

Cherwell Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies and Sites: Fringford Parish Council Response		
Page	Question	Feedback proposed
1-113	Questions 1 – 89	
	General Feedback	
48	Q35	Rural Dwellings
		The Councillors accepted the case for appropriate development for rural workers.
61	Section 4.3	SO13
		The Councillors welcomed Statement SO13 'To reduce the dependency on the private car as a mode of travel, increase the attraction of and opportunities for travelling by public transport, cycle and on foot, and to ensure high standards of accessibility to services for people with impaired mobility.'
		However, there were concerns over the fact that cycle routes will be centred on the urban area, not the rural areas and with the demise of the subsidised bus routes public transport in rural areas will become non-existent.
59	45. Local Green Space	
	Q 45	Are there areas of green space that you consider meet the requirements for the designation of a Local Green Space? If so, please provide details using the site submission form. <i>"Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract"</i>
		The Parish Council would like to propose the following areas as green space 1. Fringford Village Green 2. Fringford Cricket Pitch 3. Fringford C of E School playing field
91	74. Green Infrastructure	
	Q 74	Do you consider that Local Plan Part 2 should include local development management policy guidance on historic routeways?
		Yes, the Parish Council agrees that the policy should strongly protect historic routeways.
Page 99	77. Bicester: Transport infrastructure	
	Q 77	Do you have any views on transport issues in Bicester that you think should be addressed in Local Plan Part 2?
		Current proposals for roadways in the North and North West of Bicester including the proposed route through the new Eco-Town do not appear to be adequate to serve the volumes of housing and employment proposed and access to the M40 for villages North of Bicester. There is also concern about the loss of the Number 8 bus which is the only public transport through the village towards Bicester and Brackley.

Villages and Rural Areas		
Page 115	90. Updating Village Survey Information	
	Q 90 a	Is the survey information for your village accurate? (If not, please provide details of the current position)
		The Parish notes that there is a retail outlet indicated on the map. It should be noted that this is an agricultural / animal feed supplier with extremely limited opening hours and is not for the general household shopping which is a car journey away in Bicester.
	Q 90 b	Do you consider the existing facilities for open space, sport and recreation to be adequate? (If not, please provide details)
		Yes
	Q 90 c	Are you aware of any problems with infrastructure provision? If so, please provide details. <i>(The Consultation document list the following criteria that will be taken into account when considering sites for housing. (this could guide our feedback</i>
		Bus Service - from May 2016 there will be no bus service from the village. The only practical means of transport for villagers is by private car. Water and Sewerage – the Parish Council has received complaints about water pressure in the village – this may not be adequate for any further development. Roads – the majority of the principal roads in the housing area of the village (Rectory Lane and Main Street) are narrow and without footways and access problems often occur due to parked vehicles. Broadband – although the village now has ‘faster broadband’, it still frequently comes to a standstill simply because the system is overloaded. This is especially bad in the evenings and school holidays.
	Q 90 c i	<i>Whether the land has been previously developed land or is of lesser environmental value</i>
		There is no previously developed land or land of lesser environmental value available within the village.
	Q 90 c ii	<i>Whether significant adverse impact on heritage or wildlife assets could be avoided</i>
		The only way to avoid impacting on heritage or wildlife around the village would be not to build.
	Q 90 c iii	<i>Whether development would contribute in enhancing the built environment</i>
		No
	Q 90 c iv	<i>Whether best and most versatile agricultural land could be avoided</i>
		Not relevant as no land is available.
	Q 90 c v	<i>Whether significant adverse landscape and impacts could be avoided</i>
		No land is available so this question is not relevant
	Q 90 c vi	<i>Whether satisfactory vehicular and pedestrian access/egress could be provided</i>
		Neither Rectory Lane nor Main Street could tolerate additional vehicles due to the limited road width and nature of the village.
	Q 90 c vii	<i>Whether site is well located to services and facilities</i>
		Fringford has limited services and facilities. Due to the small population it is highly unlikely that services such as shops, doctors’ surgeries and employment would be viable in the village. Further development would inevitably lead to more car journeys.

	Q 90 c viii	<i>Whether necessary infrastructure could be provided</i>
		It is unlikely that it would be commercially viable to expand the infrastructure.
	Q 90 c ix	<i>Whether land considered for allocation is deliverable now or whether there is a reasonable prospect that it could be developed within the plan period</i>
		Not applicable
	Q 90 c x	<i>Whether land the subject of an application for planning permission could be delivered within the next five years, and</i>
		Not applicable
	Q 90 c xi	<i>Whether the development would have an adverse impact on flood risk</i>
		Not applicable
Page 116	91. Allocation of Sites	
	Q 91 a	Are there any sites which you consider suitable for development? If so, for what use?
		No sites suitable
	Q 91 b	If you are promoting a site for development please complete and submit a Call For Sites: Site Submission Form available at www.cherwell.gov.uk/policypublicconsultatio
		No
Page 117	92. Identifying where Development would be Inappropriate	
	Q 92 a	Are there local features or areas that you consider to be of particular value to the community? (If so, please provide details)
		Fringford is an archetypal English village with narrow roads, a village green, cricket pitch, listed buildings and a mix of housing types. This is much valued by the residents and visitors alike. Inappropriate development would have an adverse impact on the rural nature of the village.
	Q92 b	Do you consider that there are valued landscapes and /or areas of environmental or historic significance that merit protection from development? If so, please give details.
		The area of Main Street close to the listed building, The Forge and Green Farm, the Village Green, the area adjacent to St Michael's and All Angels Church and The Manor merit protection from development due to their historic significance. The two principle housing areas of Fringford, Main Street and Rectory Lane, the adjacent Village Green plus the area close to the cricket pitch and public house each have current significant problems with traffic and parking. The areas described in the first paragraph above plus the fields surrounding the village along with the numerous historic footpaths all provide an attraction to many tourists visiting the historic <i>Lark Rise to Candleford</i> scenery.
Page 117	93. Settlement Boundaries	
	Q 93	Do you think we should define settlement boundaries, beyond which development would not normally be permitted?
		Yes, settlement boundaries need to be defined to protect the natural environment, to retain the rural nature of the area and to prevent coalescence. CDC Spatial Strategy states that "Development in the Countryside will be strictly controlled."
Page 118	94. Retail Development in the Rural Areas	
	Q94 a	Should the Local Plan Part 2 contain a policy on retail development in the rural areas?
		Yes, there should be a policy
	Q94 b	What kinds of issues should such a policy cover?

Page 121	96 Call for Sites	
		No sites suggested
	OXFORD'S UNMET HOUSING NEEDS	
		<p>The Economist has reported that in a recent 12 month period, Oxford completed 65 dwellings. It seems very unfair that they should then expect residents of Cherwell to help make up some of the shortfall especially those to the North side of Bicester which is only going to increase the traffic issue.</p> <p>Given that Cherwell's spatial strategy contained in Local Plan Part 1 indicates that growth in the rural areas will be limited and "focus on meeting local community and business needs", it is assumed that none of Oxford city's unmet housing need would be proposed to be met in villages such as Fringford.</p> <p>Fringford and the villages North of Bicester would not be a feasible or sustainable location to meet Oxford City's unmet need due to the great employment travel distance and the poor road infrastructure through the rapidly expanding area in and around Bicester.</p>

Version 3
10 March 2016