

CAVERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE

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 | Mrs | |
| First Name | Jane | |
| Last Name | Olds | |
| Job Title (<i>where relevant</i>) | Parish Clerk | |
| Organisation (<i>where relevant</i>) | Caversfield Parish Council | |
| E-mail Address | clerk@caversfieldpc.org.uk | |
| Postal Address | 13 Oak Close Bicester | |
| Post Code | OX26 3XD | |
| Telephone Number (<i>optional</i>) | 01869 247171 | |



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?

No further observations.

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

Climate change a priority.

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

Options 1, 2 and 3. But primarily 2.

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

3 a mixture but limiting the retail to urban locations / town centres

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

Improving internet connections so that people can work more flexibly from home.

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 cafés
- 2) Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses.

2. Other community and leisure uses should be considered before turning into residential development.

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

A policy of at least 1 hour of free parking for all CDC car parks.

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

None come to mind.

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)**

Surely Banbury and Bicester need more social housing rather than less?

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?**

Choice 1

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?**

Choice 1

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

Yes - there should be minimum separation distances between 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?**

1, but it should be for all new homes, not just a proportion

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?

No specific locations are available with Caversfield.

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)?

Unable to comment.

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?

Choice 3

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?

The whole issue needs a review. We must move on into the 21st century and historic buildings must be part of this.

An example of this was in the Garden Quarter in Caversfield where it was insisted that the original 1940s aluminium windows had to be maintained and not replaced with new double glazed units, but unsightly, internal secondary glazing could be installed. Surely new 21st century units which were fit for purpose would have been a much better solution to modern living.

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?**

2: you need a criteria-based policy in order that you can identify and allocate the sites.

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?

No comment. No knowledge or experience.

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

The whole of the Green Belt should be reviewed as it is not now fit for purpose. While the Green Belt might protect Oxford and the villages surrounding it. Any villages surrounding the larger towns in Cherwell are totally unprotected from coalescence.



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

Choice 1

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.

Choice 2

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?

No experience to be able to comment.

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.**

Choice 3

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**

A mixture of choices 1 and 2.

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?**

2. The sites off Springfield Road and Rau Court have been previously designated for Recreational use. In fact, when the MoD owned them, both sites used to have children's play areas, however these were removed by the new land owners. These areas should be reinstated and are of significant importance as green lungs for the village.

As the only other publicly accessible land is a small area designated as a Village Green in Old School Close, this is extremely important.

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

No experience or knowledge of what is needed.

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

No comment.

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?

Yes. But, not sure how the principles would work in villages with very few facilities.

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?

Yes, agree with approach.

Yes, the approach should be different for rural areas with much more support to help reduce individual car travel.

Until the technology catches up with personal requirements, it is very difficult to consider other measures. Electric cars are a great idea, but are still prohibitively expensive; the infrastructure also needs greater consideration in rural areas.

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.

While it is imperative that digital infrastructure is future-proofed, the Parish Council does not have the knowledge or experience to answer this.

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?

Nothing further.

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 Parish Council does not have the knowledge or experience to answer this.

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

No comment.

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

No comment

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.

No comment

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?

No comment

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.

No comment

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

No comment

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

No comment

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

No comment

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

Reinstatement of the Bicester Magistrates' Court and Job Centre would reduce car travel from Bicester.

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

Choice 2.

Coalescence must be reduced between the town and the surrounding villages.

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.

None of the above on green field sites. Only brown field sites should be selected.

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

Neither suggestion.

Some minor conversion would be acceptable, but not to the detriment of the business of the high street shops.

A mix of shops, leisure and community use with meeting spaces would be ideal.

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.**

Surely you need to have a criteria-based policy to be able to identify the specific sites?

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

Can’t think of any additions.

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

They should not be built on at any cost, but should have regular funding assistance.

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

No comment.

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

Proper cycle lanes and a decent bus service. Medical services should be centrally provided and easily accessible.

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?

No comment

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?

No comment

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

No comment

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?

No comment

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?

No comment

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?

No comment

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.

No comment

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**

Choice 1

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**

Choice 1. However, the Parish Council does not believe there are any sites within Caversfield for allocation.

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

The current policy is working well for Caversfield and would wish to remain a Category C village.

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?

Choice 3.

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.

A combination of both.

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

Caversfield has not felt the need to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and so has no experience of this.

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

No

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

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**

