



The Planning Inspectorate

Report to Cherwell District Council

by Paul Griffiths BSc(Hons) BArch IHBC
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 6 August 2020

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

(as amended)

Section 20

Report on the Examination of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 - 2031 (Part 1) Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Housing Need

The Plan was submitted for examination on 5 March 2018

The examination hearings were held on 28 September 2018 and 5, 6, 12 and 13 February 2019

File Ref: PINS/C3105/429/5

Contents

Abbreviations used in this report	page 3
Non-Technical Summary	page 4
Introduction	page 5
Plan Context	page 6
Public Sector Equality Duty	page 6
Assessment of Duty to Co-operate	page 6
Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance	page 7
Assessment of Soundness	
Issue 1 – Housing Figures	page 8
Issue 2 – Vision and Spatial Strategy	page 9
Issue 3 – Exceptional Circumstances	page 11
Issue 4 – The Allocations	page 12
Issue 5 – The Ramifications of Deleting Policy PR10	page 13
Issue 6 – The Remains of the Allocation Policies	page 18
Issue 7 – Supporting Policies	page 24
Overall Conclusion and Recommendation	page 30
Schedule of Main Modifications	Appendix

Abbreviations used in this report

DtC	Duty to Co-operate
GI	Green Infrastructure
HMA	Housing Market Area
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
Local Plan 2015	The Cherwell Local Plan adopted in 2015
MM	Main Modification
The Framework	The National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
OGB	Oxfordshire Growth Board
The Plan	The Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part 1) Partial Review – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
SHMA 2014	Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part 1) Partial Review – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need (the Plan) provides an appropriate basis for the District to meet its commitment to dealing with the unmet housing need of the City of Oxford, provided that a number of main modifications (MMs) are made to it. Cherwell District Council has specifically requested that I recommend any MMs necessary to enable the Plan to be adopted.

Following the hearings, the Council prepared a schedule of proposed modifications and carried out sustainability appraisal (SA) of them, alongside a series of other assessments, including an addendum Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), and a second Addendum to the Green Belt Study. The MMs were subject to public consultation over a six-week period. I have recommended their inclusion in the Plan after considering the SA and associated assessments and studies, and all the representations made in response to consultation on them.

The Main Modifications can be summarised as follows:

- MMs to address the deletion of the Policy PR10 (Woodstock) allocation;
- MMs required to address the resulting shortfall in housing;
- MMs to ensure the allocation policies function effectively;
- MMs to make effective the supporting policies; and
- A number of other modifications to ensure that the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part 1) – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need (the Plan) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan’s preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate (DtC). It then considers whether the Plan is compliant with the legal requirements and whether it is sound. The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (paragraph 182) (the Framework) makes it clear that in order to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in July 2018 and further revised in February 2019. It includes a transitional arrangement in paragraph 214 which indicates that, for the purpose of examining this Plan, the policies in the 2012 Framework will apply. Similarly, where the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) has been updated to reflect the revised Framework, the previous versions of the PPG apply for the purposes of this examination under the transitional arrangement. Therefore, unless stated otherwise, references in this report are to the 2012 Framework and the versions of the PPG which were extant prior to the publication of the 2018 Framework.

Main Modifications

3. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should recommend any MMs necessary to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound and thus incapable of being adopted. My report explains why the recommended MMs are necessary. The MMs are referenced in bold in the report in the form **MM 1, MM 2** etc, and are set out in full in the attached Appendix with my (very minor) changes in ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and **red** for additions.
4. Following the examination hearings, the Council prepared a schedule of proposed MMs and alongside that produced a Cherwell Green Belt Study (Second Addendum); a Cherwell Water Cycle Study Addendum; Ecological Advice Cumulative Impacts Addendum; HRA Stage 1 and Stage 2 Addendum; a Landscape Analysis for Policy PR9; a Transport Assessment Addendum; a Site Capacity Sense Check; a Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum; a Policy PR7b Highways Update; a SA Addendum (including a non-technical summary); a Statement of Consultation Addendum; additional information on the significance of trees; an Equality Impact Assessment; and a DtC Addendum. The MM schedule and its attendant documentation was subject to public consultation for six weeks. I have taken account of the consultation responses in coming to my conclusions in this report.

Policies Map

5. The Council must maintain an adopted policies map which illustrates geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. When submitting a local plan for examination, the Council is required to provide a submission policies map showing the changes to the adopted policies map that would result from the proposals in the submitted local plan. In this case, the submission policies map comprises the annotated map in Appendix 1

to the Plan, along with various, larger scale, policy-specific Policies Maps inserted in the text.

6. The policies map is not defined in statute as a development plan document and so I do not have the power to recommend main modifications to it. However, a number of the published MMs to the Plan’s policies require further corresponding changes to be made to the policies map. These further changes to the policies map were published for consultation alongside the MMs and given a MM number. I have included them, in the interests of clarity, in the Schedule of Main Modifications in the Appendix to this report, but I have amplified their wording to reflect the fact that revised versions of the various Policies Maps are not attached to this report, but can be found in the submitted modifications.
7. When the Plan is adopted, in order to comply with the legislation and give effect to the Plan’s policies, the Council will need to update the adopted policies map to include all the changes published alongside the MMs. I have referred to these in what follows below.

Context of the Plan

8. In the Cherwell Local Plan, adopted in 2015 (Local Plan 2015), the Council undertook to continue working with all other Oxfordshire authorities as part of the DtC to address the need for housing across the Housing Market Area (HMA). The authorities concerned had all understood that the City of Oxford might not be able to accommodate all of its housing requirement for the 2011-2031 period within its own boundaries.
9. The Local Plan 2015 made clear that if joint work revealed that the Council, and other neighbouring authorities, needed to meet additional need for Oxford, then this would trigger a ‘Partial Review’ of the Local Plan 2015. As set out below, that joint work has revealed just such a requirement. The resulting ‘Partial Review’ is the Plan under examination here.
10. It is useful to recognise too the challenges faced by the City of Oxford. It is the driver of the County’s economy and makes a significant contribution to the national economy. Alongside other constraints, the tightness of the Green Belt boundary around the city leads to intense development pressure because of the demand for market housing, the need for more affordable housing, and the parallel economic priority that must be given to key employment sectors.

Public Sector Equality Duty

11. I have had due regard to the aims expressed in S149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This has included my consideration of several matters during the examination, notably the provision of affordable housing.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

12. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the Council complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A in respect of the Plan’s preparation.

13. In March 2014, prior to the publication of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA 2014), the Oxfordshire Councils agreed a process, through a Statement of Cooperation, to address the SHMA’s conclusions on housing need, anticipating that there would be unmet need arising from Oxford. Prior to that date, the Councils concerned had been working together as the Spatial Planning and Infrastructure Partnership. This became the Oxfordshire Growth Board (OGB) – a joint committee of six Oxfordshire Councils alongside other bodies including Oxford Universities, the Environment Agency, Network Rail, and the Highways Agency.
14. In November 2014, the OGB agreed that there was limited capacity in Oxford to accommodate the homes required and the resulting shortfall would have to be provided for in neighbouring Districts. A joint work programme was agreed through the OGB for considering the level of that unmet housing need, and the manner in which it could be divided between neighbouring authorities.
15. Oxford City’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) set out the potential sources of supply in Oxford. After testing, the OGB agreed, in November 2015, that Oxford’s overall need was 28,000 homes and that 13,000 could be provided within the confines of Oxford itself. That left an unmet housing need for Oxford of 15,000 homes.
16. The OGB then went on to consider how that figure of 15,000 should be apportioned. This was informed by, amongst other things, a review of the urban capacity of Oxford, a Green Belt Study to assess the performance of the Oxford Green Belt against Green Belt purposes, and sustainability testing of spatial options. This led to a decision by the OGB that the final unmet need figure was 14,850 homes and of that total, Cherwell District should accommodate 4,400 homes. That figure forms the basis of the Plan before me.
17. I deal with the provenance of the figures below because they are a separate matter. In pure DtC terms, it is abundantly clear from the process set out above that the Council has engaged through the OGB, constructively, actively and on an on-going basis, in the preparation of the Plan. The duty has therefore been met.

Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance

18. The Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Council’s Local Development Scheme.
19. Consultation on the Plan and the MMs was carried out in compliance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.
20. Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out and is adequate.
21. The HRA Stage 1 and Stage 2 Addendum, viewed alongside the original HRA sets out that a full assessment has been undertaken and that while the plan may have some negative impact which requires mitigation, that this mitigation has been secured through the Plan, as modified.

22. The Development Plan, that is this Partial Review viewed alongside the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2015, includes policies to address the strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the area.
23. The Development Plan, taken as a whole, includes policies designed to ensure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority’s area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change.
24. The Plan complies with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

25. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, I have identified seven main issues upon which the soundness of this plan depends.
26. This report deals with these main issues. It does not respond to every point or issue raised by representors. Nor does it refer to every policy, or policy criterion in the Plan.

Issue 1: Have the figures for Oxford’s unmet need, and the apportionment for Cherwell been justified?

27. As outlined above, informed by the SHMA 2014 and the SHLAA, the OGB concluded that Oxford has an unmet need of 14,850 homes between 2011 and 2031, and that of that total, Cherwell should accommodate 4,400 homes in the period to 2031.
28. It is relevant to note too that the OGB decided that of that 14,850 figure, alongside Cherwell’s apportionment, Oxford itself should accommodate 550, South Oxfordshire 4,950, the Vale of White Horse 2,220, and West Oxfordshire 2,750. I say this is relevant because Inspectors conducting examinations in West Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse in relatively recent times have accepted the figures set out above, concluding that the process by which they were produced was a robust and reasonably transparent one.
29. However, at the hearings I conducted, informed in part by a critical review of the SHMA 2014 and the Oxford City SHMA Update 2018 carried out by Opinion Research Services, there was much criticism of the way Oxford City Council had calculated their overall housing need, and their unmet need, with the suggestion being that if the city concentrated more on providing housing rather than employment sites, then they could reduce the pressures on neighbouring authorities. It is not for me to examine Oxford’s calculations but I am able to observe that the Inspectors who examined the Oxford Local Plan 2036, that was adopted on 8 June 2020, accepted Oxford’s overall housing figures, the extent of unmet need, and the balance between housing and employment sites the city had struck.

30. In that overall context, I find no fault in the way the OGB have approached the difficult problem of identifying Oxford’s unmet housing needs and apportioning them between the different authorities involved.
31. I am aware of the 2018-based household projections that were released by the Office for National Statistics on 29 June 2020. However, as I have outlined above, the 4,400 figure that the Plan seeks to address is derived from the inputs into and the approach adopted in the preparation of the Oxford Local Plan 2036. Those inputs, and the approach, have been found sound and the Oxford Local Plan 2036 has now been adopted. The 2018-based projections do not alter the validity of the approach taken by the OGB, or the fact that plans in Oxford, and other neighbouring Districts, have now been adopted. This represents significant progress in meeting Oxford’s housing needs, and the adoption of the Plan before me will ensure that another piece of the jigsaw is put in place.

Conclusion

32. As a result, I conclude that the figure for Oxford’s unmet need, and the apportionment for Cherwell, have been justified and form a robust basis for the Plan.

Issue 2: Have the vision and spatial strategy of the Plan been positively prepared and are they justified and effective?

33. It is useful to start by looking at the way the Council considered the options available to meet their commitment to meeting their portion of Oxford’s unmet need through the SA process. Nine areas of search were identified as potential locations for the housing required: Option A: Kidlington and the surrounding area; Option B: North and East of Kidlington; Option C: Junction 9 of the M40 motorway; Option D: Arncott; Option E: Bicester and the surrounding area; Option F: RAF Upper Heyford and the surrounding area; Option G: Junction 10 of the M40 motorway; Option H: Banbury and the surrounding area; and Option I: Remainder of District/Rural dispersal.
34. Informed by the evidence base, including the SA, and a consultation process, Options C to I (inclusive) were ruled out on the basis that they are too remote from Oxford to accommodate communities associated with the city; they are too far away from Oxford to be well-connected by public transport or walking or cycling, and therefore likely to result in increased use of the private car; more dispersed options provide less potential for infrastructure investment in terms, for example, of transport and education; and significant additional housing could not be built at Bicester, Banbury and RAF Upper Heyford before 2031 alongside major commitments already made in the adopted Local Plan 2015. On top of that, it was concluded that Options C to I (inclusive) would have a greater detrimental impact on the development strategy for the District set out in the Local Plan 2015.
35. Notwithstanding that they are largely located in the Oxford Green Belt, Options A and B were considered by the Council to be much better solutions to meeting the unmet need. They were identified as such largely because of their proximity to Oxford with public transport links already available and ready potential to maximise its use, alongside cycling and walking, thereby creating

travel patterns that are not reliant on the private car. Moreover, these areas already have a social and economic relationship with the city that can be bolstered. Importantly too, these options would allow affordable homes to be provided to meet Oxford’s needs close to the source of that need. Finally, the proximity to Oxford and separation from other centres of population in Cherwell means that Options A and B would be unlikely to significantly undermine the development strategy in the Local Plan 2015.

