

**CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING POLICY CONSULTATION  
22 SEPTEMBER 2023 TO 3 NOVEMBER 2023  
Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 – Regulation 18 Consultation Draft**

**Representation Form**

We are preparing a new Local Plan for Cherwell and would like your views. We are presenting a draft of the Plan for consultation so that you can consider our emerging proposals. It has been prepared to prompt discussion and feedback on new planning policies to guide the delivery of sustainable development across the district.

The draft Plan sets out a vision and proposes homes, employment land, infrastructure and other essential services required to support the local community over the Plan period.

The draft Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 and supporting documents are available to view on-line at <https://cherwell.citizenspace.com/planning-policy/cherwell-local-plan-review-2040-consultation-draft>

This response form can be downloaded from <https://cherwell.citizenspace.com/planning-policy/cherwell-local-plan-review-2040-consultation-draft>

All documents are also available on Cherwell District Council's website at:  
<https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/local-plan-review-2040>

Hard copies of the documents are available to view, and hard copies of this form are available to take away at:

- Cherwell District Council offices at Bodicote house, Bodicote, Banbury
- Libraries across the District
- Woodstock Library
- West Oxfordshire District Council Offices at Welch Way, Witney
- Public exhibitions during the consultation period

**How to use this form**

Please complete **Part A** in full.

Then complete **Part B** for each question you wish to comment on. Boxes for comments can be expanded.

**Please return completed forms:**

**By Email to:** [PlanningPolicyConsultation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:PlanningPolicyConsultation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

**Or by post to:** Planning Policy Team, Planning Policy, Cherwell District Council, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA.

If you have any questions about completing the form or accessing documents, please telephone 01295 227985 or email [planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk).

**Comments should be received no later than 11.59pm on Friday 3 November 2023.**

Your details will be added to our mailing list which means that you will be automatically notified of future stages of the local plan preparation process. If you subsequently wish to be removed from our mailing list, please contact us.

**PLEASE NOTE THAT ANONYMOUS OR CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS CANNOT BE ACCEPTED. ANY COMMENTS RECEIVED WILL BE MADE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.**

The information you provide will be stored on a Cherwell District Council database and used solely in connection with the Cherwell Local Plan Review. Representations will be available to view on the Council's website, but address, signature and contact details will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, they cannot be treated as confidential. Data will be processed and held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.

## PART A

|                                        | Details of the person / body making the comments                     | Details of the agent submitting the comments on behalf of another person / body (if applicable) |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title                                  | Mrs                                                                  |                                                                                                 |
| First Name                             | Jane                                                                 |                                                                                                 |
| Last Name                              | Olds                                                                 |                                                                                                 |
| Job Title ( <i>where relevant</i> )    | Parish Clerk                                                         |                                                                                                 |
| Organisation ( <i>where relevant</i> ) | Launton Parish Council                                               |                                                                                                 |
| E-mail Address                         | <a href="mailto:clerk@launton-pc.gov.uk">clerk@launton-pc.gov.uk</a> |                                                                                                 |
| Postal Address                         | 13 Oak Close<br>Bicester                                             |                                                                                                 |
| Post Code                              | OX26 3XD                                                             |                                                                                                 |
| Telephone Number ( <i>optional</i> )   | 07305 303889 / 01869 247171                                          |                                                                                                 |

## PART B – Please complete part B for each question you wish to comment on

### Introduction

QUESTION 1: Do you have a view on the Plan period?

No view.

QUESTION 2: How could we improve presentation of the Plan?

Overall, one of the best that has been done - but there are a number of typographical errors and consistency. The maps are of poor quality. The colour coding was useful.

**QUESTION 3: Do you have any comments on our draft proposals for retaining/saving existing policies?**

No comments.

**Do you have any additional comments on the Introduction Chapter?**

No.

## **Vision and Objectives**

**QUESTION 4: Do you have any comments on the draft Vision?**

As usual, the vision is aspirational rather than realistic, but realistic visions tend not to go down well with the public.

**QUESTION 5: Do you have any observations on our objectives?**

All the objectives make sense.

**Do you have any additional comments on the Plan Vision and Objectives Chapter?**

No.

## **Spatial Strategy**

**QUESTION 6: Do you have any comments on our strategy?**

Once again, the strategy directs the development to the larger villages which will threaten the character of those larger villages which conflicts with the first point under Rural Areas on page 13. It then also deprives the smaller villages of the opportunity of becoming more sustainable.

