

Water Eaton (Site PR6a): Consultation Response Tables (27th February 2024) – SUBMISSION VERSION

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION (CDC REF. 23/01233/OUT)
COMPREHENSIVE SUBMISSION OF FURTHER INFORMATION TO CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
CONSULTATION RESPONSE TABLES

Table 1 sets out Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023.
 Table 2 sets out Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Consultee Comments Received since 16th August 2023.

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023		
Topic	Summary of Point	Response
EIA		
1.1	I am still awaiting a number of consultation responses, notably conservation and Historic England. However, having read the submitted ES, I am of the view that the submitted heritage assessment has failed to properly assess the impact of the development on both designated and non-designated heritage assets. For example, no photomontages are included to explain and show how the development will impact on their setting. The comments received from both the Conservation Officer and Historic England were specific in what should be included in the ES.	An Environmental Statement Addendum is submitted which addresses relevant comments from the CDC Conservation officer and Historic England. Please refer to Chapter 11 Heritage (WE/ES/P02), Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) and 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01).
1.2	I have not received comments from the ecology officer yet, however, comments from both Oxford City and BBOWT have raised concerns which need to be addressed.	An Environmental Statement Addendum is submitted which addresses relevant comments from the CDC Ecology officer, Oxford City and BBOWT. Please refer to Chapter 9 Biodiversity (WE/ES/P02), Appendix 9.1 Ecological Baseline (WE/ECO/P02) and Appendix 9.3 Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (WE/BIM/P02).
1.3	LVIA – not fully assessing development from railway line and footbridge over the railway line or from south along Oxford Road with trees removed.	An Environmental Statement Addendum is submitted which addresses relevant comments from the CDC Landscape officer and consultees. Please refer to Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (WE/ES/P02), Appendix 10.2 Photomontages (previously named as Wirelines) (WE/LAN2/P02), 10.3 Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02) and 10.4 LVIA (WE/LAN4/P02).
DAS		
2.1	Character analysis is considered at 3.5, but there is no analysis of the immediate area, either Kidlington or North Oxford, instead the DAS focusses on modern development elsewhere, including other parts of the country.	The Design and Access Statement includes examples from recent relevant developments in the northern part of Oxford at Wolvercote Mill (Page 54) and immediately to the south of the site at the Croudace site on Oxford Road (Page 55). This is in addition to other representative developments at Barton Park in Oxford City (Pages 54/57) and also at Bicester Eco Town (Pages 55/56) and Launton (Page 56) in Cherwell District. The character analysis section of the DAS provides some potential characteristics taken from the study areas to inform the character of development that is taken forward. Earlier character studies reviewed the character of Cutteslowe and Kidlington, however these were not considered to provide the right design principles to guide development at PR6a.
2.2	Whilst it is agreed that the site could benefit from a more modern contemporary approach to the design of the development, it must also be locally distinctive in its design and choice of materials. As stated, this will be a new gateway into Oxford and must read as such rather than an 'anywhere' development. The choice of materials must also reflect the area, natural limestone being a key traditional material. Reference to light coloured stone/brick and/brown brick are not suitably specific and therefore not appropriate as specified. There is no mention of render, which might be appropriate to help break up the scale of the frontage buildings.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) (Page 54 (3.4.1 last bullet)). The DAS sets out a materials palette appropriate to the area. This includes light coloured stone, typical to Oxford and the southern part of Cherwell.
2.3	This chapter requires further work to set out the proposed vision for the site in terms of design with some scale parameters set for the scale and height of buildings, including typologies.	Chapter 2 of the Design and Access Statement sets out the issues that have informed the vision for the site. The Vision was established and agreed through local consultation at the pre-application stage, establishing a set of high level principles that have informed the masterplanning work. It is not intended to set detailed approaches to design and



TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
		issues such as building, typologies, heights and scale are set out elsewhere in the DAS and the Parameter Plans. In view of this, the text at pages 13 and 14 of the Design and Access Statement has not been altered. Further work has been undertaken to review and revise the parameters in terms of scale and height – revised Parameter Plans are submitted with this further submission for consideration by the Local Planning Authority.
2.4	The green infrastructure table on page 81 sets out the amount of green space, play space, outdoor sports and allotments required to serve a development of this size. It does not however confirm that the amount provided accords with these requirements.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) (P81 (see text and table)).
2.5	It should be noted that the amount of space referred to above must be in addition to the Cutteslowe Park extension and the eastern green infrastructure corridor which are specific Policy PR6a requirements to minimise the impact of the development, create an appropriate setting to the Listed St Frideswide Farmhouse and Wall and provide a clear distinction between the site and the Green Belt. Please clarify.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) (See page 81).
2.6	The DAS should be accurate in terms of its illustrations and what might be subsequently built. The illustrative sketch view of the local centre on page 92 appears to indicate a two-storey development, the heights parameter plan indicates 3-4 storey. The illustrative site plan on page 93 fails to identify a significant new green corridor to the Oxford Road and the local centre backs onto one of the main access routes into and out of the development.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02). The Building Heights Parameter Plan shows 'up to' heights. The local centre shown is therefore accurate at 2 and 3 storeys. Page 93 shows a row of trees to the Oxford Road, but in effect this green corridor will be protected through the Parameter Plan and detailed submissions, over which the LPA has strict control to grant or refuse consent. The local centre, as shown in this illustration, fronts onto one of the main accesses from which vehicular access can be taken; onto the Oxford Road (although set back) and onto the barrows park.
2.7	The dead frontage to this street as shown is not acceptable, an active frontage should be provided here also. How will the local centre be serviced/parking for residents above the local centre? Further thought is required in terms of the local centre and how it could be designed and relate to its location and the remainder of the development.	Careful consideration of the building design will provide positive activation of the façade, through windows, doors and balconies providing an attractive building and informal surveillance of the area. Servicing could either be to the front or rear depending on final arrangement. This will be a matter for the detailed design stage. Further discussion is required with the Local Planning Authority to determine whether CDC's comment relates to the local centre building frontage or to the apartments that wrap around the perimeter of the local centre.
2.8	The green landscape buffer alongside the retained bridleway is compromised for biodiversity gain by the proximity of the local centre on one side and proposed road on the other side which must be of sufficient width to serve traffic when the school street is closed to vehicular traffic. The width of buffers to Oxford Road and this hedgerow must be specified and agreed at outline.	The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) identifies minimum widths of buffer alongside Oxford Road to accommodate earthworks, ditches and structural planting, whilst also maintaining wildlife corridors and promoting BNG along the western edge of the development. The southern section of buffer is proposed to be a minimum of 9m wide. The northern section of buffer is proposed to be a minimum of 6m wide. The green landscape buffer alongside the retained bridleway is not compromised for biodiversity gain. The BNG calculations show a significant biodiversity gain in relation to the proposals. The Council will have full control over how the bridleway and its surroundings are delivered through reserved matters submissions.
2.9	Fig 34 on page 98 seeks to illustrate the potential development around Pipal Cottage, however, this does not appear to relate to either the masterplan for the site or the building heights parameter plan. Proposals and mitigation strategies must be consistent. Neither is this plan clear in terms of the proposed footpath/cycle link which enters the site at this point as there is insufficient room along the Oxford Road corridor. The note at 6.1.3 also advises that the development here could be apartments.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) and Illustrative Masterplan (477898-42T) (Page 98). These changes have been informed by the footprint and form of the existing barn structures on the site.
2.10	Page 113 advises that access to Water Eaton and St Frideswide Farm will be through new roads provided within the development, however, the plan on page 106, Fig 36 shows these as tertiary	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) (Page 113 (para 6.2.7, 6th bullet point)).