36. That selection process, underpinned by the SA, which has fed into the vision and spatial strategy of the Plan, is logically based, and robust.
37. The Plan’s vision is to meet Oxford’s unmet housing need through the creation of balanced and sustainable communities that are well-connected to Oxford. The developments are intended to attain a high standard of contextually-appropriate design that is supported by infrastructure. A range of housing types is to be provided to cater for a range of incomes, reflecting Oxford’s diversity. Development must contribute to health and well-being and respond well to the natural environment.
38. That vision is augmented by a series of four Strategic Objectives intended to be read alongside those in the Local Plan 2015. SO16 commits the Council to work with Oxford City, and Oxfordshire County Councils and others, to deliver Cherwell’s contribution to meeting Oxford’s unmet housing need along with the associated infrastructure by 2031. In SO17 the Council undertakes to provide Cherwell’s contribution to meeting Oxford’s unmet housing need so that it supports the projected economic growth envisaged in the SHMA 2014 and the local economies of Oxford and Cherwell. SO18 ties the Council to providing well-designed housing for Oxford that provides ready access to homes for those in need of affordable housing, new entrants to the housing market, key workers, and those requiring access to the main employment centres in the city. Finally, SO19 seeks to ensure that the housing is provided in a way that complements the County Council’s Local Transport Plan, including the Oxford Transport Strategy, and facilitates improvements to the availability of sustainable transport options for gaining access to Oxford
39. In seeking to address the pressing needs of a neighbouring authority in such a transparent and cooperative way, this vision is obviously positively prepared. On top of that, it results from a robust process and is thereby justified.
40. The vision and strategic objectives are then fed into a spatial strategy. In simple terms, the idea behind the spatial strategy is to locate development along the A44/A4260 corridor on a range of sites around North Oxford on land west and east of the Oxford Road (Policies PR6a and PR6b), with land at Frieze Farm reserved for a replacement golf course, if required (Policy PR6c); near Kidlington, on land south east of the settlement (Policy PR7a) and at Stratfield Farm (Policy PR7b); near Begbroke (Policy PR8); near Yarnton (Policy PR9); and near Woodstock (Policy PR10).
41. Leaving aside site-specific matters, especially around the site proposed adjacent to Woodstock, that I move on to below, the spatial strategy follows closely the cogent vision outlined by the Council. In particular, the proximity of (most of) the sites to Oxford itself, and the A44, takes advantage of existing social and economic relationships between these areas and the city and

maximises the potential to create travel patterns that obviate the need for the use of the private car. Further, (most of) the sites would place affordable housing designed to meet Oxford’s needs as close as practicable to the city, along a line of communication (the A44) that would facilitate easily accessible means of travelling into the city by bus or cycling.

42. It is important too that, separated from the centres of development in the Cherwell Local Plan 2015 and Banbury, Bicester and RAF Upper Heyford in particular, these sites are unlikely to have a significant impact on the delivery of housing designed to meet Cherwell’s own needs.

Conclusion

43. Taking all these points together, the vision and spatial strategy of the Plan have been positively prepared; they are justified; and likely to be effective. That said, most of the sites identified lie within the Oxford Green Belt and if adopted, the Plan will result in areas of land being removed from the Green Belt. I turn to that issue next.

Issue 3: Are the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the alterations to Green Belt boundaries proposed in the Plan in place so that the Plan is consistent with national policy?

44. Paragraph 83 of the Framework says that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. Evidently, in preparing a Plan that proposes changes to the boundaries of the Oxford Green Belt, the Council has met the second part of that requirement.
45. In relation to the first part, there a number of factors in play that combined, lead me to the firm conclusion that the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the alterations proposed to Green Belt boundaries have been demonstrated.
46. Chief amongst these is the obvious and pressing need to provide open-market and affordable homes for Oxford; a need that Oxford cannot meet itself. On top of that, in seeking to accommodate their part of Oxford’s unmet need, the Council has undertaken a particularly rigorous approach to exploring various options. That process has produced a vision and a spatial strategy that is very clearly far superior to other options. There is a simple and inescapable logic behind meeting Oxford’s open market and affordable needs in locations as close as possible to the city, on the existing A44/A4260 transport corridor, with resulting travel patterns that would minimise the length of journeys into the city, and not be reliant on the private car. On top of that, existing relationships with the city would be nurtured. Finally, this approach is least likely to interfere with Cherwell’s own significant housing commitments set out in the Local Plan 2015.
47. It is important to note too the scale of what is proposed. The Oxford Green Belt in the District of Cherwell covers 8,409 Ha. As submitted, and I come on to further removals below, the Plan makes provision in Policy PR3 for the removal of 253 Ha, a reduction of 3%. That is a relatively small reduction that

must be seen in the context of the regional and indeed national benefits that would flow from meeting Oxford’s unmet need in such a rational manner.

48. On top of that, as the evidence base, and notably the Green Belt Studies, show that while existing built-up areas of Oxford, Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton would be extended into the surrounding countryside, there would be clear, defensible boundaries, both existing ones that could be strengthened further as part of development proposals, and new ones, and whilst the release of some land parcels would result in harm, the overall sense of separation between Kidlington and Oxford in particular, would not be harmfully reduced. Further, the setting and special character of Oxford would not be adversely affected. In that context, the purposes of the Green Belt, as set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework, would not be undermined to any significant degree.

Conclusion

49. Overall, it is my judgment that the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the alterations to Green Belt boundaries proposed in the Plan are in place. The Plan is therefore consistent with national policy.

Issue 4: Are the sites proposed for allocation appropriately located in accordance with the Plan’s spatial strategy and thereby justified?

50. The sites proposed for housing in North Oxford (Policies PR6a – Land East of Oxford Road and PR6b – Land West of Oxford Road); Kidlington (Policy PR7a – Land South East of Kidlington and Policy PR7b – Land at Stratfield Farm); Begbroke (Policy PR8 – Land East of the A44); and Yarnton (Policy PR9 – Land West of Yarnton) are relatively close to the boundaries of Oxford itself, adjacent to the A44/A4260, and in the case of the North Oxford sites, very close to Oxford Parkway Railway Station. All would have easy access to modes of travelling into the city that need not involve the private car and would provide opportunities to improve those facilities. Moreover, they would site housing and affordable housing close to where the need is located.
51. As such, this group of sites sit comfortably with the Plan’s spatial strategy and their allocation to meet Oxford’s unmet housing need has been justified.
52. That leaves the site proposed for housing adjacent to Woodstock (Policy PR10 – Land South East of Woodstock), a settlement that is in the district of West Oxfordshire. Lying outside the Oxford Green Belt, this site lies well beyond Begbroke and Yarnton. It would be identified more as a part of Woodstock than Oxford.
53. Moreover, while it would bound the A44 and benefit from its proximity to London Oxford Airport and the potential Park and Ride service between it and Oxford, and existing bus services, it is too far away from Oxford to make travelling into the city by means other than the private car sufficiently attractive. Walking would be out of the question, and cycling would only be a reasonable proposition for those who are particularly keen.
54. On top of that, the site itself has difficulties in that as a result of recently approved housing that is under construction, the south east boundary of

Woodstock is well-defined. Its further extension in a south-easterly direction would appear incongruous and damage the character and appearance of the area. While not on its own a significant issue, this incongruity would cause some harm to the setting, and thereby the significance of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site that lies to the west of the proposed allocation. The challenges of developing the site in an acceptable way are evident in the rather contorted way in which housing on the site would be arranged in relation to green space and the need for screening woodland as shown on the Policy PR10 Policies Map.

55. All these latter points add weight to my fundamental concern about the separation between the proposed allocation and Oxford itself. This, considered alongside the difficulties around gaining access to the city by modes other than the private car, means that the site does not accord with the spatial strategy set out in the Plan. It is not, therefore, justified and Policy PR10 that allocates the site for housing, along with its supporting text must be removed **[MM124 and MM 126]**. The Policy PR10 Policies Map will need to be removed too [advertised by the Council as **MM 125**].
56. There are consequential changes required throughout the Plan **[MM 1, MM 2, MM 8, MM 9, MM 11, MM 22, MM 23, MM 24, MM 25, MM 26, MM 27, MM 28, MM 36, MM 37, MM 40, MM 128, MM 129, and MM 130]**.

Conclusion

57. The group of proposed allocations closest to Oxford (at North Oxford, Kidlington, Begbroke, and Yarnton) are fully in accord with the Plan’s spatial strategy and have therefore been justified. The site proposed for allocation adjacent to Woodstock is not in accord with that spatial strategy, has not been justified, and must therefore be removed from the Plan.
58. That removal has consequences, not least the fact that it leaves the Plan 410 dwellings short of meeting Cherwell’s apportionment of Oxford’s unmet need. That leads me on to Issue 5.

Issue 5: Have the ramifications of the deletion of the proposed Policy PR10 allocation been dealt with in a manner that is justified and effective?

59. In setting out to the Council my reasons why the proposed Policy PR10 allocation should be deleted I also made some suggestions as to how the Council might approach the 410 dwelling shortfall that would result. Following on from discussions around residential densities and land take, I made the point that to best accord with the spatial strategy, these 410 dwellings could potentially be spread around the other allocations, with increased densities, and perhaps a western extension of developed area of the Policy PR9 site, with the possibility of housing on the Policy PR6c site (Land at Frieze Farm) reserved for a replacement golf course, if required, but left it to the Council to explore options.
60. To inform that process, the Council carried out further work, notably the Cherwell Green Belt Study (Second Addendum); a Site Capacity Sense Check; a Landscape Analysis for Policy PR9; and a SA Addendum (including a non-technical summary). Having done that, the conclusion drawn was that the

shortfall caused by the deletion of the Policy PR10 allocation could best be accommodated by increasing the amount of housing on five of the remaining six sites, with, in some cases, adjustments to developable areas, site boundaries, and the extent of land to be removed from the Green Belt. Having regard to the additional work the Council carried out, I am satisfied that as a principle, that is the approach that best reflects the spatial strategy.

Policy PR6a

61. In the form submitted, Policy PR6a – Land East of Oxford Road allocated 48 Ha of land for the construction of 650 dwellings (50% affordable housing) as an urban extension to Oxford at an approximate net density of 40 dwellings per Ha. Also included were a three-form entry primary school (3.2 Ha), a local centre (0.5 Ha), on land to be removed from the Green Belt, alongside sports facilities, play areas, allotments and public open green space as an extension to Cutteslowe Park (11 Ha). The allocation also referred to the creation of a green infrastructure (GI) corridor (8 Ha) connecting Cutteslowe Park with Oxford Parkway Railway Station and the Water Eaton Park and Ride facility and the retention of 3 Ha of the site as agricultural land.
62. At this point it is relevant to deal with the reference to ‘approximate net density’ in Policy PR6a, and in the other allocation policies. Clearly, much well-informed work has gone into the analysis of what this site, and other sites, can accommodate and the policy, along with others, is crystal clear about the number of dwellings to be provided. In that context, the reference to ‘approximate net density’ is superfluous. The same point can be made about the other allocations.
63. Further analysis has demonstrated that the density proposed for the residential element of the allocation is reasonable. Having said that, the Education Authority has confirmed that the required primary school need only be two- rather than three-form entry. This reduces the land take for the school from 3.2 Ha to 2.2 Ha. There is no good reason why the 1 Ha gained should not be given over to housing. This increases the housing capacity of the allocation from 650 dwellings to 690 dwellings. Changes to the Plan [**MM 3**, **MM 17**, the change advertised as **MM 45** but amended in the interests of clarity, **MM 46**, and **MM 47**] are required to reflect this increase, and the reasons behind it, and to make the policy, and the Plan, effective.

Policy PR6b

64. As submitted, Policy PR6b – Land West of Oxford Road proposed an urban extension to the city of Oxford on 32 hectares of land currently occupied by the North Oxford Golf Club with 530 dwellings (50% affordable housing) on 32 Ha of land at an approximate average net density of 25 dwellings per Ha. Land was also reserved within the site to allow for improvements to the existing footbridge over the railway on the western boundary of the site to improve links to the ‘Northern Gateway’ site which is an allocation in the recently adopted Oxford Local Plan 2036. The intention is to remove the entire site from the Green Belt.
65. Following the main hearings, I made plain that notwithstanding the value placed on the North Oxford Golf Club, the site it occupies is an excellent one for the sort of housing the Plan proposes, given its location so close to Oxford

Parkway, with its Park & Ride, and its proximity to the centre of Oxford. The principle of the allocation is sound, therefore.