## **District Wide Policies**

**QUESTION 7: Should we seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain if this means sacrificing other requirements?**

Unable to answer this question without knowing what other requirements are going to be sacrificed!

**QUESTION 8: Should we identify further land for employment?**

Probably not, but any land which is identified must be readily accessible to the local workforce with adequate infrastructure and amenable to sustainable transport.

**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.**

No comment.

**QUESTION 10: Do you have any comments on our approach of focusing employment development on strategic sites at Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington?**

Seems sensible but the sites must be sustainably chosen, which some of the sites appear not to be.

**QUESTION 11: What are your views on our proposed approach towards development at existing and allocated employment sites?**

Core Policy 26 seems sensible.

**QUESTION 12: What are your views on our proposed approach towards new employment development on unallocated sites?**

Core Policy 27 seems sensible.

**QUESTION 13: What are your views on allowing ancillary uses on employment sites?**

Acceptable.

**QUESTION 14: What are your views on our proposed approach to rural diversification?**

A sensible approach.

**QUESTION 15: What are your views on our proposed approach to tourism development?**

Core Policy 31 doesn't specify whether all the items in the list should apply or only some of them. Almost all the other lists in core policies have 'and' or 'or' as part of the list.

**QUESTION 16: What are your views on our proposed approach to retail development and town centres?**

A sensible approach, but it needs to be enforceable.

**QUESTION 17: Do you agree with the town centre and primary shopping frontage boundaries shown on the plans?**

In the Bicester town centre – the Dean’s Court shopping area (including the new ‘Poundland’) has not been included.

**QUESTION 18: Do you agree that only within the primary shopping frontage area E use classes should be protected?**

Yes

**QUESTION 19: Do you have comments on the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment?**

The Parish Council lacks the expertise to comment on the assessment.

**QUESTION 20: Do you have comments on our emerging housing distribution?**

The Council has grave concerns about the 800 houses south east of Wretchwick Green. It is, in effect, a new large extension to Bicester which will come very close to the boundary with Launton. Building that number of houses in that location will have a huge detrimental effect on the village of Launton, not least due to the inevitable increase in traffic through the village.

**QUESTION 21: Are there any Parish Councils seeking a specific housing requirement for Neighbourhood Plans?**

No.

**QUESTION 22: What are your views on our settlement hierarchy proposals?**

The village designations should be reviewed regularly and should meet a specific set of criteria on the services available at the time. What counts as a larger village now may have no facilities or bus service in a handful of years.

Asking for fixed definitions and flexible designations / classifications.

**QUESTION 23: What are your views on our suggested policy for affordable housing?**

The policy should not be for less than 30%, but should ideally be more than 30%.

**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?**

It is not possible to answer this without knowing what sacrifices are being considered. But we do support maximising the delivery of affordable housing.

**QUESTION 25: Do you agree with our approach for assessing the suitability of sites for travelling communities?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 26: Would you like to propose any sites for consideration as Local Green Spaces?**

Nothing in Launton comes to mind.

**Do you have any additional comments on Our Strategy for Development in Cherwell Chapter?**

Core Policies 43 and 45 are extremely important for retaining the individual character of Cherwell's villages and providing buffers between settlements.

## **Banbury Area Strategy**

**QUESTION 27: What are your views on our aspirations for the Banbury area?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 28: Do you think these sites in the Banbury area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 29: Are there any alternative housing sites for Banbury you wish to suggest?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 30: Are there other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Banbury?**

No comment.

**Do you have any additional comments on the Banbury Area Strategy chapter?**

No comment.

## **Bicester Area Strategy**

**QUESTION 31: What are your views on our aspirations for the Bicester area?**

Aspirational. Saying the right things, but time will tell how many will be able to be achieved.

**QUESTION 32: Do you think these sites in the Bicester area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?**

Sites 1 and 3 seem totally unsustainable, particularly in relation to infrastructure and traffic use.

Site 1 should not be described as part of Bicester.

Site 3 will inevitably lead to Bicester growing way beyond Launton village.

Site 3 will need to be very carefully designed to avoid coalescence between Launton and Bicester. This site will increase the transport requirements and congestion through the village.

We realise that there are difficulties in locating sites for additional housing, but these two sites appear to be in extreme conflict with other policies within the Local Plan; especially with reduction in local traffic and preservation of the character and separation of rural settlements.

**QUESTION 33: Are there any alternative housing sites for Bicester you wish to suggest?**

No.

