and 9, but they need to be strengthened. Supported CP53 but suggested that water infrastructure should be covered in an improved separate policy. Supported the reference to sewer flooding in CP7 and highlighted the role of SUDs. Objected to	Comments noted. The mitigating and adapting to climate change has been refined and strengthened as part of the Regulation 19 Plan process. With regard to the 20% biodiversity net gain target, the targets ascribed in the Local Plan Review have

the designation of retained operational land at Bretch Hill Reservoir as existing green space in CP55 • **Natural England** - supported CP11 but noted that some allocations could potentially cause direct or indirect harm to these sites which should not occur unless the benefits of development clearly outweigh the harm which it would cause. Welcomed the 20% biodiversity net gain policy, the green and blue infrastructure strategy, and its reference within the policy, but this could be enhanced to be more in line with the targets proposed in the Green Infrastructure Standards by Natural England. Welcomed CP43 and the weight the policy gives to conserving the Cotswolds AONB. All allocations within a protected landscape should be subject to landscape and visual impact assessments and suggested that Local Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Advised that agricultural land classification survey data is used to inform decision making and that one of the main issues will be increased emissions from more traffic generation • **Home Builders Federation** (HBF) supported CP's1-6 but noted concern that the policies seek to push efficiency standards beyond those in the Future Homes Standard. Further evidence is required to justify the alternative standards set out in CP3 and CP4. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment should set out how these standards will be met. CP2 and CP4 are inconsistent with the HBF's approach. CP3 requires the implementation of the energy hierarchy and the need for monitoring which is considered inappropriate as developers cannot be held accountable for how an individual uses their home. Considered CP9 to be unsound as developers have a right to connect and there is a legal duty on water companies to meet the needs of the plan-led system so suggested that CDC should work with water companies to ensure that there is sufficient water supply and wastewater capacity to support new development. The council would need to find sites to deliver an additional 8,394 homes between 2020 and 2040 and recommended at least a 10% contingency which may need to be higher depending on the spatial strategy which is taken forward. Considered that it is important that there is a continual supply of homes and does not consider the ring-fencing of supply to meet Oxford's needs to be appropriate. Noted that allocating smaller sites and supporting SME house builders ensures a stronger supply in the short term and improves the diversity of choice in the housing market. Recommended that CP37 is reworded to state that in setting the housing mix, applicants would have regard to the current evidence rather than having to accord with it. Welcomed the reference to market	been carefully considered to ensure developments across the district are viable and can meet the ascribed biodiversity net gain percentage requirement. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has a standalone policy on 'public services and utilities' to ensure schemes that involve new or improvements to public services/utilities are supported where they accord with other relevant policies in the Development Plan. The Plan emphasises the important role of SuDS through its standalone policy on SuDS delivery. Site allocations taken forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review have been subject to comprehensive assessment, including assessments on their impact to environmental and heritage assets. With regard to housing supply, the trajectory of the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review builds in a steady supply of homes over the Plan period on a combination of small, medium and large sites. Housing policies have been informed by the accompanying Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This Assessment has considered

condition in any assessment of the housing mix. On CP38 the HBF considered it important that Local Plans look to allocate specific sites to meet the needs of older people rather than seek to meet this solely through delivery on other sites. Recommended that CDC set a policy target for the delivery of homes for older people and maintains a supply of land to meet that and notes that the Local Plan should set out its support and encouragement for older persons accommodation on brownfield land, other land in established urban/suburban areas and on non-allocated land. Suggested that older people's accommodation is exempt from affordable housing policies to ensure it can come forward. Regarding CP39 HBF, it is important to recognise that the optional technical standards can only be introduced where they are needed however the only justification provided in the Local Plan is that the standards are now mandatory on new dwellings developed under permitted development rights. Do not consider the blanket requirement in CP40 for self-build homes on large housing sites to be appropriate as the deliverability of self-build plots vary between sites and suggested that the approach rather should focus on identifying specific sites on which self-build can be delivered rather than including it as part of other sites delivering market and affordable housing. CDC should consider whether it is more appropriate to release more small sites for self and custom-building father than relying on larger sites • **National Highways** would be concerned by any proposals which have the potential to impact safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network (SRN) e.g. M40, A34 and A43. Noted a particular interest in traffic increases to the M40 J9 and J10. CDC should be supporting car alternatives and welcomed the promotion of 20-minute neighbourhoods. National Highways should be consulted on any proposals regarding CP71 and CP63. A transport evidence base should be provided to demonstrate the impact of the Local Plan on the SRN • **The Environment Agency** - a sequential test has not been carried out for the proposed allocations, and that some of the proposed housing, employment and safeguarded areas in CP's 6,62,64,70,71,72 and 76 lie within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and so need to be sequentially tested. As this evidence has not been produced, the plan is currently unsound as it Is not consistent with the NPPF. Additionally, some of the developments are more or less vulnerable and would not be compatible in Flood Zone 3b. Stated that table 1 'Flood Risk' and Annex 3 of the NPPF 'Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification' should be referred to. Noted that CP7 does not reference or provide guidance on the appropriateness of different vulnerabilities of development within	the impact of both biodiversity net gain percentages and affordable housing percentages on the deliverability of schemes across the district. Impacts of development, namely deriving from the Plan's site allocations, will be assessed as part of the Transport Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Mitigatory measures will be set out within the project schedule of the IDP. Flood risk analysis provided by the Environment Agency on each of the Regulation 18 indicative site allocations has informed the decision-making stage at Regulation 19 stage. Utility constraints have been considered and have informed the Regulation 19 Plan's site allocations.