66. Moreover, Policy PR6c – Land at Frieze Farm allocates land for a replacement golf course and from what I saw of the existing course, it could, if necessary, provide equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality, on a site very close to the existing facility.
67. The relatively low density of housing proposed reflected the presence of many mature trees on the golf course. Further and closer inspections of the trees have revealed that the low density proposed was unnecessarily cautious and that the density of development could be increased without having to remove any important individual specimens or groups of trees. Moreover, reflective of the position of the site as a ‘gateway’ to the city, the site could accommodate higher density housing types, not just detached or semi-detached dwellings. All this would allow the overall density to be increased to 30 dwellings per hectare which would mean that the allocation could provide for 670 dwellings, an increase of 140, overall.
68. Changes to the Plan [**MM 4, MM 18, and MM 59**] are required to reflect this uplift, the reasons behind it, and as outlined above, to remove the reference to approximate average net density, to make it function effectively.

Policy PR7a

69. Policy PR7a – Land South East of Kidlington, as submitted, proposed an extension to Kidlington on 32 Ha on land with 230 dwellings (50% affordable housing) on the northern portion (proposed for removal from the Green Belt) at an approximate average net density of 35 dwellings per Ha, with play areas and allotments, and 0.7 Ha of land reserved for an extension to the existing Kidlington Cemetery. The southern part of the allocation (that would remain within the Green Belt) was to provide around 21 Ha of formal sports facilities.
70. Bearing in mind the way that the settlement of Kidlington approaches the Kidlington roundabout, and the proposed Policy PR7b allocation, that I move on to below, the southern boundary of the area proposed for housing and to be removed from the Green Belt appears arbitrary. Further exploration has shown that extending it southward to follow an historic field boundary would give the site a more logical relationship with development on the opposite side of Bicester Road (a Sainsbury’s supermarket complex), and the allocation proposed in Policy PR7b, and allow the allocation to make provision for an additional 200 dwellings, applying the same density metric allowed for the rest of the site. The parallel reduction in formal sports provision is in line with the Council’s Playing Pitch Strategy (2018).
71. There would need to be additional land removed from the Green Belt but the boundary so formed would be much more likely to endure, and the sense of separation between Kidlington and Oxford would be largely maintained. As a result, the purposes of the Green Belt would not be harmed to any significant, additional degree. On that basis, bearing in mind the conclusions I have drawn above about the principle of removing land from the Green Belt to meet Oxford’s unmet need, I am satisfied that the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify this additional removal are in place.

72. To make it effective, the Plan needs to be updated [**MM 5, MM 19, MM 74 and MM 75**] to reflect that additional housing coming forward as part of the allocation, and to remove the reference to approximate average net density. There is a change needed too [**MM 69**] to paragraph 5.90 of the supporting text to reflect properly the situation in relation to the relationship between the allocation and existing field boundaries. This correction is needed in order to ensure the supporting text accurately and effectively supports the policy itself.
73. There will be consequential changes required to the Policies Map [advertised by the Council as **MM 72** but amended in the interests of clarity] and to clear up some confusion with the policy text that refers to GI [advertised by the Council as **MM 73** but amended in the interests of clarity].

Policy PR7b

74. In its submitted form, Policy PR7b – Land at Stratfield Farm allocated 10.5 Ha of land as an extension to Kidlington with 100 dwellings (50% affordable housing) proposed on 4 Ha (an approximate average net density of 25 dwellings per Ha) with associated play areas and allotments (all to be removed from the Green Belt). Also included was the improvement, extension and protection of an existing orchard linked to Stratfield Farmhouse (a Grade II listed building), the creation of a nature conservation area on 6.3 Ha of land, and links to other allocated sites (Policy PR8 across the Oxford Canal and sporting facilities that form part of Policy PR7a) and Oxford Parkway.
75. The allocation has significant constraints, notably capacity at the Kidlington Roundabout, the need to protect as far as possible the farm complex, and its setting, the presence of trees and woodlands, and the relationship with the Stratfield Brake. However, further analysis of capacity at the Kidlington Roundabout, potential layouts, and reducing the size of the nature conservation area by 1 Ha, alongside expansion of the developable area of the site which will ensure that the revised Green Belt Boundary follows a physical feature, in this case an established field boundary, without any significant increase in harm, has shown that 120 dwellings could be accommodated on 5 Ha earmarked for residential development without threatening any of the identified constraints.
76. As with Policy PR7a that I refer to above, there would need to be additional land removed from the Green Belt but this would not result in a significant increase in harm, and the Green Belt boundary so formed would follow a physical feature likely to endure, the sense of separation between Kidlington and Oxford would be maintained, and the relationship between the Policy PR7b allocation, the Policy PR7a allocation, and the Sainsbury’s Supermarket between them would be a logical one. As a consequence, the purposes of the Green Belt would not be harmed to any significant, additional degree.
77. On that basis, bearing in mind the conclusions I have drawn above about the principle of removing land from the Green Belt to meet Oxford’s unmet need, I am satisfied that the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify this additional removal are in place.
78. Changes are needed to take account of this increase in housing provision and to make Policy PR7b, and thereby the Plan, effective [**MM 6, MM 20, MM83,**

and MM 84]. Amendments relating to Stratfield Farmhouse in paragraphs 5.95 and 5.96 of the supporting text are also necessary to properly reflect its aspect and position in relation to the associated orchard **[MM 70]** and to ensure it is one of the parameters for development **[MM 71]**. These changes are required in order to ensure the supporting text accurately and effectively supports the policy itself. There are associated changes required to the Policies Map too [advertised by the Council as **MM 82** but amended in the interests of clarity].

Policy PR8

79. Policy PR8 – Land East of the A44 as proposed in the Plan proposes a new urban neighbourhood on 190 Ha of land to the north of Begbroke and east of Kidlington. The allocation makes provision for 1,950 dwellings (50% affordable housing) on approximately 66 Ha of land (an approximate average net density of 45 dwellings per Ha), alongside a secondary school on 8.2 Ha of land, a three form entry Primary School on 3.2 Ha of land, a two form entry Primary School on 2.2 Ha, a Local Centre on 1 Ha of land as well as sports facilities and play areas. That area is to be removed from the Green Belt. Also included are a Local Nature Reserve on 29.2 Ha of land based around the Rowel Brook, a nature conservation area on 12.2 Ha of land to the east of the railway line, south of the Oxford Canal and north of Sandy Lane, public open space as informal canalside parkland on 23.4 Ha of land and 12 Ha of land retained in agricultural use.
80. There are to be new public bridleways connecting with existing rights of way and provision for a pedestrian, cycle, and wheelchair bridge over the Oxford Canal and public bridleways to allow connection with the allocation at Stratfield Farm (Policy PR7b) and beyond. Land within the allocation is to be reserved for a future railway station (0.5 Ha) and to allow for the future expansion of the Begbroke Science Park (14.7 Ha).
81. Bearing in mind the relatively high density proposed for the dwellings as part of the allocation, there is no capacity for any increase in housing numbers. That said, as set out, the reference to approximate average net density is superfluous, given that the number of houses to be provided, and details of other requirements are explicitly set out, and needs to be removed **[MM 95]** to make the policy and the Plan effective.

Policy PR9

82. In the Plan as submitted, Policy PR9 – Land West of Yarnton proposes the development of an extension to Yarnton on 99 Ha of land to include 530 dwellings (50% affordable housing) on 16 Ha (an approximate average net density of 35 dwellings per Ha). On top of the 16 Ha, 1.6 Ha of land is set aside for use by the William Fletcher Primary School to enable expansion and replacement of playing pitches and amenity space. The developable area and land reserved for the primary school is proposed for removal from the Green Belt. Provision for formal sports, play areas and allotments within the developable area (unless shared or part shared with the school) is required along with public access to 74 Ha of land to the west of the residential area and a new Local Nature reserve accessible to the school. There is to be a community woodland in 7.8 Ha of land to the north west of the developable area, to the east of Dolton Lane.

83. Further discussions have shown that the area set aside for the school should be 1.8 Ha. Alongside that, analysis following the hearings has shown that while it would entail further removal of land from the Green Belt, extending the developable area to the west up to the 75m contour, which is approximately the lower end of this topography, would still avoid the greater harm associated with the release of the higher slopes.
84. However, the site does have significant constraints, not least the need to relate properly to the nature of the existing settlement, and it appears that the residential density originally proposed was optimistic. The upshot of an extended developable area, with additional land take from the Green Belt, and a reduced density is that the site can reasonably accommodate 540 dwellings.
85. Changes are required to the policy to address the increase in developable area to 25 Ha, the number of houses to 540, and to delete the reference to approximate average net density [MM 7, MM21, MM 113], and the change relating to the school [MM 114]. Balancing changes need to be made to the area of accessible land (redefined as public open green space) which reduces to 24.8 Ha [MM 115] with the balance of 39.2 Ha being retained in agricultural use [MM 116]. The nature of the access to the countryside that will result needs to be properly explained in paragraph 5.121 of the supporting text [MM 111]. There will need to be corresponding changes to the Policies Map to take account of all that [advertised by the Council as MM 112 but amended in the interests of clarity].
86. There would need to be additional land removed from the Green Belt but as stated above the Green Belt boundary so formed would correspond to the lower end of the topography and a new Green Belt edge could be established. Moreover, it would have no undue impact in landscape terms, and the impact of the change on the purposes of Green Belt would be marginal, in the light of the original deletion proposed. On that basis, bearing in mind the conclusions I have drawn above about the principle of removing land from the Green Belt to meet Oxford’s unmet need, I am satisfied that the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify this additional removal are in place.

Conclusion

87. The result of these changes to Policies PR6a, PR6b, PR7a, PR7b, PR8 and PR9, alongside others that I move on to below, is to reinstate the 410 dwellings lost from the overall requirement of 4,400 as a result of the deletion of the Policy PR10 allocation.
88. While I acknowledge that this involves further Green Belt releases, exceptional circumstances have been made out for them. Overall, I consider that the ramifications of the deletion of the Policy PR10 allocation been dealt with in a manner that is justified and effective.

Issue 6: Are the remaining elements of the allocation policies, including Policy PR6c, justified, effective and compliant with national policy?

89. While I acknowledge the need to cover a lot of ground in them, it is fair to say that what remains of the individual allocation Policies PR6a, 6b, 7a, 7b, 8 and 9 after their adjustment to account for the deletion of the PR10 allocation is

lengthy, and broad in its compass. I make no criticism but would observe that the scrutiny through the examination process has resulted in a myriad of changes that as part of the policies themselves, need to be dealt with as MMs.

90. Some of these changes, required to make the policies effective, are common to all of them. Each allocation policy contains a criterion directed towards the production of Development Briefs. In each case, it needs to be made clear that minor variations in the location of specific uses from what is shown on the Policies Maps (as revised) will be permitted, where shown to be justified [**MM 49, MM 60, MM 76, MM 86, MM 99, and MM 117**].
91. In a similar way, each of the allocation policies outlines the need for a Phase I Habitat Survey. To explain what is required fully, it needs to be made plain that this must include surveys for protected and other notable species, as appropriate [**MM 52, MM 62, MM 77, MM 89, MM 103 and MM 119**].
92. On top of that, all the allocation policies as drafted contain a criterion that deals with foul drainage and the need for the developer to demonstrate that Thames Water have agreed that it can be accepted into its network. To function effectively, these criteria need to be broadened out to include reference to the Environment Agency as well as Thames Water, and to be more specific about the agreement reached to allow foul drainage to be accepted into the existing network [**MM 54, MM 64, MM 78, MM 90 MM 106 and MM 120**].
93. None of the allocation policies include a criterion designed to deal with issues around the re-use and improvement of soils. All the sites are green field, or in the case of the Policy PR6b site, cultivated to function as a golf course, and it is evident that there will be a need for soil to be removed. It is an important part of mitigation to ensure that this is re-used in an environmentally effective manner and this needs to be secured in the individual policies to ensure effectiveness [**MM 56, MM 65, MM 80, MM 93, MM 109 and MM 122**].
94. Each of the allocation policies refers to the need for a Delivery Plan including a start date, and a demonstration to show how the development would be completed by 2031. As drafted, the policies set out the need for a programme showing how a five-year supply of housing (for the site) will be maintained year on year. The inclusion of the term (for the site) introduces a rather inflexible element. The important point is that all sites designed to meet Oxford’s unmet need should act in concert to maintain a five-year supply. To be effective, and comply with national policy, the relevant criterion in each allocation policy must be changed to reflect that by the deletion of (for the site) in each case [**MM 57, MM 67, MM 81, MM 94, MM 110, and MM 123**].
95. Archaeology is the subject of a criterion in each of the allocation policies with reference to the need for desk-based archaeological investigations and subsequent mitigation measures, if found to be necessary. However, to be properly effective, the relevant criterion needs to be more specific and explain that the outcomes of those investigations need to be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any development scheme [**MM 55, MM 63, MM 79, MM 92, MM 108, and MM 121**].

