

**Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review
Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options
September 2021**

Representation Form

Cherwell District Council has prepared a document called *Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options* which is the second stage of consultation to inform a new district wide Local Plan.

This consultation paper sets out what has changed since we first consulted, and the current options we are considering for preparing the Cherwell Local Plan Review. There will be other options we will need to consider as we progress, and other plans and programmes become firmer. Some of the options we have identified may also need refinement.

This stage of plan making is about developing our thinking and gathering evidence. The responses to this consultation are an important part of that process and will help shape our new Local Plan. Having previously consulted on issues, we once again wish to ensure that a wide cross-section of views is obtained in identifying and examining our development and policy options.

We are also inviting comments on our emerging evidence base, including an Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report.

These documents are available to view for comment from **Wednesday 29 September 2021 to 11.59pm
Wednesday 10 November 2021.**

To view the Community Involvement Paper 2 (Developing our Options) and the accompanying Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report and other evidence documents please visit letstalk.cherwell.gov.uk/cherwell-local-plan-2021. **Please note you can also complete this representation form online.**

Hard copies of the Options Paper and Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report are available for viewing during opening hours at our advertised deposit locations which include Bodicote House, and libraries across the District.

How to use this form

Please complete **Part A** in full.

Then complete **Part B for each question you wish to comment on.**

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.

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 return completed forms:

By Email to: PlanningPolicyConsultation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review
Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options
Representation Form

Or by post to: Planning Policy Team, Planning Policy, Conservation and Design, 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.

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 | | |
| First Name | | |
| Last Name | | |
| Job Title (<i>where relevant</i>) | | |
| Organisation (<i>where relevant</i>) | | |
| E-mail Address | | |
| Postal Address | | |
| Post Code | | |
| Telephone Number | | |

Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review
Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options
Representation Form

| | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| <i>(optional)</i> | | |
|-------------------|--|--|



PART B – Please complete Part B for each option/question you wish to comment on

OPTION 1: VISION – Do you have any observations on the suggested Vision?

Vision should include:

- Recognition of the tools needed to achieve the goals of economic growth that are compatible with climate change, health and well being goals, specifically the provision of high quality active travel provision as priority over car dependent decisions.
- Neighbourhoods are primarily connected to each other and to facilities by direct and safe walking and cycling paths rather than being dependent on motor vehicle carriageways.
- Priority is given to ensuring that walkers and cyclists are able to reach their destinations safely and conveniently and motor vehicle routes are then designed around this, rather than vice-versa.
- People are able to maintain their health and fitness effortlessly by using safe and convenient walking and cycling routes.
- Dominance, noise, pollution, danger, and inefficient use of space by motor vehicles in urban centres is minimised by pedestrianising town centres, rerouting motor vehicles around key urban centres rather than directly through town centres, and better allocating roads and car parking to more efficient use of space such as public space for parks, gardens, cafes and restaurants, and bike and electric bike parking.
- Rural communities are connected to urban centres with safe and direct walking and cycling routes.



OPTION 2: KEY OBJECTIVES - Do you have any observations to make on the draft objectives? Which do you consider are the most important?

KO1: It is important to consider the link between required area for housing and the current policies around car dependency. The space requirement can be greatly reduced by addressing the space hungry needs of parking and roads. Urban sprawl will be in direct contradiction to the stated climate mitigation objectives of the council.

KO10: The transport emissions of housing developments must be included in the definition of net zero, this will necessitate prioritising active travel provision.

KO11: This is not ambitious enough, given the timeframe of the local plan, the ending of reliance on fossil fuels should be the aim rather than a reduction of reliance.

KO16: the role of active travel is highly supported, but the integration into developments and transport planning is not visible from the objectives, it is not a separate issue.

KO28: the concept of the 15minute neighbourhood should be considered as the definition with which to make this objective a reality. The sustainable accessibility of amenities and facilities should be within a 15 active travel or public transport journey.

OPTION 3: LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND -Where do you think employment land should be focused to deliver the jobs needed in Cherwell?

- 1) At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
- 2) At significant transport interchanges
- 3) Mostly on previously developed land, including in less sustainable locations
- 4) At the larger villages

5) A combination of all of the above options

Employment land should be situated in locations that are readily walkable and cyclable from urban centres along safe and segregated paths, or located at sustainable transport interchanges such as railway stations that can be reached on foot or by bike.

OPTION 4: EMPLOYMENT LAND - When identifying sites for employment land, what should be our priority to balance protecting communities and meeting the needs of our business?