	given flood zones. Supported SO2, CP1, CP42 and CP73 noting that North-West Bicester (LPR33) is upstream of Bure Park and may be an opportunity to enhance the river corridor and reduce flood risk in Bicester. Recommended that the reference to climate change in CP7 is expanded to ensure climate change is considered throughout assessments of flood risk, including in the sequential and exception tests and whilst in support of CP10 they recommended that this referred to mitigation measures required to ensure any development within the SAC does not impact fluvial flood risk. Regarding Kidlington, the Environment Agency commented in support of the area strategy. Regarding the Banbury Area Strategy they noted that two Banbury sites (Canalside, LPR55 and Higham Way, LPR56) are identified as at fluvial flood risk in the level 1 SFRA and to ensure that the sites are justified and deliverable, a level 2 SFRA is required. They recognise a level 2 SFRA is being prepared. Regarding the Bicester Area Strategy the Environment Agency noted that LPR21a (South-East of Wretchwick Green) is identified in the Local Plan as being at 'low' flood risk however commented that part of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and therefore is at high risk of flooding. Also noted that LPR37a (South of Chesterton and North-West of the A41) and LPR33 (North-West Bicester) are both partially located in areas at risk of fluvial flooding and as such should be assessed within the level 2 SFRA. Recommended that detailed flood models are provided for any sites proposed which are at flood risk, including both areas where detailed modelling is not yet available and where current detailed models do not include climate change allowances or the 3.3% AEP. Noted that the Environment Agency are creating a New National Model and that it is highly likely that this will need to be considered at some stage for the allocated sites. The following sites are considered to be at medium to high risk of fluvial flooding: LPR21a (South-East of Wretchwick Green), LPR33 (North-West Bicester) and LPR38 (Land East of M40 J9 and South of Green Lane. Regarding LPR8a (Land North of The Moors) the Environment Agency commented that the level 2 SFRA should investigate the area of the site that falls within Flood Zone 2 to further assess whether the site is at greater fluvial flood risk than shown in the flood map for planning and if so, what measures would be required to ensure the development would be safe from flooding without increasing the flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency also suggested specific wording amendments to various parts of the Local Plan and errors within the level 1 SFRA. Advised that a watercourse policy and advice note is required. Regarding CP1, the climate emergency and biodiversity crisis are linked and as such should be tackled together, and therefore CP1 and CP11 should be joined. In terms	

	of CP9, reference needs to be made to the unique habitats that are water dependent and that CP10 should aim to protect connectivity between the SAC and other green spaces both upstream and downstream. Welcomed the ambition to create a linear park through Banbury but commented that this should include a provision for wildlife as well as people through providing an ecological buffer strip along the river corridor. On LPR52 (North of Wykham Lane), there should be a commitment to a minimum of 20% biodiversity net gain for the river as part of any development on the site and an undeveloped buffer zone measuring a minimum of 10m from the top of the riverbank should be designed and reinstated along the Sor Brook Tributary. On LPR55 (Canalside), they suggested that an undeveloped buffer zone measuring a minimum of 10m from the top of the riverbank should be designed and reinstated along the river Cherwell and there should be a commitment to a minimum of 10% BNG for the river as part of development on the site. With reference to LPR56 (Higham Way), there should be a commitment to a minimum of 20% BNG for the river as part of development. On LPR21a (South-East of Wretchwick Green) site 1 for residential development has the potential to impact a small section of the main river in the NW corner and therefore there should be a commitment to achieving BNG for this section. On LPR33 (North- West Bicester), several watercourses are impacted by the site, that there should be a commitment to a minimum of 20% BNG for the rivers as part of development on the site, and that an undeveloped buffer zone of 10m should be designed. On LPR37a (South of Chesterton and North-West of the A41), site 2 offers excellent opportunity for enhancement of the river corridor, that there should be a commitment to 20% BNG and an undeveloped buffer of 10m minimum from the top of the riverbank should be designed. With reference to LPR63 (Begbroke Science Park) they commented that clarity is required on the red line boundary, and that they expect that both a minimum 20% BNG is in place for the river and that an undeveloped 10m minimum buffer from the top of the riverbank is designed. On LPR42a (South of Heyford Park), the overall development should demonstrate a minimum of 20% BNG and that a 10m minimum undeveloped buffer is designed from the top of the riverbank. Additionally, specific streams and rivers should be recognised within the Local Plan, and support for greenways and cycling routes but that design should consider the implications for nearby watercourses and wildlife. Furthermore, regarding the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, river tributaries deserve equal consideration as the main river network, tjay watercourses should be marked on all maps, and	