96. There are then a series of changes required that are individual to the various allocations.

Policy PR6a

97. As set out above, Policy PR6a allocates land east of Oxford Road, to the immediate north of the city, and south of the Oxford Parkway complex. In the supporting text that acts as a preamble to the policy itself, paragraph 5.85 refers to the emerging Cherwell Design Guide. The reference to ‘emerging’ needs to be removed as the document has now been adopted. Moreover, reference to Oxfordshire County Council’s Cycling and Walking Design Guides should be included. These changes **[MM 44]** are needed to ensure the context for Policy PR6a is set out effectively.
98. Criterion 7 deals with the GI corridor and, as drafted, requires a pedestrian, wheelchair and all-weather cycle route along the site’s eastern boundary as shown. To be consistent, and thereby effective, this needs to be more specific, and must make clear that the route is ‘within the area of green space shown on the policies map’ **[MM 48]**.
99. Criterion 10 sets out the details of the Development Brief required by criterion 9. Point (b) must be clear that two points of access will be required with primary access/egress from/to the Oxford Road. Point (c) deals with connectivity within the site itself, and with locations further afield but must make plain that access to existing property through the site should be maintained. These changes to criterion 10 **[MM 50, MM 51]** are required to make it effective.
100. The site contains heritage assets including St Frideswide Farmhouse, a Grade II* listed building, and criterion 15 sets out the need for a Heritage Impacts Assessment. This needs to identify rather than include measures to avoid or minimise conflict with them and further, the criterion needs to make plain that these measures need to be incorporated in any scheme that comes forward for the site. These changes are needed to ensure effectiveness **[MM 53]**.
101. I have referred to archaeology in general terms above but there is a point specific to the site too. As drafted, criterion 28 refers to archaeological features, including the tumuli to the east of the Oxford Road, and the need to make them evident in the landscape design. To be effective, that requirement needs to be strengthened to make the point that the tumuli need to be incorporated into the landscape design as well as made evident **[MM 58]**.

Policy PR6b

102. Policy PR6b allocates the site currently occupied by the North Oxford Golf Club, on the opposite side of the Oxford Road from the Policy PR6a site. There are some specific points to deal with here too.
103. Under the requirement for a Development Brief in criterion 8, point (b) talks of ‘points of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways’. To act as an effective pointer for development, this needs to make clear that two points of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways are envisaged, with the primary access and egress being from and to Oxford Road **[MM 61]**.

104. Criterion 17 requires any planning application that flows from the allocation to be supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the tests contained in paragraph 74 of the Framework are met, so as to enable the redevelopment of the golf course.
105. I expressed my concerns about this criterion during the hearings and afterwards because it is difficult to see how the allocation could be justified if there remain questions about compliance with paragraph 74. I do understand that the existing golf course is well-appreciated by its users but those that propose its replacement with housing have shown that it is underused, and that there are lots of other facilities where golf can be played nearby. Even if they are wrong on those points, the Plan includes in Policy PR6c that I deal with below, provision for a replacement golf course and, given the requirements of that policy (as proposed to be modified) I see no good reason why it need be inferior in quality or quantity to the existing course.
106. The essential point about paragraph 74 is that to pass the tests therein, the proposal only has to accord with one of the criteria. On that basis, given that criterion 21 of the policy requires a programme for the submission of proposals and the development of a replacement golf course on the Policy PR6c site, if it is needed, before work on the housing on the existing golf course commences, then the requirements of paragraph 74 have been passed already. Criterion 17 serves no purpose, therefore. On that basis, to make the policy effective, the criterion needs to be removed **[MM 66]**.

Policy PR6c

107. While it is not an allocation that includes housing, it is as well to deal with Policy PR6c at this juncture. In the form submitted, the policy allocates land at Frieze Farm for the potential construction of a golf course, should this be required as a result of the development of the site of the Policy PR6b allocation. It goes on to explain that the application for development of the golf course will need to be supported by a Development Brief prepared jointly, in advance, by representatives of the landowner(s) and the Council, in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council. It is then explained that the intention is that the Development Brief will incorporate design principles that respond to the landscape and Green Belt setting (the site is intended to remain part of the Green Belt) and the historic context of Oxford.
108. As I have explained above, I consider that the extent of the site is such that it could provide a facility that would be similar, or superior, in quality and quantity to the existing course so there is no difficulty in principle here. Nevertheless, the examination showed the policy as drafted to be rather lacking in coverage and detail. There are constraints that will influence any provision of a golf course and associated facilities on the site that need to be addressed. These need to be identified as requirements for the Development Brief referred to above and, as a result, the policy requires significant expansion.
109. The Development Brief will have to include a scheme and outline layout of the golf course and associated infrastructure, and points of vehicular access/egress will need to be identified. Alongside that, connectivity within the site for vehicular, cycle, pedestrian and wheelchair traffic, and their

connections to off-site infrastructure and public transport will need to be set out, as will details of the protection of, and linkage to, existing rights of way. Using some of the language of the policy as submitted, it will need to be made clear that design principles that respond to the landscape, canal-side, and Green Belt setting, and the historic context of Oxford, will be expected. Moreover, the Development Brief will need to address biodiversity gains informed by a Biodiversity Impact Assessment, something I move on to below, and details will be needed of the provision for access by emergency services.

110. Aside from a Development Brief, in line with the other allocations, any application will need to be supported by a Biodiversity Impact Assessment and a Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan. The latter would need to cover measures for securing net biodiversity gain, and for the protection of biodiversity during the construction process; measures for retaining and securing any notable and/or protected species; a demonstration that designated environmental assets on the site will not be harmed; measures for the protection and enhancement of existing wildlife corridors, hedgerows, and trees; the creation of a GI network with connected wildlife corridors; measures to control any spillage of artificial light, and noise; the provision of bird and bat boxes and for the provision of green walls and roofs; farmland bird compensation; and proposals for long-term wildlife management and maintenance.
111. The policy will also need to address the presence of Frieze Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building, and its environs, as part of the site. This will require a Heritage Impact Assessment which should identify measures to avoid or minimise conflict with designated heritage assets within and adjacent to the site, with these measures then incorporated in any development proposals. There is a need to ensure too that the issue of archaeology is dealt with.
112. A golf course on the site is clearly going to generate trips so there is a need to clarify that any application should include a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan aimed at maximising access by means other than the private car. The site is well located, close to the northern boundary of Oxford itself, and adjacent to transport corridors, which ought to ensure that is not too onerous a requirement.
113. There will need to be a Flood Risk Assessment, informed by ground investigations and detailed modelling of existing watercourses, with an allowance for climate change. It will also need to be made clear that landforms should not be raised, or new buildings located, in the modelled flood zone.
114. Of course, any application will need to be supported by a detailed landscaping scheme, which should include measures for the appropriate re-use and management of soils. It will also need to be demonstrated that foul drainage can be accepted into the existing network.
115. Finally, the expectation that a single, comprehensive scheme is required for the whole site will need to be made plain in the policy. In parallel to that, there will need to be a Delivery Plan that co-ordinates development with any taking place on the Policy PR6b allocation; the idea being that, if deemed necessary, there will be no period when golfing facilities are unavailable.

116. These additions and alterations to Policy PR6c **[MM 68]** are necessary to ensure it functions in an effective manner.

Policy PR7b

117. Policy PR7b allocates land for housing, amongst other things at Stratfield Farm. In the form submitted, criterion 9 refers to the need for a Development Brief for the site, to be prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council. To be properly effective, given the nature of the requirements in the policy, and in particular the need for a link across the Oxford Canal, there also needs to be consultation with the Canal and River Trust **[MM 85]**.

118. Criterion 10 sets out the requirements for the Development Brief. Point (b) deals with access and egress and identifies two specific points – the Kidlington Roundabout junction and from Croxford Gardens. This is rather inflexible and to permit other possible solutions using a single access/egress, point (b) needs to include the phrase ‘unless otherwise approved’. This addition **[MM87]** is needed to make the policy effective. Linked to that, point (c) refers amongst other things, to an access road from the Kidlington Roundabout to the easternmost parcels of development and the Stratfield Farm building complex only, as shown on the inset Policies Map. Again, to provide flexibility and the potential for alternative solutions, the word ‘only’ needs to be deleted as does the reference to the inset Policies Map. This change is needed to make the policy effective **[MM 88]**.

119. The need for a Heritage Impact Assessment is set out in criterion 17 with particular reference to Stratfield Farmhouse. This criterion needs to be made more specific in that it should ‘identify’ rather than ‘include’ measures to avoid or minimise conflict with identified heritage assets. It also needs to be clarified that heritage assets might well be found adjacent to the site as well as within it. Finally, it needs to be made plain that identified measures should be incorporated or reflected in any development scheme that might come forward. These changes **[MM 91]** are necessary in order to ensure that criterion 17 operates in an effective way.

Policy PR8

120. As set out above, Policy PR8 allocates land east of the A44 at Begbroke. Criteria 4 and 5 relate to the Primary Schools and as drafted, the policy sets out that these should be at least three form entry and at least two form entry. It is clear though that no capacity beyond three form entry, and two form entry, will be necessary. On that basis, to ensure the policy is justified, the term ‘at least’ needs to be removed in each criterion **[MM 96 and MM 97]**.

121. Criterion 17 refers to the need for a Development Brief and lists the need for consultation with the County Council and Oxford City Council. Given the requirements of the policy, and in particular the potential for a railway station/halt, alongside linkages to and over the Oxford Canal, this list needs to include the Network Rail and the Canal and River Trust. These additions are needed to make the policy effective **[MM 98]**.

122. Policy criterion 18 deals with the extent of coverage of the Development Brief. Point (b) refers to access and egress from and to existing highways. The

criterion needs to be clear that two separate ‘connecting’ points from and to the A44 are needed, to include the use of the existing access road to the Science Park. These changes **[MM 100]** are needed to make the criterion and thereby the policy function effectively.

123. Point (f) of criterion 18 covers the proposed closure/unadoption of Sandy Lane and talks of the need to consult with the County Council. Given that Sandy Lane crosses the railway by way of a level crossing, consultation should also take place with Network Rail. An addition to point (f) is needed **[MM 101]** to make this clear and to make the criterion and the policy effective.

124. Criterion 19 outlines the requirements of the policy in relation to a Biodiversity Impact Assessment. As drafted, the criterion says that there should be investigation of any connectivity, above or below ground, between Rowel Brook and Rushy Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Following on from the Rushy Meadows Hydrological and Hydrogeological Desk Study, this requirement for investigation can be made more specific. To reflect the study, the requirement needs to make clear that the Biodiversity Impact Assessment should be informed by a hydrogeological risk assessment to determine whether there would be any material change in ground water levels as a result of the development and any associated impact, particularly on Rushy Meadows SSSI, requiring mitigation. This addition **[MM 102]** is necessary to ensure the criterion and thereby the policy is effective.

125. The need for a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan is covered in criterion 22. Given the proximity to the railway, it needs to be made plain that the Transport Assessment should address the effect of vehicular and non-vehicular traffic resulting from the development on use of the level crossings on Sandy Lane, Yarnton Lane and Roundham. This further clarification **[MM 104]** is needed to make the criterion and the policy effective.

126. Criterion 23 sets out the need for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) but the expectation that residential development must be located outside the modelled Flood Zones 2 and 3 envelopes needs to be made explicit. This change **[MM 105]** is required to make the criterion effective.

127. The required Heritage Impact Assessment is the subject of criterion 25. This criterion needs to be made more specific in that it should ‘identify’ rather than ‘include’ measures to avoid or minimise conflict with identified heritage assets. Moreover, it needs to be explained that identified measures should be incorporated or reflected in any development scheme that might come forward. These changes **[MM 107]** are necessary in order to ensure that criterion 25 and the policy overall, operate in an effective way.

Policy PR9

128. As set out above, Policy PR9 allocates land for housing, amongst other things, to the west of Yarnton. Criterion 8 deals with the Development Brief and point (b) refers to vehicular access and egress to and from the A44. This needs expansion to set out the expectation that there will be at least two separate points of access and egress with a connecting road in-between. This change **[MM 118]** is needed to make requirements plain and to ensure the criterion and the policy work in an effective manner.

Conclusion

129. With those MMs, the elements of allocation policies that remain and Policy PR6c will be justified, effective and compliant with national policy.

Issue 7: Are the other policies in the Plan, aimed at supporting the allocation policies, and the appendices, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

130. The Plan presages the allocation policies discussed above with a series of policies that set the context for what follows.