- 1) Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8)**
- 2) Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes)**
- 3) Provide a mixture of the above**

QUESTION: SUPPORTING EMPLOYMENT – Are there any other employment policies we should include in the Plan?

OPTION 5: TOWN CENTRES & RETAIL - To support our town centres, should we

- 1) Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes**
- 2) Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.**

Town centre development should be focussed on ensuring that there is a sufficiently large concentration of development in a single place that a person can meet many or all of their needs conveniently on foot or bike without being forced to travel out-of-town or to areas that are only accessible by motor vehicle.

QUESTION: TOWN CENTRE USES (BANBURY, BICESTER & KIDLINGTON) - Are there other policies that should be considered in relation to retail to support our town centres?

- Out-of-town drive and park only development should generally be restricted.
- All town centres should be readily accessible by safe, direct, and attractive footpaths and cycle paths.
- Motor vehicles should be prevented from driving directly through the middle of town centres so as to avoid wasting space and creating danger, pollution, and noise. This is stifling economic growth and an increase of tourism. Rather, motor vehicles should be encouraged to take indirect routes around town centres so as to discourage unnecessary motor vehicle use and to support and encourage walking and cycling.
- “No cycling” areas should be removed.
- Sufficient secure and convenient parking for bikes and electric bikes should be provided. Retailers should be able to easily apply for bike parking to be installed at their location if requested.

QUESTION: SUPPORTING OUR TOWN CENTRES - Are there any local town centre and retail related policies that we should consider?

See above.

OPTION 6: RATES OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING - Should we

- 1) Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units?
- 2) Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District)

OPTION 7: AFFORDABLE HOUSING TENURE - Should we

- 1) prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures?**
- 2) Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent?**

OPTION 8: HOUSING INTERNAL SPACE STANDARDS - Should we:

- 1) Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?**
- 2) Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement?**

QUESTION: SEPARATION DISTANCES - Should we introduce a policy requiring minimum separation distances between residential properties?

Cherwell should not introduce a policy requiring minimum separation distances between residential properties. High density (designed properly) supports walkable and cyclable towns where residents can fulfil the majority of their needs on foot or by bike. Larger separation distances makes it more difficult to provide facilities due to insufficient density, forcing facilities to be located only where they can be accessed by motor vehicle.

Detached housing is also less energy efficiency that terraced and adjoining properties.

OPTION 9: HOUSING ACCESSIBILITY - Should we:

- 1) Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes?**
- 2) Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility?**

New homes should have sufficient safe and convenient bike parking spaces as well as communal bike parking for visitors.

Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review
Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options
Representation Form

QUESTION: TRAVELLING COMMUNITIES - We would be interested to hear if there are any specific locations within the district that would be suitable to meet the needs of Travelling Communities and the reasons why these areas are considered suitable. How can we best ensure that the Travelling Communities have sustainable access to services and facilities?

QUESTION: HOUSING POLICIES - Are there any other housing policies we should include in the Plan? For example, is there a need to support alternative methods of construction (e.g. modular homes)?

OPTION 10: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION - Should we

- 1) Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan. or**
- 2) Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and non-residential development that only meet standards set by Government. or**
- 3) Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government?**

QUESTION: RETROFITTING OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS - How should we address the challenges of retrofitting existing building stock balancing this against the need to protect historic buildings?

OPTION 11: RENEWABLE ENERGY - Should we

- 1) Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation**
- 2) Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation?**

QUESTION: POLICIES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE, SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION & RENEWABLE ENERGY -
Are there any other policies that you think are required to help support the approach to managing climate change?

Given the vast proportion of emissions in Cherwell are for transport, yet most local journeys distances that are walkable or cyclable are currently made by motor vehicle, serious emphasis should be placed on ensuring that all construction enables residents, workers, and visitors to reach it safely, directly, and conveniently on foot or by bike.

Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review
Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options
Representation Form

Less reliance should be placed on electric vehicles given that electric vehicles do not address the negative consequences of manufacture, traffic congestion, traffic accidents, parking space requirements, waste of road space, danger, and undermining of public health.

QUESTION: GREEN BELT – Are there any local Green Belt matters we need to consider?

OPTION 12: BIODIVERSITY - Where biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures cannot be achieved on site, should we:

- 1) Secure as close to the site as possible

- 2) Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused**
- 3) Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district**

OPTION 13: NATURAL CAPITAL - Should we:

- 1) Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; or**
- 2) Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to:**
 - a) be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and**
 - b) demonstrate environmental net gain; or**
- 3) Not require major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment.**

QUESTION: BIODIVERSITY & THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - Do you have any views on policies for inclusion in the review of the Plan on biodiversity and the natural environment?