that the negative effects of encroachment and crossings on smaller watercourses should be considered. Noted that a separate policy is required on water quality, that clarity is needed on which SSSIs are water dependent and that the water cycle study is not referenced in the Local Plan and should be. Raised groundwater quality issues for Bolton Road, LPR55 (Canalside), LPR56 (Higham Way), LPR21a (South-East of Wretchwick Green), LPR33 (North-West Bicester), LPR37a (South of Chesterton and North-West of A41), LPR8a (North of The Moors), LPR63 (Begbroke Science Park) and LPR42a (South of Heyford Park) but no objections to other sites on this matter • **National Gas** - CP46 should be altered to include reference to respecting existing site constraints including utilities • **National Grid** - there is a NGET asset in the plan area and recommended CP46 be altered to include reference to respecting existing site constraints including utilities • **East West Rail** - London Road Crossing, Bicester use when EWR is operational will increase waiting times and congestion in the area and that alternatives are being considered to mitigate this. Welcomed the clear policy direction in this area. Requested clarification on the implementation of CP71 and proposed SE link road could form part of the wider transport strategy. On Graven Hill there is likely to be an interface between EWR and the proposed development	
What the neighbouring and other local authorities said:	
• **West Oxfordshire District Council** requested that LPR002 SE Woodstock is removed from the Local Plan • **Vale of White Horse District Council** - the climate and natural environment objectives could be more ambitious in line with the Oxfordshire strategic vision, and it will be difficult to balance the strategy of providing housing for all sectors of Cherwell's communities with other parts of the strategy. There should be clarity about what exceptional circumstances exist to remove Green Belt land the employment need is very large and should be clearly explained as to what supply is from previous allocation, windfalls, and new supply. The duty to cooperate statement requires updates as there are errors • **South and Vale District Council** - the 2023 Duty to Cooperate statement requires updates	Comments noted. The SE Woodstock site has been carried forward within the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review.

• Oxfordshire County Council Property & Estates questioned on CP54 what a 'robust marketing exercise' should include and require clarification • **Oxfordshire County Council** - the SFRA suggests that LPR55 has a high risk of fluvial and a moderate risk of flooding from surface water, and that LPR56 has a high risk of fluvial flooding. There are opportunities in LPR33, LPR37 and LPR42a for natural flood management which are not identified in the indicative site development templates. Regarding landscape, they noted that site allocations near Oxford and Bicester should consider the potential impacts and opportunities on the Bernwood Forest and Ray Valley Living Landscape project and recommended that CDC consult BBOWT on the Local Plan proposals with the view that proposed allocations can positively connect and contribute to the project. Noted that The Moors has no exceptional circumstances for green belt release and that LPR2 would increase the population within the catchment area of Woodstock CE Primary School beyond the schools capacity but not enough to make a new school viable =. Objected to LPR21a and LPR42a as LPR21a would directly affect the waste management facility adjacent and because LPR42a is in a crushed rock Minerals Safeguarding Area. If either LPR21a or LPR42a came forward, appropriate mitigation would need to be provided. If LPR21b came forward, they would recommend that use classes do not preclude waste facilities • **Buckinghamshire Council** – concerned about LPR21a and LPR21b due to the impact on traffic levels on the a41 and impact on local communities. Suggested that a strategic approach is taken when considering the implications of increased traffic to Aylesbury on the A41 and that the capacity of the A41 should be investigated. They are keen to understand views on introducing a strategic bus service along the A41 and requested details on the ongoing review of road links out of Bicester. The plan should recognise opportunities for accessing sites from improved footpath and cycle routes from the A41 into Buckinghamshire. Supported contributing to Oxford City's unmet need and suggested that a meeting is held between officers to discuss the implications of the plan • **West Northamptonshire Council** - recognition that West Northamptonshire residents utilise Cherwell facilities is needed. Also supported that proposals for further land allocations near J10 and J11 of the M40 have not been taken forward. No objection was raised to the spatial strategy, strategic policies, vision or objectives	None of the Regulation 19 site allocations involve Green Belt release. The Duty to Cooperate Statement has been updated as part of the Regulation 19 plan-making process. Comments noted re flood risk on the indicative site allocations. Opportunities for natural flood risk management have been explored further as part of the Regulation 19 plan-making process. Infrastructure capacity challenges, including education provision, will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Mitigatory measures and future infrastructure requirements will be set out in the IDP's accompanying project schedule.

