

Response to Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review – Fringford Parish Council

No	Item
1	<p><i>Cherwell's Contribution to Oxford's Housing Needs</i> Is 4,400 homes the appropriate housing requirement for Cherwell in seeking to meet Oxford's unmet housing need?</p> <p>On top of the already ambitious Cherwell Housing growth plans 4,400 extra homes is not reasonable.</p> <p>Whilst the need clearly has to be met it seems very unfair that Cherwell has to help make good Oxford's lack of earlier planning.</p>
2	<p><i>Spatial Relationship to Oxford</i> Do you agree that we need to specifically meet Oxford's needs in planning for the additional housing development?</p> <p>The Consultation Paper confirms "<i>The urban capacity of Oxford is as yet unconfirmed</i>". Whilst the Parish Council accepts that there is a need to cooperate, should Oxford also be asked to complete a partial review of their Planning? For example, if Oxford were to develop at London densities, it would almost certainly be able accommodate all of its proposed housing need within its own boundaries.</p> <p>The Parish Council believes that Oxford should reduce its employment aspirations and future employment growth should be targeted towards the complete Oxford-Cambridge corridor in line with Government strategy. Given its virtually full employment levels, there is no logical reason why Oxford City should be continuing to zone land for new employment creation rather than housing, whilst expecting the Districts to meet its housing need.</p> <p>Any proposed external sites are all likely to be less 'sustainable' than local Oxford ones and in and around villages are contrary to Cherwell's strategies of sustainable development and maintaining a rural environment.</p> <p>The proposed number of extra homes needs further negotiation if general feedback within Cherwell is not supportive of accepting this number.</p>
3	<p><i>Cherwell Issues</i> Are there any new issues that we need to consider as we continue assess the development options?</p> <p>Sustainability, distance from Oxford and resultant travel pollution, time and costs are issues which must be considered.</p> <p>The inadequate road system and travel problems on the A34 and at M40 Junction 9 and north of it, particularly around Bicester where significant extra housing is planned which will add to the congestion and environmental damage.</p> <p>Lack of adequate public transport in many villages including Fringford.</p>
4	<p><i>Draft Vision for Meeting Oxford's Housing Needs</i> Do you support the draft vision? Are there changes required</p> <p>Cherwell's amendment is acceptable.</p>
5	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO16</i> Do you support draft Strategic Objective SO16? Are there changes required?</p> <p>Yes</p>

6	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO17</i> Do you support the draft Strategic Objective SO17?</p>
7	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO18</i> Do you support the draft Strategic Objective SO18?</p>
8	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO19</i> Do you support the draft Strategic Objective SO19?</p>
9	<p><i>Identifying Areas of Search</i> Do you have any comments on the Areas of Search we have defined?</p> <p>Options A and B for preference.</p> <p>Option C should be avoided due to potential traffic challenges.</p> <p>Option E, Bicester and Surrounding Area: need to generally avoid coalescence of town and villages and the impact on countryside. Need to avoid villages north of Bicester due to distance from Oxford, lack of adequate public transport and traffic congestion/pollution on routes toward Oxford.</p> <p>Option I – Need to consider maintenance of rural character and sustainability in terms of available services and travel in villages.</p>
10	<p><i>Site Size Threshold</i> Do you agree with our minimum site size threshold of two hectares for the purpose of site identification? Do you agree that we should not be seeking to allocate sites for less than 100 homes?</p> <p>Yes so that there is sufficient funding for the infrastructure needs. The minimum density will also help to generate the required target.</p>
11	<p><i>Identified Potential Strategic Development Sites</i> Do you have any comments on the sites that we have identified? Please provide the site reference number when providing your views.</p> <p>Discount all of Options C D E G and Option I no 31 and 136 as they will have an adverse effect on the traffic flow.</p> <p>Sites C, E and any sites that are within Category I that are more than 10 miles from Oxford due to sustainability.</p>
12	<p><i>Site Promotions</i> Do any site promoters/developers/landowners wish to provide updated or supporting information about your sites?</p> <p>N/A</p>
13	<p><i>Other Potential Strategic Development Sites</i> Are there any potential sites that we have not identified?</p> <p>N/A</p>
14	<p><i>Representations and Submissions</i> Do you have any comments on the representations and submissions we have received so far? Do you disagree with any that we have received? Please provide the representation number where applicable.</p> <p>The three sites in Fringford previously submitted and subsequently shown as rejected by CDC should remain rejected on the grounds of sustainability, distance from Oxford, inadequate transport links and lack of services.</p>

15	<i>Interim Transport Assessment – Key Findings for Areas of Search</i> Do you have any comments on the assessment and its findings?
	Agree with the ratings of the sites as listed and the low scoring of Options C and I
16	<i>Areas of Search – Selection of Options</i> Do you agree with all the Areas of Search being considered reasonable?
	Transport is a key issue and should exclude some of the potential sites listed above (restricted to Options A and B).
17	<i>Initial Sustainability Appraisal – Key Findings for Areas of Search</i> Do you have any comments on the Initial Sustainability Appraisal and its findings for Areas of Search?
	Option E Bicester should be excluded on the grounds of inadequate transport links/sustainability challenges.
18	<i>Strategic Development Sites – Initial Selection of Options for Testing</i> Do you agree with the initial selection of site options for testing?
	Yes
19	<i>Initial Transport Assessment – Key Findings for Strategic Development Sites</i> Do you have any comments on the Assessment and its findings?
	Agreed
20	<i>Initial Sustainability Appraisal – Key Findings for Strategic Development Sites</i> Do you have any comments on the SA's initial findings for sites?
	Agreed
21	<i>Evidence Base</i> Do you have any comments on our evidence base? Are there other pieces of evidence that we need to consider?
	No
22	<i>Five Year Land Supply Start Date</i> Is 2021 a justified and appropriate start date for being required to meet Oxford's housing needs and to deliver a 5 year supply?
	Yes
23	<i>Maintaining a Five Year Land Supply</i> Do you agree that phasing of land release within individual strategic development sites will promote developer competition and assist the maintenance of a five year housing supply to meet Oxford's unmet Housing needs? What alternatives would you suggest?
	Planning permissions should have a three-year expiry date.
24	<i>Monitoring Delivery</i> Are there any proposals you would like us to consider to ensure that the final plan is delivered and sustainable development is achieved.
	There should be an agreed time based delivery structure for the monitoring reports.

5 January 2017