OPTION 14: CHILDREN’S PLAY - Should we:

- 1) Continue to provide children’s play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach**
- 2) Provide children’s play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play**
- 3) Seek opportunities to integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas.**

Many areas where children would historically have played on the streets have been rendered too dangerous due to the quantity, speed, and size of motor vehicles. Streets should be designed so that it is safe for children to play in the street, or ride their bikes safely without supervision. Low traffic neighbourhoods would contribute to this coupled with the concepts from the Netherlands and Germany of ‘Residential areas’ and ‘Cycle Streets’ where walking, playing and cycling are prioritised and cars are ‘guests’

OPTION 15: OUTDOOR SPORTS PROVISION - Should we:

- 1) Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites**
- 2) Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements**
- 3) Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use**

Sports facilities should be within cycling distance of most users. However the planned relocation of sports facilities from Bicester to Chesterton indicates that insufficient land has been earmarked near to housing and that they are increasingly built in locations that makes their access car dependent.

QUESTION: LOCAL GREEN SPACES –

- 1) Do you have any comments on the sites submitted for Local Green Space designation so far?**
- 2) Do you have sites that you consider meet the criteria for Local Green Space designation?**

QUESTION: PROTECTING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT – Are there any specific policies for heritage and protecting the historic environment that we should include?

QUESTION: ACHIEVING GOOD DESIGN & ‘BEAUTY’ – How can the local plan best support improvements in design and target local design codes/guidance that follow?

One aspect of good design and beauty is to avoid areas that are dominated by cars, car-parking, and roads. While the car has its place, good design can ensure that other factors such as public spaces, greenery, footpaths and cycle paths through green areas are highlighted.

QUESTION: 20-MINUTE NEIGHBOURHOODS - Do you agree that 20-minute neighbourhoods offer a helpful set of principles for ensuring places are well-designed and sustainable? Are there features that would work in sub-urban or the rural areas?

20-minute neighbourhoods are a helpful set of principles for ensuring that places are well-designed and sustainable. The 20 minutes should be measured by walking and cycling distances.

QUESTION: TRANSPORT & CONNECTIVITY –

- **Do you agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach to support the Local Plan Review?**
- **Should the approach be different for the rural areas, for example focusing on low carbon technology rather than a reduction in the need to travel?**
- **What measures would help you drive less or use alternative transport modes with**

lower emissions?

The transport hierarchy has never really been implemented properly, despite previous documents referring to it. Development is currently focussed on motor vehicle travel and increasing the number of cars on the road. Serious steps need to be taken to ensure that other alternatives are available, and properly funded. The most obvious is to put in place concrete commitments to ensure that transport and connectivity properly applies the transport hierarchy, with reducing the need to travel and enabling active travel as the starting point. Targets and monitoring need to be in place for active travel to enable the level of transparency and modelling capability that is currently reserved for vehicle traffic only.

Rural areas are now becoming more feasible to connect with the advent of the electric bike. Measures should be taken to connect outlying villages with local towns in a safe and convenient way. Dedicated, off-carriageway, cycle routes should be implemented, and certain connecting roads should be closed to motor vehicle traffic.

OPTION 16: DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE - Should we

- 1) Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing).**
- 2) Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure.**
- 3) Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development.**

QUESTION: TRANSPORT POLICIES –

Do you agree with the range of policies and documents we have identified?

Are there any transport-related policies that we should consider through the Local Plan Review?

There needs to be a detailed Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure plan for all key towns and villages that specifies exactly what pedestrian and cycle routes and crossings need to be constructed where. Currently provision is very haphazard and up to the whim of the developer, rather than being a proper, joined-up and cohesive plan that all parties are working towards. The progress in implementing the LCWIP should form a key measurable and public metric on the county's progress to decarbonising transport.

OPTION 17: INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY - Should we:

- 1) update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy?**

2) Retain the current methodology?

And, should we:

3) Continue to prepare the IDP by place or

4) look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are?

The approach to infrastructure delivery needs to be revised. Currently, it is very backward looking and locks in previous shortcomings. For example, if there is limited walking and cycling due to limited or no safe or direct supporting infrastructure, this is often taken to be evidence of a lack of demand. Demand should be estimated on the basis that suitable infrastructure was provided and with a view to the levels of active travel demand needed to reduce vehicle congestion and transport emissions. Along key routes, walking and cycling levels should massively increase to be in line with climate and health goals

Grouping infrastructure by how accessible it currently is by walking, cycling, and public transport will tend to lock in these types of shortcomings. Better would be to group infrastructure according to how accessible it would be if walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure was improved.