**QUESTION 34: Do you agree with the employment sites we have selected at Bicester to accommodate new employment development?**

Employment sites make more sense than the housing locations.

**QUESTION 35: Are there any alternative sites to accommodate housing and employment needs that you think are more suitable?**

No.

**QUESTION 36: Are there any other transport schemes that you think should be delivered at Bicester?**

Infrastructure for Sustrans Route 51 ends at the bridge at Launton and should be improved.  
Nothing else specific.

**QUESTION 37:** Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes at Bicester?

No.

**QUESTION 38:** Is there other green and blue infrastructure you think should be delivered at Bicester?

Nothing specific.

*Question 39: No question – Duplication in draft Local Plan*

**QUESTION 40:** Are there any other measures we should be taking to improve Bicester town centre?

Regardless of the intentions, the reality is that people will continue to want to drive cars into Bicester – particularly from the villages – and the reduction of parking facilities within Bicester will threaten Bicester's viability.

**QUESTION 41:** What are your views on our proposed approach to development proposals at Former RAF Bicester?

The proposed approach is laudable.

Do you have any additional comments on the Bicester Area Strategy chapter?

No.

### **Kidlington Area Strategy**

**QUESTION 42:** What are your views on our aspirations for the Kidlington area?

No comment.

**QUESTION 43:** Do you think these sites in the Kidlington area should be explored further for potential allocation for housing?

No comment.

**QUESTION 44: Are there any alternative housing sites for the Kidlington area you wish to suggest?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 45: Do you agree with the employment sites we have selected at Kidlington to accommodate new employment development?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 46: Are there any alternative sites to accommodate housing and employment needs that you think are more suitable?**

No comment.

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

No comment.

**QUESTION 48: Should land for employment use be identified at London Oxford Airport?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 49: Do you have any comments on the transport schemes proposed for the Kidlington area?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 50: Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes in the Kidlington area?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 51: Do you have any comments on the green and blue infrastructure proposed for the Kidlington area?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 52: Do you have any views on the proposed changes to the village centre?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 53: Do you have any views on the areas of change identified?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 54: Are there any other opportunity areas or sites that we should be including?**

No comment.

**Do you have any additional comments on the Kidlington Area Strategy chapter?**

No comment.

### **Heyford Park Area Strategy**

**QUESTION 55: Do you have any views on our aspirations for Heyford Park?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 56: Do you agree with the local service role for Heyford Park proposed in Core Policy 3?**

No comment.

**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?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 58: Do you have any comments on the potential allocation at Heyford Park?**

No comment.

**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?**

No comment.

**QUESTION 60: Are there any other areas of land that you think should be safeguarded for transport schemes in the Heyford area?**

No comment.

**Do you have any additional comments on the Heyford Park Area Strategy chapter?**

No comment.

## **Rural Areas Strategy**

**QUESTION 61: Do you have any views on our aspirations for our Rural Areas?**

As noted previously, we disagree with directing the development solely to the larger and more sustainable villages.

Most other aspirations seem laudable.

**QUESTION 62: Do you support our preliminary proposals for housing in our rural areas?**

Subject to consultation being held with the 11 Larger Villages about the site-specific allocations for the 500 dwellings most of the rest of the proposals seem relatively sensible.

Is there going to be any attempt to define the built-up limits of the individual villages?

**QUESTION 63: Are there any potential rural housing sites you wish to suggest?**

Not in Launton.

**QUESTION 64: Do you know of any potential new rural employment sites?**

No.

**Do you have any additional comments on the Rural Areas Area Strategy chapter?**

As noted above, we regard additional consultation with the 11 Larger Villages as a prerequisite to the plan being finalised.

## **Implementing the Plan**

QUESTION 65: Do you have any comments on these measures?

There appears to be nothing in the Plan which states that the housing should be phased over the life of the Plan rather than built all in one go. This has been used in appeals as an argument against CDC's refusal of planning permission.

Do you have any additional comments on the Implementing the Plan chapter?

No.

## **Appendices**

Do you have any comments on the appendices?

The maps are difficult to read and are of poor quality.

There should be an explanation comparing and contrasting the timescales involved in the categorisation of "deliverable" and "developable" housing sites.

Page 276 the definition of the area in Launton appears to be incorrect. There is no Launton Road in Launton.

## **Supporting Documents**

Do you have any comments on the supporting technical evidence?

No.

## **Additional comments**

Do you have any additional comments on the Draft Local Plan Review?

No.