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
	streets which are a shared surface. Is this likely to be acceptable for farm traffic, which may include commercial vehicles? The plans do not show access into these properties.	
2.11	The rural streets are described as private drives. The use of private drives precludes connectivity and will therefore not be appropriate along this green edge with the landscape buffer. Access into this space will be required from the adjacent development parcels.	The proposed Rural Edge Streets are not proposed to be private and their design and scale, including planting, will enable an appropriate transition between the housing along Tertiary Streets and the wider countryside. Connectivity between the adjoining Tertiary Streets and Rural Edge Streets (as shown on Figure 36) has been the subject of consultation with OXCC Highways (Pages 105-106 and 111).
2.12	Page 119 of the DAS considers surface water drainage and the use of SUDs through green infrastructure and alongside the main spine road. The submission must be clear that there is sufficient room to accommodate appropriate SUDs and tree planting along the spine road and that the provision of extensive SUDs within the eastern green infrastructure can be appropriately accommodated and does not compromise this as a planted landscape buffer with wildlife zones, ponds, copse planting and leisure route as indicated. The DAS must be clear in demonstrating that all this can be successfully accommodated.	The Design and Access Statement outlines the surface water drainage strategy (as stated on Page 119 and also Page 43). More detail is provided in the Flood Risk Assessment relating to the provision of a new drainage system, which was discussed with OXCC as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) prior to the planning application submission, who confirmed that the proposed strategy was appropriate. Section 5 of the FRA identifies the proposed drainage strategy. As identified in the FRA the outline drainage strategy (including SuDs) can be accommodated within the eastern green infrastructure without compromising the provision of tree planting, wildlife zones, ponds, copse planting and the creation of leisure routes. Details relating to the delivery of the drainage strategy and green infrastructure will be identified at the Reserved Matters Application stage.
2.13	The DAS must also provide clear advice regarding the provision of connecting green infrastructure corridors running east-west across the site which are also a specific policy requirement of Policy PR6a as well as Policy PR5.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) (Figure 28 now identifies corridors).
2.14	In terms of the proposed school street, the submission is not consistent in how the site can be accessed by vehicles when the street is closed, for example, the plan on page 94 is not consistent with the street strategy plan or the proposed movement plan. This alternative route will need to be of sufficient width to accommodate this traffic, including deliveries and possible refuse vehicles. This requires consideration and clarification. It also appears to encroach into the green infrastructure alongside the bridleway and the barrows.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02). All drawings have now been updated to consistently show agreed school arrangement.
2.15	Page 121 sets out the proposed character areas. In terms of the Oxford Road character area the DAS advises that existing planting will be retained in part with new formal planting. This does not accord with the landscape strategy which identifies that all planting along the frontage will be removed and that a new landscape/wildlife corridor will be created. Please clarify what is expected here, including its minimal width.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) (Page 121) to accord with the landscape strategy.
2.16	It further states that the majority of buildings in this area will be 3 to 4 storeys with 5 storey elements. This is not in accordance with the approved design brief which states that the majority of buildings here will be 3 storeys with 4 to 5 storeys in key locations. Having regard to the existing development context, as previously advised, a development of 4 storey blocks along this frontage will not sit comfortably with the existing street scene and character of development on this edge of Oxford.	Revisions have been made to the Design and Access Statement to confirm that along the Oxford Road frontage there will be mainly 3 storey buildings with occasional 4 storey buildings at key locations (WE/DAS/P02) (Page 121). The Building Heights Parameter Plan identifies predominantly 3 storeys with occasional 4 storeys (up to 14 metres) in key locations, with building heights reduced to predominantly 2 storeys around Pipal Cottage. This compares with the version of the Building Heights Parameter Plan which was submitted with the planning application and identified 3-4 storey buildings (up to 14 metres) alongside the Oxford Road and key buildings at gateway / landmark features of up to 18 metres.
2.17	The DAS should also include more detail regarding appropriate typologies and set parameters for size of buildings etc.	Details of typologies and housing mix will be a matter for further consideration at the detailed design stage.
2.18	Further detail should also be included to identify building setbacks from the Oxford Road and eastern green buffer as well as landscape corridors to be provided internally between parcels. It is important that these are established at outline to ensure that new tree planting does not cause shading to	The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) identifies minimum widths of buffer alongside Oxford Road to accommodate earthworks, ditches and structural planting, whilst also maintain wildlife corridors and promoting BNG along the western edge of the development.