QUESTION: DELIVERING INFRASTRUCTURE - Are there other infrastructure policies that we should include?

Given the vast benefits of creating walking and cycling infrastructure over motor vehicle infrastructure, and the current imbalance in the networks, funding should be weighted towards walking and cycling.

OPTION 18: HOUSING & EMPLOYMENT GROWTH AT BANBURY - If Banbury is identified as a location for growth, should we:

- 1) Consider further urban extensions into the open countryside.
- 2) Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages
- 3) Focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury

OPTION 19: BANBURY – DIRECTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT - If additional development is directed to Banbury requiring green field sites

Should we:

- 1) Consider sites to the north of the town.
- 2) Consider sites to the south of the town
- 3) Consider sites to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 Junction 11)
- 4) Consider sites to the west of the town?
- 5) A combination of any of the above

We would welcome views on any specific sites identified through the call for sites, or suggestions for new sites.

QUESTION: IMPORTANT VIEWS OF BANBURY –

1. Should we retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary’s Church?
2. Are there any other specific buildings or locally important views that should be protected through the Local Plan review?

OPTION 20: BANBURY TOWN CENTRE – ARTICLE 4 DIRECTIONS - To help support the vitality of Banbury’s main shopping area, should we

- 1) consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission?**
- 2) Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules.**

OPTION 21: BANBURY CANALSIDE – Should we:

- 1) Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area.**
- 2) Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable well designed, mixed use area.**
- 3) Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes**

Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review
Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options
Representation Form

QUESTION: BANBURY'S OPEN SPACES - How do you think Banbury's network of green spaces, sport and play facilities could be protected and enhanced?

QUESTION: ADDRESSING INEQUALITY IN BANBURY – Are there other policies we could include to help address inequalities in Banbury?

Planning for Cherwell – the Cherwell Local Plan Review
Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing our Options
Representation Form

QUESTION: REDUCING CAR DEPENDENCY IN BANBURY - What would help you make fewer trips by car in Banbury?

OPTION 22: HOUSING & EMPLOYMENT GROWTH AT BICESTER – If Bicester is identified as a location for further growth, should we:

- 1) Consider further major urban extensions into the open countryside.**
- 2) Limit development at Bicester to protect its setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages**

3) Focus development at an existing or new settlement(s) well connected to Bicester

Any development in or around Bicester must be well connected by cycling and walking provision, this would favour more central locations, but where expansion takes place the connectivity and extent of land needed can be limited by prioritising active travel provision over space inefficient car centred developments.

OPTION 23: BICESTER 2 – DIRECTIONS OF GROWTH - If development is directed to Bicester requiring green field sites should we:

- 1) Consider sites to the north of the town,
- 2) Consider sites to the south of the town,
- 3) Consider sites to the east of the town,
- 4) Consider sites to the west of the town?
- 5) A combination of any of the above

We would welcome views on any specific sites identified through the call for sites, or suggestions for new sites.

OPTION 24: BICESTER TOWN CENTRE – ARTICLE 4 DIRECTIONS – Should we

- 1) consider the use of an article 4 direction to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to residential?**
- 2) Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules**

The main problem for Bicester is that it is dominated by motor vehicles and the public space is wasted. The historic and very beautiful market square is a car park and huge traffic gyratory, despite there being ample parking nearby and other routes around the town centre that do not require driving straight through the middle of the most valuable public space. This parking is an inefficient use of space, limiting the number of customers who can access the centre as well as making the place less appealing for customers to visit due to noise, pollution and danger from traffic.

It is obvious that the Market Square should be closed to motor vehicles to encourage tourists, visitors, and shoppers back to the centre. Motor vehicles should be routed around the Market Square, not through it.

Equally, Church Street and the Causeway are the most beautiful and historical areas, but are ruined by traffic driving straight through. The Causeway should also be closed to motor vehicles.

OPTION 25: BICESTER – COMMUNITY & CULTURAL FACILITIES - Should we

- 1) Identify a specific site(s) to enable the development of cultural facilities for Bicester**
- 2) Facilitate such developments through a criteria-based policy.**

QUESTION: BICESTER’S HERITAGE & HISTORIC BUILDINGS – Are there specific buildings, areas or historic assets that should be specifically protected through the Local Plan?

QUESTION: BICESTER’S OPEN SPACES - How do you think Bicester’s network of green spaces, sport and play facilities could be protected and enhanced?