What the local organisations/interest groups said:	
• **Oxford Green Belt Network** - in support for CP44 retaining green belt boundaries and stated that amendments to the green belt are not justified • CPRE Oxfordshire The Countryside Charity - concerned that the housing numbers are too high and suggested that a land strategy should be developed to underpin the plan, and if this is not achieved a brownfield first priority should be stated for housing, employment and renewable energy production. Opposed to The Moors and suggested that more local green spaces should be identified. The employment policy Is weaker and should be revisited • **Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum** – full support for CP23, and CP24 does not mention that Heyford Park is a brownfield site itself. Full support for CP's 38,45,49 and 56 but questioned why in CP39 there is no mention on accessible and adaptable housing. On CP51, Parish Councils should be involved in negotiating S106 agreements with developers and that the agreed funding should be spent within the agreed timescale • **Kidlington Development Watch** - support for CP44, in that green belt boundaries will be retained and requested that there are no more revisions to the green belt boundaries. A policy or design guide needed to control redevelopment to apartments to address issues which would arise • **Keep the Horton General** - suggested enhancing the plans for health and care, specifically on CP's 49, 50 and 67. Suggested that the Horton should be developed to provide modern facilities to support a growing population which the JR would be unable to cope with • **Bicester Athletic Club** - the proposed plans lack substance and ambition, and the hoped-for track and field facility at Kingsmere has been ebbed away at which is a step back from the current plan. With additional housing, there is likely to be higher demand for a local track and field facility so should be considered • **Cherwell Development Watch Alliance** - strong support for CP44 and stated that the green belt boundaries should not be changed • **Tudor Hall School** - concern about LPR52 due to the proximity to the boarding school. LPR52 is not consistent with Banbury's spatial strategy, CP30 and CP43 but if the development is to go ahead, they would welcome landscaping to screen the housing development from the school	Comments noted. None of the site allocation put forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review involve the need for Green Belt release. The indicate site at Heyford Park is not proposed for allocation. The SE Woodstock site has been carried forward within the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review. The housing requirement of the Regulation 19 Plan is underpinned by the Government's standard method with Oxford's unmet need factored in. The Regulation 19 Local Plan Review has departed from the housing figures outlined in the HENA. Infrastructure requirements for leisure/sports facilities and healthcare will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

• **Campaign to Protect Old Woodstock** objected to South-East Woodstock due to the impact on infrastructure, on Blenheim World Heritage Site, on the setting of Woodstock and increasing car travel • **CAG Oxfordshire** - the Local Plan should make a clear emphasis on nature recovery as being vital in its own right. The number and order of policies should be rationalised, and some simple 'best practise' guidelines should be included. Requested that highly accessible map layers are made available to show relevant designations • **North Oxfordshire Green Party** - carbon offsetting appears to be laying the groundwork for avoiding the need for zero carbon development. The vision should include improving water, electric and sewerage infrastructure to support developments, and any large developments should include space for allotments. Solar panels and air source heat pumps should be the norm and that building of blue infrastructure and surface urban drainage should be included. Policies should support composting on site of new developments and that solar energy should be on brownfield sites and rooftops to prevent losing green belt land. CP39 should ensure that all developments have 50% of space not built on and that CP46 should be reworded to be stronger. There is a lack of green and blue infrastructure in the plan for Bicester, that employment floorspace should be limited to the original proposal, that affordability and climate change should be priorities and that there is confusion between Kidlington and Kidlington area as well as the boundaries of the surrounding villages. Additionally, the canal path should not be a priority when funding is scarce as it is unsuitable for community as it is too narrow, dark and there is no barrier	The Local Plan Review will have an accompanying interactive policies map where policy layers can be toggled on and off. Policies on SuDS and 'mitigating and adapting to climate change' have been refined and strengthened as part of the Regulation 19 Plan process.

Local Green Space Submissions to the Call for Sites

In addition, 35 sites for designation as a Local Green Space were formally submitted through the Call for Sites process at this stage. 32 of these were new sites and three were updates to sites previously submitted. Additionally, several sites were suggested in representations to the Local Plan consultation, however as these were not formally submitted, and did not include all the necessary information, they were excluded from consideration.

A full list of sites identified as potential Local Green Space sites is included at **Appendix 15.**

6. Next Steps

All the feedback we have received during the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Review consultation will be carefully considered and used to help inform the next stage of the Local Plan process.

The programme for preparation of the Cherwell Local Plan Review is presented in the latest Local Development Scheme which is available online at Local Development Scheme | Local Development Scheme | Cherwell District Council.