

Response to Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review

Caversfield Parish Council

No	Item
1	<p><i>Cherwell's Contribution to Oxford's Housing Needs</i> Is 4,400 homes the appropriate housing requirement for Cherwell in seeking to meet Oxford's unmet housing need?</p>
	<p>The Parish believes that Oxford should be accommodating its own housing and re-thinking its policy of putting employment before housing.</p>
2	<p><i>Spatial Relationship to Oxford</i> Do you agree that we need to specifically meet Oxford's needs in planning for the additional housing development?</p>
	<p>The Parish does not agree that Cherwell needs to specifically meet Oxford's needs. If Oxford re-allocated the large areas of land set aside for employment to high density, affordable, housing there would be less need for other areas. This would also reduce the amount of vehicles travelling longer distances to get in to work in Oxford.</p>
3	<p><i>Cherwell Issues</i> Are there any new issues that we need to consider as we continue assess the development options?</p>
	<p>Within Caversfield, the loss of the local bus service. The Cherwell Area should not become a dormitory for Oxford city.</p>
4	<p><i>Draft Vision for Meeting Oxford's Housing Needs</i> Do you support the draft vision? Are there changes required</p>
	<p>This is acceptable.</p>
5	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO16</i> Do you support draft Strategic Objective SO16? Are there changes required?</p>
	<p>The Parish supports the draft objective.</p>
6	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO17</i> Do you support the draft Strategic Objective SO17?</p>
	<p>Yes, if Oxford cannot be persuaded to change their employment policy.</p>
7	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO18</i> Do you support the draft Strategic Objective SO18?</p>
	<p>Yes, if Oxford cannot be persuaded to change their employment policy.</p>
8	<p><i>Draft Strategic Objective SO19</i> Do you support the draft Strategic Objective SO19?</p>
	<p>Yes</p>
9	<p><i>Identifying Areas of Search</i> Do you have any comments on the Areas of Search we have defined?</p>
	<p>Option C should be avoided due to the potential traffic challenges. Option E should be avoided to avoid coalescence between the town of Bicester and the surrounding villages.</p>
10	<p><i>Site Size Threshold</i> Do you agree with our minimum site size threshold of two hectares for the purpose of site identification? Do you agree that we should not be seeking to allocate sites for less than 100 homes?</p>
	<p>Yes, however the hectare area should have been bigger.</p>

11	<p><i>Identified Potential Strategic Development Sites</i> Do you have any comments on the sites that we have identified? Please provide the site reference number when providing your views.</p> <p>Caversfield has serious concerns about the sites identified in the Village. Caversfield is a Category C village and therefore only infill and conversion is acceptable (Adopted Policy Villages I, C 260). None of the sites proposed would conform to the village categorisation.</p> <p>Four sites have been identified in the village: PR 33, PR 105, PR150 (which is labelled as Bicester in the plan but which is in Caversfield), and, PR 190</p> <p>PR33 was rejected at appeal in 2014 as a suitable site. According to the Planning Inspector the reasons being: the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the built up limits of Bicester and Caversfield, the proposed green buffer gap between the planned expansion of Bicester and Caversfield and housing land supply (HLS); the surrounding landscape; the setting of the RAF Bicester conservation area; and, the setting of adjacent listed buildings/heritage assets. The access was also not adequate.</p> <p>PR105 is one of the only areas of green space available in the centre of the village (the large park is owned by the MoD and public access could be withdrawn at any time). Vehicular access would be limited and the local roads would not be able to support the additional volume of traffic. It is also believed that the services infrastructure, particularly, the water, grey water and electricity could not support further additional housing. The Parish Council believes that this site in particular should be retained in perpetuity as recreational land and given to the community for such use.</p> <p>PR150 (which is labelled as Bicester in the plan, but is in Caversfield) was requested as part of the Green Buffer to reduce coalescence between Bicester / the Eco Town and the village of Caversfield. This Green Buffer was rejected by the Planning Inspector for Local Plan Part 1 as they believed there were other policies in place to protect the village. Building on this area of land would be highly detrimental to the rural village of Caversfield and would be well outside the built up area of the village.</p> <p>PR190 was not supported by the Parish Council when the original project was raised in 2009. The infrastructure and services were not adequate to support a development of 480 houses, and the proposal now to put 900+ houses on the land would make the limited infrastructure and services in the village worse. The area is a long way from any form of public transport with pedestrian and vehicular access onto both the Fringford Road and the Buckingham A4421 difficult. The narrow rural Fringford Road is not suitable for additional traffic and access onto the Buckingham Road would be dangerous.</p>
12	<p><i>Site Promotions</i> Do any site promoters/developers/landowners wish to provide updated or supporting information about your sites?</p> <p>N/A</p>
13	<p><i>Other Potential Strategic Development Sites</i> Are there any potential sites that we have not identified?</p> <p>N/A</p>

14	<i>Representations and Submissions</i> Do you have any comments on the representations and submissions we have received so far? Do you disagree with any that we have received? Please provide the representation number where applicable.
	N/A
15	<i>Interim Transport Assessment – Key Findings for Areas of Search</i> Do you have any comments on the assessment and its findings?
	No
16	<i>Areas of Search – Selection of Options</i> Do you agree with all the Areas of Search being considered reasonable?
	Yes
17	<i>Initial Sustainability Appraisal – Key Findings for Areas of Search</i> Do you have any comments on the Initial Sustainability Appraisal and its findings for Areas of Search?
	No
18	<i>Strategic Development Sites – Initial Selection of Options for Testing</i> Do you agree with the initial selection of site options for testing?
	Yes
19	<i>Initial Transport Assessment – Key Findings for Strategic Development Sites</i> Do you have any comments on the Assessment and its findings?
	No
20	<i>Initial Sustainability Appraisal – Key Findings for Strategic Development Sites</i> Do you have any comments on the SA's initial findings for sites?
	No
21	<i>Evidence Base</i> Do you have any comments on our evidence base? Are there other pieces of evidence that we need to consider?
	No
22	<i>Five Year Land Supply Start Date</i> Is 2021 a justified and appropriate start date for being required to meet Oxford's housing needs and to deliver a 5 year supply?
	Adequate
23	<i>Maintaining a Five Year Land Supply</i> Do you agree that phasing of land release within individual strategic development sites will promote developer competition and assist the maintenance of a five year housing supply to meet Oxford's unmet Housing needs? What alternatives would you suggest?
	Yes
24	<i>Monitoring Delivery</i> Are there any proposals you would like us to consider to ensure that the final plan is delivered and sustainable development is achieved.
	This project should be a 'one off' agreement with Oxford and it should not be expected to be expanded in the future. The developers will need to be held to account to ensure that they do actually supply the housing promised