These spaces could be protected and enhanced by being connected by safe (away from the road) and direct walking and cycling routes to discourage motor vehicles and encourage visitors.

QUESTION: LOCAL GREEN SPACES IN BICESTER – Do you have any views on the submitted proposals for Local Green Space designation in Bicester?

QUESTION: REDUCING CAR DEPENDENCY IN BICESTER - What would help you make fewer trips by car in Bicester?

Bicester would be eminently walkable and cyclable due to its lack of hills and compact layout. Most places in Bicester are no more than 20 minutes from other places. However, the main obstacle to walking and cycling is a lack of direct and safe walking and cycling routes. Many routes are on busy and fast cars, with paths that are of poor quality, with barriers, uneven surfaces, and lack of priority. Junctions are dangerous and indirect, often taking several minutes to navigate.

By contrast, driving in Bicester is generally encouraged, with wide, fast roads and junctions.

To reduce car dependency, steps should be taken to make it more convenient to walk and cycle than to drive. This might involve requiring car drivers to take a slightly more indirect route, but the consequences would be to support walking and cycling and remove cars from the road, making it quicker and more convenient for those who choose to drive.

Cycle routes should be made accessible to the disabled and those with less usual bikes, such as cargo bikes, this opens the possibility of use by mobility scooters.

The London Road level crossing should be closed to motor vehicles, but made accessible to pedestrians, mobility scooter users and cyclists with a safe and convenient underpass.

QUESTION: KIDLINGTON INFILL HOUSING – Do you think we need a policy to control the redevelopment of larger dwellings or plots to apartments?

What might be the key criteria in such a policy to understand if the proposal is acceptable?

OPTION 26: KIDLINGTON EMPLOYMENT – Should we:

- 1) Undertake a small-scale Green Belt review to test whether there are exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate employment uses;
- 2) Accommodate employment land needs outside the existing Green Belt boundaries?

OPTION 27: KIDLINGTON CENTRE – Should we:

- 1) Maintain and protect the existing Kidlington village centre

- 2) Consider tools such as Article 4 Directions to prevent the conversion of retail and leisure uses to residential
- 3) Investigate the potential of expanding the village centre to include Exeter Close

QUESTION: REDUCING CAR DEPENDENCY IN KIDLINGTON & THE SURROUNDING VILLAGES - Are there any specific areas or routes that we should prioritise to promote sustainable travel? What might make you make fewer trips by car?



OPTION 28: KIDLINGTON GREEN SPACE – Should we

- 1) Explore the potential for creating a network of accessible, and wherever possible, linked green spaces around Kidlington
- 2) Just focus on protecting and enhancing existing green spaces and public rights of way?

QUESTION: KIDLINGTON SPORTS, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY NEEDS - Do you have any information that could help us plan for the future sports, recreation and community needs of the area?

OPTION 29: HEYFORD PARK – Should we:

- 1) Allocate further land for housing and employment at Heyford Park (e.g. beyond that planned for)
- 2) Limit further development beyond that which is already planned for the plan period.

We would be interested to understand if some areas/directions for growth are more appropriate than others.

OPTION 30: HOUSING IN THE RURAL AREAS - If additional development is required should we

- 1) Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local needs or
- 2) Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs

OPTION 31: MEETING RURAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT NEEDS – Should we:

- 1) Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs or
- 2) Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans
- 3) Use a combination of the above

OPTION 32: DEVELOPING A RURAL SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY - In developing a rural settlement hierarchy should we:

- 1) Give additional weight to the availability of certain services and facilities (which do you think are the most important?)
- 2) Give additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling?

Please tell us if there are other factors that we should consider in developing a rural settlement hierarchy

OPTION 33: THE RURAL ECONOMY – In support of the rural economy, including agriculture and tourism, should we

- 1) Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals**
- 2) Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the rural economy**
- 3) Use a combination the above?**

OPTION 34: HISTORIC & NATURAL ENVIRONMENT – Should we:

- 1. Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district**
- 2. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance.**

QUESTION: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING - How could we best support Neighbourhood Planning through the Local Plan in those communities that wish to prepare a plan?

QUESTION: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES – Are there other areas where a local development management policy would be helpful?

It would be helpful to have a plan for promoting walking and cycling in towns and villages, and for connecting towns and villages.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS CONSULTATION. PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM BY 11.59PM ON 10 NOVEMBER 2021 BY EMAIL TO: PlanningPolicyConsultation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

ALTERNATIVELY, PLEASE SEND BY POST TO:

**Planning Policy Team
Planning Policy, Conservation and Design
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
OX15 4AA**