131. Policy PR1: Achieving Sustainable Development for Oxford’s Needs sets out the parameters and general principles of the Plan. The primary aim is to deliver 4,400 homes to help meet Oxford’s unmet housing needs by 2031. However, this is a rather narrow definition because the housing needs to come forward alongside supporting facilities. To be absolutely clear, there needs to be a reference in this primary aim to the necessary supporting infrastructure. This addition **[MM 29]** is required to ensure the policy is effective.

132. Following on from that, Policy PR2 deals with housing mix, tenure and size. This covers a range of matters including the provision of 80% of the affordable housing (each allocation envisages it coming forward as 50% of overall house numbers) as affordable rent/social rented dwellings and 20% as other forms of intermediate affordable homes. That is justified by the evidence base but to be properly transparent there needs to be a confirmation in the policy that references to ‘affordable housing’ mean ‘affordable housing as defined by the Framework’. This change **[MM 30]** is necessary to allow the policy to operate effectively. The precise wording of MM 30 says (as defined by the NPPF). I have proceeded on the basis that this means the current (2019) version of that document.

133. In Policy PR3, the Plan deals with the implications of its policies for the Oxford Green Belt. I have dealt above with the issue of ‘exceptional circumstances’ in relation to the original allocations and their extended forms. Paragraph 5.38 of the supporting text deals with the extent of the removals proposed in order to meet Oxford’s unmet housing needs. The extension of some of the allocations through the examination process means that the 253 Ha originally identified for removal needs to be amended to read 275 Ha, alongside a corresponding change to the removal in percentage terms – 3.3% from 3%, and the percentage area of Cherwell that lies within the Green Belt – 13.8% rather than 13.9%, falling from 14.3%. These changes **[MM 31]** are required to ensure transparency and to make the Plan effective. Consequent changes will also be required to the Policies Maps [advertised by the Council as **MM 148** but amended in the interests of clarity].

134. Paragraph 5.39 of the supporting text makes reference under PR3(e) to the potential extension of the Begbroke Science Park. Obviously, this is not a matter for the Plan at issue but to give some context, a reference to Policy Kidlington 1 of the Local Plan 2015 that makes provision for that extension is

needed. This addition **[MM 32]** is necessary to make the Plan accurate and thereby effective.

135. Unsurprisingly, Policy PR3 in the Plan as submitted reflects the allocations as originally promulgated. There have been changes to the areas to be removed from the Green Belt in Policies PR7a (from 10.8 to 21 Ha), PR7b (from 4.3 to 5 Ha) and PR9 (from 17.7 to 27 Ha). I have dealt with the reasoning behind these changes and the question of whether the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the additional removals are in place above. Policy PR3 needs to be updated **[MM 33, MM 34 and MM 35]** to reflect the revised position post MMs and to be properly effective.
136. GI is dealt with in Policy PR5. Paragraph 5.67 of the supporting text explains that a connected network of GI is an integral part of the vision behind the Plan. It then goes on to list what the provision of GI involves. Point 5 deals with the need to integrate with other planning requirements. Amongst these, sub-point (v) refers to creating high-quality built and natural environments. To give further clarity, this needs to make clear that such environments must be sustainable in the long term. Moreover, the list needs to be expanded to include reference to the construction of sustainable urban drainage systems. These additions **[MM 38]** are required to ensure the explanation in paragraph 5.67 is an effective one.
137. Further, paragraph 5.69 of the supporting text, as drafted, sets out ten reasons why the delivery of GI is so important to the Plan. There is a need to add an eleventh – a reference to the enhancement GI would bring to health and well-being. This addition **[MM 39]** to the text is required in order to put the reasoning behind Policy PR5 on an effective footing.
138. Policy PR5 itself explains the presumption that GI will come forward as part of the strategic allocations with provision made on site except in exceptional circumstances, when financial contributions might be accepted in lieu. The policy then lists nine expectations of applications for development on the allocated sites.
139. The first requires the identification of existing GI and a demonstration of how this will, as far as possible, be protected and incorporated into the layout design and appearance of the proposed development. The ‘as far as possible’ offers an unreasonable amount of leeway to potential developers. Its removal **[MM 41]** is necessary to ensure the policy protects existing GI effectively.
140. The eighth expectation is for any application to demonstrate where multi-functioning GI can be achieved. This needs to be expanded to take in the ability of GI to address climate change impacts, and for applicants to follow best practice guidance. This addition **[MM 42]** is needed to ensure effectiveness.
141. Expectation 9 addresses the important point that details will be required of how the GI that comes forward will be maintained and managed. It is necessary to make clear that the intention is that GI coming forward will need to be maintained and managed in the long term. This addition **[MM 43]** is required in order that the policy functions in an effective way.

142. Policy PR11 is concerned with the important question of infrastructure delivery. Paragraph 5.143 of the supporting text is part of the preamble to the policy and sets the scene for the way it is intended to operate. There is a reference to the Council’s emerging Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions; the descriptor ‘emerging’ needs to be removed to reflect current circumstances along with the final sentence that refers to an announcement being expected from the Government (about the Community Infrastructure Levy) in the 2017 budget. These changes **[MM 127]** are required in order to ensure the supporting text offers effective support to the policy itself.
143. Policy PR11 itself is concerned with the Council’s approach to securing the delivery of infrastructure associated with the housing needed to address Oxford’s unmet needs and sets out three ways in which this will be achieved.
144. The first way relates to the way in which the Council will work in partnership with others to address various infrastructure requirements. Of these various requirements, the first relates to the provision of physical, community and GI. However, to work as intended, this should cover not only provision but also maintenance. This change **[MM 131]** is required to ensure the policy functions effectively.
145. The second way refers to the completion and subsequent updating of a Development Contributions Supplementary Planning Document. As this has been completed, that reference needs to be removed **[MM 132]** to ensure effective operation.
146. The third way requires developers to demonstrate through their proposals that infrastructure requirements in a series of areas can be met and with developer contributions in line with adopted requirements. This series of areas needs an addition to cover sport while the reference to adopted requirements needs to refer to the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions. Alongside another to better articulate what is expected of developers in this regard, these changes **[MM 133]** are needed to make the policy effective.
147. The three ways set out in the policy fail to have regard to the situation where forward funding for infrastructure has been provided by bodies such as the OGB as part of the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, which needs to be recovered from developers. A new criterion 4 is necessary to secure this **[MM 134]** and make the policy effective.
148. Policy PR12a is concerned with delivery and the maintenance of housing supply. I can see the sense of the Council wanting to separate out their commitment to meeting Oxford’s unmet needs from their own commitments in the Local Plan 2015, as set out in the first paragraph of the policy. That would avoid the situation where meeting Oxford’s unmet needs could be disregarded because of better than expected performance on the Local Plan 2015 Cherwell commitments, or vice versa. Paragraph 5.165 of the supporting text deals with the trajectory envisaged and sets out three principles. The second refers to the phased delivery of two sites which could be brought forward earlier if required. The passage of time means that phased delivery in this way is no

longer possible and this criterion needs to be removed **[MM 135]** to ensure that the policy itself is supported in an effective way.

149. The third principle, as drafted, refers to the requirement that developers maintain a five-year supply for their own sites. As set out above in dealing with the individual allocations, this requirement is not necessary because it is supply overall that matters. The third principle needs to be amended to explain that what is required is that individual sites operate in concert to maintain a five-year supply. This change **[MM 136]** is necessary to make the policy effective and compliant with national policy.
150. The third paragraph of the policy refers to the phased delivery of the Policy PR7a site, and the Policy PR10 site. As dealt with above, this is now unnecessary, and the third paragraph must be removed **[MM 137]** to ensure effective policy operation.
151. The fifth paragraph of the policy as drafted says that permission will only be granted for any of the allocated sites if it can be demonstrated at application stage that they will deliver a continuous five-year supply on a site-specific basis. This needs to be amended to reflect the fact that, as set out in national policy, it is maintaining a five-year supply overall that matters. This change **[MM 138]** is required to make the policy comply with the national approach, and effective.
152. Policy PR12b is included in order to deal with applications that may be submitted to address Oxford’s needs but not on sites allocated in the Plan. In principle, this seems to me a reasonable precaution but the policy in the form submitted has issues that need to be addressed. There are five qualifications that a site that came forward in this way must meet. The first is that the Council must have accepted in a formal way that sites beyond those allocated in the Plan are necessary to ensure a continuous five-year supply and the second requires compliance with Policy PR1. Both are reasonable requirements.
153. The third requires the site that is proposed to have been identified in the Council’s Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as a potentially developable site. Given the wide compass of that assessment, that is reasonable too but to ensure this requirement is effective the word ‘potentially’ needs to be removed **[MM 139]**.
154. The fifth qualification sets out the material that will be required to support any application that comes forward. The first of these (a) is a Development Brief. To be effective, this needs to be expanded to include ‘place shaping principles for the entire site’. It also needs to be confirmed that the Development Brief needs to be agreed in advance of any application. These changes **[MM 140]** are needed to ensure that this part of the policy is effective.
155. Point (b) refers to a delivery plan to show that the site itself will deliver a five-year supply of housing. As rehearsed above, it is the contribution of the site to supply overall that is important so (b) needs to be amended to reflect that. This amendment **[MM 141]** is needed to make the policy compliant with national policy, and effective.

156. Point (h) covers any Heritage Impact Assessment that might be required. This requirement needs to be amended to reflect modifications made in this regard to the allocation policies that is to require measures to be identified and for them to be included in any subsequent scheme that might come forward. These changes **[MM 142]** are required to make the policy effective.
157. Archaeology is the subject of point (i). This needs to be altered to bring it into line with the corresponding point in the allocation policies – requiring outcomes of any investigation to be incorporated or reflected in any scheme that comes forward. This change **[MM 143]** is required to make the policy effective.
158. There is a significant omission in the policy as submitted in that affordable housing is not mentioned. A new qualification is required to set out the requirement for 50% affordable housing as defined in the Framework (2019) in line with the allocation policies. This addition **[MM 144]** is required to ensure the policy is compliant with the national approach, and effective.
159. Policy PR13 deals with monitoring and securing delivery. It is largely effective in its approach but the last sentence of the third paragraph needs to acknowledge that any cooperative work to identify strategic requirements arising from cumulative growth in the County must take account not only of the Local Transport Plan and the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy but also associated monitoring. This addition **[MM 145]** is necessary to make the policy and thereby the Plan effective.
160. Appendix 3 to the Plan sets out a housing trajectory. This needs to be updated to reflect the deletion of the Policy PR10 site, and the changes to the other allocations. This amendment **[MM 146 with my deletion and addition for the purposes of clarity]**, is needed to ensure the Plan is consistent and therefore effective. A similar update **[MM 147 with my deletion and addition in the interests of clarity]** is needed to Appendix 4 to the Plan which sets out the Infrastructure Schedule, for the same reasons.
161. There are parts of the Plan that relate to the manner in which the Plan was prepared, and its Oxford, and wider context. Changes are required to the text **[MM 10, MM 12, MM 13, MM 14, MM 15, and MM 16]** to ensure these parts of the Plan are up to date and thereby effective.

Conclusion

162. With those MMs, the policies of the Plan aimed at supporting the allocation policies, and the appendices, will be effective.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

163. The Plan has several deficiencies in respect of soundness for the reasons set out above, which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explained in the main issues set out above.
164. The Council has requested that I recommend MMs to make the Plan sound and capable of adoption. I conclude that the DtC has been met and that with the recommended MMs set out in the attached Appendix, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 - 2031 (Part 1) Partial Review – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Need satisfies the requirements referred to in Section 20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act and is sound.

Paul Griffiths

INSPECTOR

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the Main Modifications.

Appendix – Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission local plan, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM 1	2	Contents	<i>Delete 'Woodstock' Heading and page number reference</i>
MM 2	8	xiv	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'The Plan therefore focuses development on a geographic area extending north from Oxford to south Kidlington, <u>and</u> along the A44 corridor to Yarnton and Begbroke., and up to Woodstock in West Oxfordshire.
MM 3	9	Table 1 PR6a	<i>Replace '650' with '<u>690</u>'</i>
MM 4	9	Table 1 PR6b	<i>Replace '530' with '<u>670</u>'</i>
MM 5	9	Table 1 PR7a	<i>Replace '230' with '<u>430</u>'</i>
MM 6	9	Table 1 PR7b	<i>Replace '100' with '<u>120</u>'</i>
MM 7	9	Table 1 PR9	<i>Replace '530' with '<u>540</u>'</i>
MM 8	9	Table 1 PR10	<i>Delete Woodstock row from Table 1.</i>
MM 9	12	1.7	<i>Amend to read:</i> The Partial Review means change for the area of the district which adjoins north Oxford and that which focuses on the A44 corridor. from Oxford to Woodstock in West Oxfordshire.
MM 10	24	2.2	<i>Amend point 4 to read:</i> 'prepared to be consistent with national policy – to meet the apportioned housing requirements so that they meet core planning principles and demonstrate clear, exceptional circumstances for development within the Oxford Green Belt <u>removing land from the Oxford Green Belt for development.</u> '
MM 11	27	2.10	<i>Amend to read:</i> Seven <u>Six</u> residential development areas are identified in a geographic area extending north from Oxford (either

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>side of the A4165 Oxford Road) and along the A44 corridor and to Woodstock in West Oxfordshire.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford (policy PR6a) - Gosford and Water Eaton Parish 2. Land West of Oxford Road, North Oxford (policy PR6b) - Gosford and Water Eaton Parish 3. Land at South East Kidlington (policy PR7a) - Gosford and Water Eaton Parish 4. Land at Stratfield Farm Kidlington (policy PR7b) - Kidlington Parish 5. Land East of the A44 at Begbroke/Yarnton (policy PR8) - Yarnton and Begbroke Parishes (small area in Kidlington Parish) 6. Land West of the A44 at Yarnton (policy PR9) - Yarnton and Begbroke Parishes 7. Land East of Woodstock (policy PR10) - Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish.
MM 12	49	3.57	<p><i>Amend to read:</i></p> <p>'The Oxford Transport Strategy has three components: mass transit, walking and cycling, and managing traffic and travel demand. <u>The Strategy is supported by the Active and Healthy Travel Strategy and Oxfordshire County Council Cycling and Walking Design Guides.</u> Mass transit in Oxford is planned to consist of rail, Rapid Transit (RT) and buses and coaches.'</p>
MM 13	53	3.66	<p><i>Amend the first sentence to read:</i></p> <p>'Woodstock is a focus for growth in West Oxfordshire's new, emerging <u>adopted</u> Local Plan. The draft Plan includes more extensive.....'</p>
MM 14	53	3.66	<p><i>Amend to read:</i></p> <p>'Woodstock is a focus for growth in West Oxfordshire's new, emerging Local Plan. The draft Plan includes more extensive growth at Witney and Chipping Norton, growth at Carterton comparable to that at Woodstock and less significant growth in the Burford-Charlbury Area. Larger strategic development is planned at Eynsham on the A40 to the west of Oxford, the majority of which is intended to address West Oxfordshire's contribution (2750 homes) to Oxford's unmet housing need. <u>Oxfordshire's Local Transport Plan (LTP4): A40 Strategy proposes a new link road in Cherwell between the A40 and the A44 to improve access from West Oxfordshire to the A44 and A34.</u></p>
MM 15	54	3.73	<p><i>Amend to read:</i></p> <p>'A National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) report is expected by the end of <u>on the Cambridge-Milton-Keynes-Oxford Arc was published in November 2017</u> including recommendations to the Government linking east- west transport improvements with wider</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			growth and investment opportunities along this corridor'
MM 16	54	3.76	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'Approximately 30,000 homes are being planned in The emerging Vale of Aylesbury Vale Local Plan (Draft Plan, 2016) proposes 33,300 new homes to be built in the district in for the period to 2033. The focus of the growth will be at Aylesbury which has recently been granted Garden Town status.
MM 17	64	Table 4 PR6a	<i>Replace '650' with '690'</i>
MM 18	64	Table 4 PR6b	<i>Replace '530' with '670'</i>
MM 19	64	Table 4 PR7a	<i>Replace '230' with '430'</i>
MM 20	64	Table 4 PR7b	<i>Replace '100' with '120'</i>
MM 21	64	Table 4 PR9	<i>Replace '530' with '540'</i>
MM 22	64	Table 4 PR10	<i>Delete Woodstock row from Table 4.</i>
MM 23	65	5.16	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'Figure 10 illustrates our strategy for accommodating growth for Oxford. It shows the geographic relationship between Cherwell, Oxford and West Oxfordshire and specifically the proximity of north Oxford with Kidlington, Yarnton, <u>and</u> Begbroke <u>and</u> Woodstock along the A44 corridor.'
MM 24	66	5.17	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'All of the sites we have identified other than land to the south-east of Woodstock lie within the Oxford Green Belt. We consider that there are exceptional circumstances for the removal of these sites (either in full or in part) from the Green Belt.'
MM 25	66	5.17	<i>Delete as follows:</i> '8. the need to ensure a cautious approach at Woodstock (in terms of the number of new homes) due to the presence of international and national heritage assets while responding to the proximity and connectivity of a growing town to both Oxford and the growth areas on the A44 corridor.'
MM 26	66	5.17	<i>Renumber point 9 as point 8, point 10 as point 9, point 11 as point 10 and point 12 as point 11.</i>
MM 27	67	5.18	<i>Delete as follows:</i>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			'Land to the south-east of Woodstock lies outside but next to the Oxford Green Belt. Land at Frieze Farm is to remain in the Green Belt as we consider that its possible use as a replacement Golf Course would be compatible with the purposes of Green Belts.'
MM 28	69	PR1	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'Cherwell District Council will work with Oxford City Council, West Oxfordshire District Council, Oxfordshire County Council, and the developers of allocated sites to deliver:'
MM 29	69	PR1	<i>Amend point (a) to read:</i> '4,400 homes to help meet Oxford's unmet housing needs <u>and necessary supporting infrastructure</u> by 2031'
MM 30	73	PR2	<i>Amend point 2 to read:</i> '...Provision of 80% of the affordable housing (<u>as defined by the NPPF</u>) as affordable rent/social rented dwellings and 20% as other forms on intermediate affordable homes'
MM 31	76	5.38	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'The Oxford Green Belt in Cherwell presently comprises some 8409 hectares of land. Policy PR3 sets out the area of land for each strategic development site that we are removing from the Green Belt to accommodate residential and associated land uses to help meet Oxford’s unmet housing needs. In total it comprises 253 <u>275</u> hectares of land – a 3 <u>3.3</u> % reduction. Consequently, the total area of Cherwell that comprises Green Belt falls from 14.3% to 13.98 %.'
MM 32	77	5.39	<i>Amend penultimate sentence to read:</i> 'The potential extension of the Science Park, <u>provided for by Policy Kidlington 1 of the Local Plan,</u> will be considered further in Local Plan Part 2...'
MM 33	77	PR3	<i>Amend the sentence to read:</i> 'Policy PR7a – removal of 10.8 <u>21</u> hectares of land as shown on inset Policies Map PR7a'
MM 34	77	PR3	<i>Amend sentence to read:</i> 'Policy PR7b – removal of 4.3 <u>5</u> hectares of land as shown on inset Policies Map PR7b'
MM 35	77	PR3	<i>Amend sentence to read:</i>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			'Policy PR9 – removal of 17.7 <u>27</u> hectares of land as shown on inset Policies Map PR9'
MM 36	82	5.65	<i>Amend last sentence to read:</i> 'Site specific transport measures are identified in Policies PR6a, PR6b, PR7a, PR7b, PR8, <u>and</u> PR9, and PR10.'
MM 37	82	PR4a	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'The strategic developments provided for under Policies PR6 to PR <u>9</u> 10 will be expected to provide proportionate financial contributions directly related to the development in order to secure necessary improvements to, and mitigations for, the highway network and to deliver necessary improvements to infrastructure and services for public transport.'
MM 38	85	5.67	<i>Amend sub-point v. to read:</i> ' <u>creating high- quality built and natural environments that can be sustained in the long term,</u> and ' <i>Renumber sub-point vi. as sub-point vii.</i> <i>Add new sub-point vi. to read:</i> ' <u>the construction of sustainable urban drainage systems</u> '
MM 39	86	5.69	<i>Add new point 11 to read:</i> ' <u>enhance health and well-being</u> '
MM 40	86	PR5	<i>Amend first sentence to read:</i> '...Policies PR6 to <u>PR9</u> PR10 ...'
MM 41	86	PR5	<i>Amend point 1 to read:</i> 'Applications will be expected to: (1) Identify existing GI and its connectivity and demonstrate how this will, as far as possible, be protected and incorporated into the layout, design and appearance of the proposed development'
MM 42	86	PR5	<i>Amend point 8 to read:</i> 'Demonstrate where multi- functioning GI can be achieved, <u>including helping to address climate change impacts and taking into account best practice guidance.</u> '
MM 43	86	PR5	<i>Amend point 9 to read:</i> 'Provide details of how GI will be maintained and managed in the long term.'

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM 44	88	5.85	<p><i>Amend 2nd sentence to read:</i></p> <p>‘...It will be necessary to have regard to adopted Development Plan policies for design and the built environment for both Cherwell and Oxford, to the emerging Cherwell Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and to Oxford City Council’s SPD - High Quality Design in Oxford - Respecting Heritage and Achieving Local Distinctiveness, <u>and Oxfordshire County Council’s Cycling and Walking Design Guides...</u>’</p>
MM 45	89	Policies Map PR6a	<p><i>Reduce land allocation for primary school use from 3.2 hectares to 2.2 hectares</i></p> <p><i>Allocate 1 hectare to residential use (see <u>attached pages 47 and 48 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019</u>)</i></p>
MM 46	90	PR6a	<p><i>Amend point 1 to read:</i></p> <p>‘Construction of 690 <u>650</u> dwellings (net) on approximately 25 <u>24</u> hectares of land (the residential area as shown). The dwellings are to be constructed at an approximate average net density of 40 dwellings per hectare’</p>
MM 47	90	PR6a	<p><i>Amend point 3 to read:</i></p> <p>‘The provision of a primary school with at least three <u>two</u> forms of entry on 32.2 hectares of land in the location shown’</p>
MM 48	90	PR6a	<p><i>Amend point 7 to read:</i></p> <p>‘...pedestrian, wheelchair and all-weather cycle route along the site’s eastern boundary <u>within the area of green space as shown on the policies map.</u>’</p>
MM 49	91	PR6a	<p><i>Add a second sentence to point 10 (a) to read:</i></p> <p><u>‘Minor variations in the location of specific uses will be considered where evidence is available.’</u></p>
MM 50	91	PR6a	<p><i>Amend point 10 (b) to read:</i></p> <p>‘<u>Two pP</u>oints of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways, primarily from Oxford Road’</p>
MM 51	91	PR6a	<p><i>Amend point 10 (c) to read:</i></p> <p>‘An outline scheme for public vehicular, cycle, pedestrian and wheelchair connectivity within the site, to the built environment of Oxford, to Cutteslowe Park, to the allocated site to the west of Oxford Road (policy PR6b) enabling connection to Oxford City Council’s allocated ‘Northern Gateway’ site, to Oxford Parkway and Water Eaton Park and Ride, and to existing or new points of</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			connection off-site and to existing or potential public transport services. <u>Required access to existing property via the site should be maintained.</u> '
MM 52	92	PR6a	<i>Amend point 13 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by a phase 1 habitat survey including habitat suitability index (HSI) survey for great crested newts, <u>and protected and notable species surveys as appropriate, including for great crested newt presence/absence surveys (dependent on HSI survey), surveys for badgers, breeding birds and reptiles, an internal building assessment for roosting barn owl, a tree survey and an assessment of the watercourse that forms the south-eastern boundary of the site and Hedgerow Regulations Assessment.</u> '
MM 53	92	PR6a	<i>Amend point 15 to read:</i> 'The application shall be supported by a Heritage Impact Assessment which will include <u>identify</u> measures to avoid or minimise conflict with the identified heritage assets within the site, particularly the Grade 2* Listed St Frideswide Farmhouse. <u>These measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme.</u> '
MM 54	92	PR6a	<i>Amend point 17 to read:</i> 'The application should demonstrate that Thames Water has agreed in principle <u>and the Environment Agency have been consulted regarding wastewater treatment capacity and agreement has been reached in principle</u> that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into <u>the drainage its network.</u> '
MM 55	93	PR6a	<i>Amend point 18 to read:</i> '...mitigation measures. <u>The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme.</u> '
MM 56	93	PR6a	<i>Add new point 20 to read:</i> 'The application shall include a management plan for the <u>appropriate re- use and improvement of soils</u> ' <i>Re-number subsequent points</i>
MM 57	93	PR6a	<i>Amend the final sentence of point 21 to read:</i> 'The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development, demonstration of how the development would be completed by 2031 and a

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			programme showing how <u>the site will contribute towards maintaining</u> a five year supply of housing. <u>(for the site) will be maintained year on year.'</u>
MM 58	94	PR6a	<i>Amend point 28 to read:</i> 'The location of archaeological features, including the tumuli to the east of the Oxford Road, should be <u>incorporated and</u> made evident in the landscape design of the site.'
MM 59	96	PR6b	<i>Amend point 1 to read:</i> 'Construction of <u>670 530</u> dwellings (net) on 32 hectares of land (the residential area as shown). The dwellings are to be constructed at an approximate average net density of 25 dwellings per hectare.'
MM 60	96	PR6b	<i>Add a second sentence to point 8 (a) to read:</i> <u>'Minor variations in the location of specific uses will be considered where evidence is available.'</u>
MM 61	96	PR6b	<i>Amend point 8 (b) to read:</i> <u>'Two pPoints of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways, primarily from Oxford Road, and connecting within the site.'</u>
MM 62	98	PR6b	<i>Amend point 11 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by a phase 1 habitat survey including habitat suitability index (HSI) survey for great crested newts, <u>and protected and notable species surveys as appropriate, including great crested newt presence/absence surveys (dependent on HSI survey), surveys for badgers, breeding birds and reptiles, an internal building assessment for roosting barn owl, a tree survey and an assessment of water bodies.'</u>
MM 63	98	PR6b	<i>Amend point 13 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by a desk-based archaeological investigation which may then require predetermination evaluations and appropriate mitigation measures. <u>The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme.'</u>
MM 64	98	PR6b	<i>Amend point 15 to read:</i> 'The application should demonstrate that Thames Water has agreed in principle <u>and the Environment Agency have been consulted regarding wastewater treatment capacity and agreement has been reached</u>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			in principle that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into <u>the drainage its network.</u> '
MM 65	98	PR6b	<i>Add new point 16 to read:</i> ' <u>The application shall include a management plan for the appropriate re- use and improvement of soils</u> ' <i>Re-number subsequent points</i>
MM 66	98	PR6b	<i>Delete point 17 and renumber subsequent points accordingly</i>
MM 67	99	PR6b	<i>Amend the final sentence of point 19 to read:</i> 'The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development, demonstration of how the development would be completed by 2031 and a programme showing how <u>the site will contribute towards maintaining</u> a five year supply of housing. (for the site) will be maintained year on year.'
MM 68	101	PR6c	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'Land at Frieze Farm will be reserved for the potential construction of a golf course should this be required as a result of the development of Land to the West of Oxford Road under Policy PR6b. <u>Planning Application Requirements</u> <u>1.</u> The application will be expected to be supported by, and prepared in accordance with, a Development Brief for the entire site to be jointly prepared and agreed in advance between the appointed representative(s) of the landowner(s) and Cherwell District Council and in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council. The Development Brief shall <u>include:</u> <u>(a) A scheme and outline layout for delivery of the required land uses and associated infrastructure</u> <u>(b) Points of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways</u> <u>(c) An outline scheme for public vehicular, cycle, pedestrian and wheelchair connectivity within the site, to the built environment, and to existing or new points of connection off-site and to existing or potential public transport services.</u> <u>(d) Protection and connection of existing public rights of way</u> <u>(e) incorporate dDesign principles that respond to the landscape, canal-side and Green Belt setting and the</u>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>historic context of Oxford</p> <p><u>(f) Outline measures for securing net biodiversity gains informed by a Biodiversity Impact Assessment in accordance with (2) below</u></p> <p><u>(g) An outline scheme for vehicular access by the emergency services</u></p> <p><u>2. The application(s) shall be supported by the Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) based on the DEFRA biodiversity metric (unless the Council has adopted a local, alternative methodology), to be agreed with Cherwell District Council</u></p> <p><u>3. The application(s) shall be supported by a proposed Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (BIMP) informed by the findings of the BIA and habitat surveys and to be agreed before development commences. The BIMP shall include:</u></p> <p><u>(a) measures for securing net biodiversity gain within the site and for the protection of wildlife during construction</u></p> <p><u>(b) measures for retaining and conserving protected/notable species (identified within baseline surveys) within the development</u></p> <p><u>(c) demonstration that designated environmental assets will not be harmed, including no detrimental impacts through hydrological, hydro chemical or sedimentation impacts</u></p> <p><u>(d) measures for the protection and enhancement of existing wildlife corridors and the protection of existing hedgerows and trees</u></p> <p><u>(e) the creation of a green infrastructure network with connected wildlife corridors</u></p> <p><u>(f) measures to minimise light spillage and noise levels on habitats especially along wildlife corridors</u></p> <p><u>(g) a scheme for the provision for bird and bat boxes and for the viable provision of designated green walls and roofs</u></p> <p><u>(h) farmland bird compensation</u></p> <p><u>(i) proposals for long-term wildlife management and maintenance</u></p> <p><u>4. Measures for the retention of the Grade II listed Frieze Farmhouse and an appropriate sensitive setting</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>5. <u>The application shall be supported by a Heritage Impact Assessment which will identify measures to avoid or minimise conflict with identified heritage assets within and adjacent to the site, particularly the Grade II Listed Frieze Farmhouse. These measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme'</u></p> <p>6. <u>The application(s) shall be supported by a desk-based archaeological investigation which may then require predetermination evaluations and appropriate mitigation measures. The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme</u></p> <p>7. <u>The application(s) shall be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan including measures for maximising sustainable transport connectivity, minimising the impact of motor vehicles on existing communities and actions for updating the Travel Plan during the construction of the development</u></p> <p>8. <u>The application will be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, informed by a suitable ground investigation and having regard to guidance contained within the Council's Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Flood Risk Assessment should include detailed modelling of watercourses taking into account allowance for climate change. There should be no ground raising or built development within the modelled flood zone.</u></p> <p>9. <u>The application shall be supported by a landscaping scheme including details of materials for land modelling (to be agreed with the Environment Agency), together with a management plan for the appropriate re-use and improvement of soils</u></p> <p>10. <u>The application should demonstrate that Thames Water has agreed in principle that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into its network.</u></p> <p>11. <u>A single comprehensive, outline scheme shall be approved for the entire site. The scheme shall be supported by draft Heads of Terms for developer contributions that are proposed to be secured by way of legal agreement. The application(s) shall be supported by a Delivery Plan demonstrating how the implementation and phasing of the development shall be secured comprehensively and how the provision of supporting infrastructure will be delivered. The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development and a programme showing how and when the golf course would be constructed to meet any identified need as a result of the development of Land to the West of Oxford Road</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			(Policy PR6b)
MM 69	103	5.90	Amend last sentence to read: 'A clearly defined field boundary <u>partially</u> marks the extent of the area that is identified for development and the remainder of the southern boundary follows <u>a former historic field boundary.</u> '
MM 70	104	5.95	Delete first two sentences and replace with: 'The farmhouse looks south across land planted as <u>an orchard. To the west of the farmhouse is an area of trees and a traditional orchard which forms an important part of its historic setting.</u> '
MM 71	104 to 105	5.96	Renumber points 5 to 8 as 6 to 9 Insert new point 5 to read: 'Retention and renovation of the Grade II Listed Stratfield Farmhouse and the protection of its historic <u>setting.</u> '
MM 72	106	Policies Map PR7a	Increase extent of residential area Reduce extent of Outdoor Sports Provision Amend revised Green Belt boundary (see attached <i>pages 49 and 50 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019</i>)
MM 73	106	Policies Map PR7a	Amend the policies map to include 'new green space/parks' notation over (in addition to) 'Outdoor Sports provision' on the policies map (see attached <i>pages 49 and 50 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019</i>)
MM 74	107	PR7a	Amend point 1 to read: 'Construction of <u>430</u> 230 dwellings (net) on <u>21</u> 11 hectares of land (the residential area as shown). The dwellings to be constructed at an approximate average net density of 35 dwellings per hectare. '
MM 75	107	PR7a	Amend point 4 to read: 'The provision of <u>21.5</u> 11 hectares of land to provide formal sports facilities for the development and for the wider community and green infrastructure within the Green Belt.'
MM 76	107	PR7a	Add a second sentence to point 9 (a) to read: ' <u>Minor variations in the location of specific uses will be considered where evidence is available.</u> '
MM 77	109	PR7a	Amend point 12 to read:

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			'The application(s) shall be supported by a phase 1 habitat survey including habitat suitability index (HSI) survey for great crested newts, <u>and protected and notable species surveys as appropriate, including great crested newt presence/absence surveys (dependent on HSI survey), surveys for badgers, breeding birds and reptiles, an internal building assessment for roosting barn owl, a tree survey and an assessment of water bodies.'</u>
MM 78	109	PR7a	<i>Amend point 14 to read:</i> 'The application should demonstrate that Thames Water, <u>Natural England has agreed in principle and the Environment Agency have been consulted regarding wastewater treatment capacity and agreement has been reached</u> in principle that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into <u>the drainage its network.'</u>
MM 79	109	PR7a	<i>Amend point 16 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by a desk-based archaeological investigation which may then require predetermination evaluations and appropriate mitigation measures. <u>The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme'</u>
MM 80	109	PR7a	<i>Add new point 17 to read:</i> ' <u>The application shall include a management plan for the appropriate re- use and improvement of soils'</u> <i>Re-number subsequent points</i>
MM 81	110	PR7a	<i>Amend the final sentence of point 19 to read:</i> 'The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development, demonstration of how the development would be completed by 2031 and a programme showing how <u>the site will contribute towards maintaining a five year supply of housing. (for the site) will be maintained year on year.'</u>
MM 82	111	Policies Map PR7b	<i>Increase Residential area Reduce Nature Conservation Area Amend Revised Green Belt boundary Amend Green Space boundary (see attached pages 51 and 52 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019)</i>
MM 83	112	PR7b	<i>Amend point 1 to read:</i> 'Construction of <u>120 100</u> homes (net) on <u>5 4</u> hectares of land (the residential area). <u>The dwellings to be constructed at an approximate average net density of</u>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			25 dwellings per hectare.'
MM 84	112	PR7b	<p><i>Amend point 7 to read:</i></p> <p>'Creation of a nature conservation area on 6.3 <u>5.3</u> hectares of land as shown on the inset Policies Map, incorporating the community orchard and with the opportunity to connect to and extend Stratfield Brake District Wildlife Site.'</p>
MM 85	112	PR7b	<p><i>Amend last sentence of point 9 to read:</i></p> <p>'The Development Brief shall be prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council, and <u>Oxford City Council and the Canal and River Trust</u>'</p>
MM 86	112	PR7b	<p><i>Add a second sentence to point 10 (a) to read:</i></p> <p><u>'Minor variations in the location of specific uses will be considered where evidence is available.'</u></p>
MM 87	113	PR7b	<p><i>Amend point 10 (b) to read:</i></p> <p>'Points of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways with, <u>unless otherwise approved</u>, at least two separate points.'</p>
MM 88	113	PR7b	<p><i>Amend point 10 (c) to read:</i></p> <p>'The scheme shall include an access road from the Kidlington roundabout to the easternmost development parcels and the Stratfield Farm building complex. only, as shown on the inset Policies Map.'</p>
MM 89	114	PR7b	<p><i>Amend point 13 to read:</i></p> <p>'The application(s) shall be supported by a phase 1 habitat survey including an habitat suitability index (HSI) survey for great crested newts, <u>and protected and notable species surveys as appropriate, including</u> great crested newt presence/absence surveys (dependent on HSI survey), hedgerow and tree survey, surveys for badgers, water vole, otter, invertebrate, dormouse, breeding birds and reptiles, an internal building assessment for roosting barn owl, and an assessment of water bodies.'</p>
MM 90	115	PR7b	<p><i>Amend point 16 to read:</i></p> <p>'The application should demonstrate that Thames Water, <u>Natural England has agreed in principle and the Environment Agency, have been consulted regarding wastewater treatment capacity and agreement has been reached</u> in principle that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into <u>the drainage</u> its network.'</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM 91	115	PR7b	<p><i>Amend point 17 to read:</i></p> <p>'...a Heritage Impact Assessment which will <u>identify include</u> measures to avoid or minimise conflict with identified heritage assets <u>within and adjacent to</u> the site, particularly Stratfield Farmhouse. <u>These measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme'</u></p>
MM 92	115	PR7b	<p><i>Amend point 18 to read:</i></p> <p>'...a desk-based archaeological investigation which may then require predetermination evaluations and appropriate mitigation measures. <u>The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme'</u></p>
MM 93	115	PR7b	<p><i>Add new point 19 to read:</i></p> <p><u>'The application shall include a management plan for the appropriate re- use and improvement of soils'</u></p> <p><i>Re-number subsequent points</i></p>
MM 94	115	PR7b	<p><i>Amend the final sentence of point 21 to read:</i></p> <p>'The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development, demonstration of how the development would be completed by 2031 and a programme showing how <u>the site will contribute towards maintaining a five year supply of housing. (for the site) will be maintained year on year.'</u></p>
MM 95	121	PR8	<p><i>Amend point 1 to read:</i></p> <p>'Construction of 1,950 dwellings (net) on approximately 66 hectares of land (the residential area as shown). <u>The dwellings are to be constructed at an approximate average net density of 45 dwellings per hectare'</u></p>
MM 96	121	PR8	<p><i>Amend point 4 to read:</i></p> <p>'The provision of a primary school with <u>at least</u> three forms of entry on 3.2 hectares of land in the location shown'</p>
MM 97	121	PR8	<p><i>Amend point 5 to read:</i></p> <p>'The provision of a primary school with <u>at least</u> two forms of entry on 2.2 hectares of land in the location shown if required in consultation with the Education Authority and unless otherwise agreed with Cherwell District Council.'</p>
MM 98	122	PR8	<p><i>Amend last sentence of point 17 to read:</i></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			'The Development Brief shall be prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council, and Oxford City Council, <u>Network Rail and the Canal and River Trust</u> '
MM 99	122	PR8	<i>Add a second sentence to point 18 (a) to read:</i> ' <u>Minor variations in the location of specific uses will be considered where evidence is available.</u> '
MM 100	122	PR8	<i>Amend point 18 (b) to read:</i> 'Points of vehicular access and egress from and to existing highways with at least two separate, <u>connecting points from and to the A44 and including the use of the existing Science Park access road.</u> '
MM 101	123	PR8	<i>Amend point 18 (f) to read:</i> 'In consultation with Oxfordshire County Council <u>and Network Rail</u> , proposals for the closure/unadoption of Sandy Lane, the closure of Sandy Lane to motor vehicles...'
MM 102	123	PR8	<i>Amend point 19 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by the Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) based on the DEFRA biodiversity metric (unless the Council has adopted a local, alternative methodology), prepared in consultation and agreed with Cherwell District Council. The BIA shall include <u>be informed by a hydrogeological risk assessment to determine whether there would be any material change in ground water levels as a result of the development and any associated adverse impact, particularly on Rushy Meadows SSSI, requiring mitigation. It shall also be informed by investigation of any above or below ground hydrological connectivity with the SSSI and between Rowel Brook and Rushy Meadows SSSI</u>
MM 103	124	PR8	<i>Amend point 21 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by a phase 1 habitat survey <u>and protected and notable species surveys as appropriate, including</u> and surveys for badgers, nesting birds, amphibians (in particular Great Crested Newts), reptiles and for bats including associated tree assessment, hedgerow regulations assessment.'
MM 104	124	PR8	<i>Amend point 22 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan including measures for

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			maximising sustainable transport connectivity, minimising the impact of motor vehicles on new residents and existing communities, and actions for updating the Travel Plan during construction of the development. <u>The Transport Assessment shall include consideration of the effect of vehicular and non-vehicular traffic on use of the railway level crossings at Sandy Lane, Yarnton Lane and Roundham.</u>
MM 105	125	PR8	<i>Amend point 23 to read:</i> 'The application shall be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment informed by a suitable ground investigation, and having regard to guidance contained within the Council’s Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. A surface water management framework shall be prepared to maintain run off rates to greenfield run off rates and volumes, with use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in accordance with adopted Policy ESD7, taking into account recommendations contained in the Council’s Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA’s. <u>Residential development must be located outside the modelled Flood Zone 2 and 3 envelope.</u>
MM 106	125	PR8	<i>Amend point 24 to read:</i> 'The application should demonstrate that Thames Water, <u>Natural England has agreed in principle and the Environment Agency have been consulted regarding wastewater treatment capacity and agreement has been reached</u> in principle that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into <u>the drainage its network.</u>
MM 107	125	PR8	<i>Amend point 25 to read:</i> 'The application shall be supported by a Heritage Impact Assessment which will include <u>identify</u> measures to avoid or minimise conflict with the identified heritage assets within the site, particularly the Oxford Canal Conservation Area and the listed structures along its length. <u>These measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme.</u>
MM 108	125	PR8	<i>Amend point 26 to read:</i> '...mitigation measures. <u>The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme.</u>
MM 109	125	PR8	<i>Add new point 28 to read:</i>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			'The application shall include a management plan for the appropriate re- use and improvement of soils' <i>Re-number subsequent points</i>
MM 110	125	PR8	<i>Amend the final sentence of point 30 to read:</i> 'The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development, demonstration of how the development would be completed by 2031 and a programme showing how <u>the site will contribute towards maintaining</u> a five year supply of housing. (for the site) will be maintained year on year. '
MM 111	127	5.121	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'We are also seeking to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt within the site by requiring improved informal access to the countryside and significant ecological and biodiversity gains <u>primarily through the establishment of publicly accessible informal parkland between the proposed built development and the retained agricultural land to the west. There will also be opportunities for significant ecological and biodiversity gains.</u> The Council’s priority will be the creation of a new Local Nature Reserve at the southern end of the site with good access to the primary school and the existing public rights of way.'
MM 112	129	Policies Map PR9	<i>Extend residential area to 25.3 hectares</i> <i>Delete Public Access Land</i> <i>Amend Revised Green Belt boundary</i> <i>Add 24.8 hectares of new green space/parks</i> <i>Add 39.2 hectares of retained agricultural land (see attached pages 53 and 54 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019)</i>
MM 113	130	PR9	<i>Amend point 1 to read:</i> 'Construction of 540 530 dwellings (net) on approximately 25 16 hectares of land (the residential area as shown). The dwellings are to be constructed at an approximate average net density of 35 dwellings per hectare'
MM 114	130	PR9	<i>Amend point 3 to read:</i> 'The provision of 1.6 1.8 hectares of land for use by the existing William Fletcher Primary School to enable potential school expansion within the existing school site and the replacement of playing pitches and amenity space.'
MM 115	130	PR9	<i>Amend point 5 to read:</i> ' Public access within the 74 hectares of land <u>The provision of public open green space as informal</u>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<u>parkland on 24.8 hectares of land to the west of the residential area and a new Local Nature Reserve accessible to William Fletcher Primary School.'</u>
MM 116	130	PR9	<i>Insert point 7 to read:</i> <u>'The retention of 39.2 hectares of land in agricultural use in the location shown'</u>
MM 117	130	PR9	<i>Add a second sentence to point 8 (a) to read:</i> <u>'Minor variations in the location of specific uses will be considered where evidence is available.'</u>
MM 118	130	PR9	<i>Amend point 8 (b) to read:</i> <u>'At least two separate pPoints of vehicular access and egress to and from the A44 with a connecting road between.'</u>
MM 119	132	PR9	<i>Amend point 11 to read:</i> 'The application(s) shall be supported by a phase 1 habitat survey including habitat suitability index survey for great crested newts, <u>and protected and notable species surveys as appropriate, including great crested newt presence/absence surveys (dependent on HSI survey), for badgers, breeding birds, internal building assessment for roosting barn owl, dormouse, reptile, tree and building assessment for bats, bat activity, hedgerow regulations assessment and assessment of water courses"</u>
MM 120	132	PR9	<i>Amend point 14 to read:</i> 'The application should demonstrate that Thames Water has agreed in principle <u>and the Environment Agency have been consulted regarding wastewater treatment capacity and agreement has been reached in principle that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into the drainage its network.'</u>
MM 121	132	PR9	<i>Amend point 16 to read:</i> <u>'...mitigation measures. The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme.'</u>
MM 122	132	PR9	<i>Add new point 17 to read:</i> <u>'The application shall include a management plan for the appropriate re- use and improvement of soils'</u> <i>Re-number subsequent points</i>
MM 123	133	PR9	<i>Amend the final sentence of point 18 to read:</i>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			'The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development, demonstration of how the development would be completed by 2031 and a programme showing how <u>the site will contribute towards maintaining</u> a five year supply of housing. (for the site) will be maintained year on year.'
MM 124	135 to 137	5.124 to 5.139	<i>Delete paragraphs 5.124 to 5.139.</i>
MM 125	138 to 144	Policies Map PR10	<i>Delete Policies Map and Key</i>
MM 126	139 to 143	PR10	<i>Delete Policy PR10</i>
MM 127	145	5.143	<i>Amend to read:</i> 'The Council’s emerging Supplementary Planning Document provides guidance on Developer Contributions associated with new development. The Council has consulted on a draft Charging Schedule for a possible Community Infrastructure Levy, a potential complementary means of acquiring funds for infrastructure. However, it has not yet been determined whether the Council will introduce CIL, particularly as the Government is reviewing how CIL functions, and its relationship with securing developer contributions through ‘Section 106’ legal obligations and options for reform. An announcement is expected by the Government at the Autumn Budget 2017. ”
MM 128	146	5.148	<i>Amend to read:</i> '...liaison on infrastructure issues will be required with partner authorities including the County Council, <u>and Oxford City Council</u> and West Oxfordshire District Council. '
MM 129	146	5.148	<i>Amend to read:</i> In delivering the developments identified in this Plan, liaison on infrastructure issues will be required with partner authorities including the County Council <u>and Oxford City Council</u> and West Oxfordshire District Council. for example to ensure a joined-up approach to the provision of additional school places and public open space where there are cross-boundary implementation matters to consider.
MM 130	147	PR11	<i>Amend point 1 to read:</i> 'Working with partners including central Government,

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			the Local Enterprise Partnership, Oxford City Council, West Oxfordshire District Council , Oxfordshire County Council and other service providers to:...
MM 131	147	PR11	<i>Amend point 1 (a) to read:</i> 'provide <u>and maintain</u> physical, community and green infrastructure'
MM 132	148	PR11	<i>Amend point 2 to read:</i> Completing and k 'Keeping up-to-date a Developer Contributions
MM 133	148	PR11	<i>Amend point 3 to read:</i> ' Ensure that D development proposals will be required to demonstrate that infrastructure requirements can be met including the provision of transport, education, health, social, <u>sport</u> , leisure and community facilities, wastewater treatment and sewerage, and with necessary developer contributions in accordance with adopted requirements <u>including those of the Council's Developer Contributions SPD.</u>
MM 134	148	PR11	<i>Add new point 4 to read:</i> ' <u>All sites are required to contribute to the delivery of Local Plan infrastructure. Where forward funding for infrastructure has been provided, for example from the Oxfordshire Growth Board as part of the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, all sites are required to contribute to the recovery of these funds as appropriate.</u> '
MM 135	150	5.165	<i>Delete point 2.</i>
MM 136	150	5.165	<i>Amend point 3 to read:</i> '3. we are requiring developers to clearly show that they can maintain <u>contribute towards maintaining</u> a five year supply. for their own sites. '
MM 137	150	PR12a	<i>Delete 3rd paragraph:</i> ' Land South East of Kidlington (Policy PR7a—230 homes) and Land South East of Woodstock (Policy PR10—410 homes) will only be permitted to commence development before 1 April 2026 if the calculation of the five year land supply over the period 2021 to 2026 falls below five years '.
MM 138	150	PR12a	<i>Amend fifth paragraph to read:</i> 'Permission will only be granted for any of the allocated sites if it can be demonstrated at application stage that they will <u>contribute in delivering</u> a continuous five year housing land supply

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			on a site-specific basis (i.e. measured against the local plan housing trajectory allocation for the site). This will be achieved via the Delivery Plans required for each strategic development site.
MM 139	151	PR12b	<i>Amend point 3 to read:</i> 'the site has been identified in the Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment as a potentially D developable site'
MM 140	151	PR12b	<i>Amend point 5 (a) to read:</i> 'A comprehensive Development Brief <u>and place shaping principles for the entire site</u> to be agreed <u>in advance</u> by the Council in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council
MM 141	151	PR12b	<i>Amend point 5 (b) to read:</i> 'The Delivery Plan shall include a start date for development, demonstration of how the development would be completed by 2031 and a programme showing how <u>the site will contribute towards maintaining a five year supply of housing.</u> (for the site) will be maintained year on year.'
MM 142	152	PR12b	<i>Amend point 5 (h) to read:</i> 'a Heritage Impact Assessment which will <u>identify include</u> measures to avoid or minimise conflict with identified heritage assets within and adjacent to the site. <u>These measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme.'</u>
MM 143	152	PR12b	<i>Amend point 5 (i) to read:</i> 'a desk-based archaeological investigation which may then require predetermination evaluations and appropriate mitigation measures. <u>The outcomes of the investigation and mitigation measures shall be incorporated or reflected, as appropriate, in any proposed development scheme'</u>
MM 144	151	PR12b	<i>Add new point 3 to read:</i> ' <u>50% of the homes are provided as affordable housing as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework.'</u> <i>Renumber existing points 3 to 5 as 4 to 6.</i>
MM 145	155	PR13	<i>Amend last sentence of 3rd paragraph to read:</i>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			'This will include the implementation of Local Plans and County wide strategies such as the Local Transport Plan and the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy <u>and associated monitoring</u> .
MM 146	162	Appendix 3	<i>Update housing trajectory as indicated on revised trajectory attached (see page 58 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019)</i>
MM 147	163 to 182	Appendix 4	<i>Update infrastructure schedule (see attached updated schedule pages 59-104 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019)</i>
MM 148	-	Whole Plan	<i>Remove policy shading for PR3b, PR3c, PR3d and PR3e (land to be removed from the Green Belt) (note: retain shading for safeguarded land – PR3a) (see attached Proposed Map Changes) (see pages 47 to 57 of the Schedule of Main Modifications November 2019)</i>