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
	buildings and to ensure the long-term protection and retention of that planting, particularly if many of these buildings along Oxford Road are apartment blocks with main living areas overlooking this belt.	The widths of the green infrastructure corridor along the eastern edge of the site corresponds with the width of corridor identified on the Policies Map of Policy PR6a of the adopted Local Plan Partial Review, and pre-application discussions with the LPA about the width of this corridor. Further information on internal development parcels will be a matter for the detailed design stage.
2.19	In terms of the detailed design of the internal road structure, OXCC Transport comment as follows: (i) Shared surfaces should be 6m to accommodate a 4.6m carriageway that allows two-way traffic and 1.2m area for pedestrians. The 5m and 4.8m proposed for the secondary and tertiary streets is therefore not adequate, (ii) All roads within the development must be able to accommodate an 11.6m refuse vehicle. The DAS should be amended accordingly.	Road widths have been checked by the applicants' technical team and changes made to the DAS.
Parameter Plans		
3.1 - Masterplan	<p>It is noted that this plan has been submitted for illustrative purposes only, however, it is heavily relied upon in terms of the development proposals as set out in the application documentation, including the Design and Access Statement and is therefore likely to be closely followed by the reserved matters submissions and is therefore an important consideration of the outline.</p> <p>The masterplan has sought to indicate how the site might be developed having regard to necessary infrastructure and residential parcels, The indicative street layout is not clear and does not create land parcels that will be ultimately easy to develop due to their size, shape and relationship with adjoining parcels and infrastructure provision. There is little value in a masterplan that simply cannot be delivered. For example, the layout at the southern end of the site indicates a number of small, narrow, oddly shaped parcels. This concern also ties in with the lack of commitment in terms of green infrastructure widths and sizes. If parcels are unable to be developed economically, the green spaces will suffer.</p>	Revisions have been made to the Illustrative Masterplan (477898-42T) to demonstrate delivery. Further information will be provided at the detailed design stage.
3.2 Land Use and Access Parameter Plan	This is not fully in accordance with the approved development brief of Policy PR6a in terms of the location of the school and local centre which were under much discussion at pre-application. The location of the school and local centre in close proximity to one another is welcomed, however, the proposed school site is compromised by the eastern green infrastructure buffer and the barrows. The issue of whether there is sufficient to accommodate the spine road and the school site between these two constraints remains a potential issue which must be clarified prior to outline consent being issued. It is noted that the plan indicates the school site with a variation of +10/~10 metres along each of the boundaries, with the exception of the eastern boundary. This variation could be critical if the northern and western boundaries were moved outwards by 10m and could result in the school location being considered unacceptable further down the line. The position and indicative layout of the school site was discussed at length during the pre-application and has been agreed in principle by OXCC Education. The comments in their consultation response are relevant in terms of the final delivery of the school and the outline submission must therefore confirm that the school site identified can be successfully delivered in this location without compromising green infrastructure or the barrows.	The reference to these variations has been removed from the Land Use and Access Parameter Plan (477898-32W).
3.2.1	This parameter plan also advises that the access roads are subject to a centre line deviation of +15/~15 metres, this is of concern in respect of the proposed cyclops junction which is now proposed very close to the existing St Frideswide Farm access and existing species rich hedgerow which runs alongside its northern boundary. The removal of this hedge would not be acceptable. Further the position of the main spine road through the site is severely constrained by the proposed school site, green infrastructure to the eastern boundary and the archaeology to its western boundary. These	The reference to these variations has been removed from the Land Use and Access Parameter Plan (477898-32W).

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
	<p>constraints are fixed points. Further, the planning statement suggests a variation of +/- 20m which is slightly different. This requires clarification and further consideration.</p>	
<p>3.3 Building Heights</p>	<p>Proposed building heights have been subject to much discussion during the pre-application submission. The parameter plan submitted remains little changed from the concerns raised at that time. The plan indicates buildings along the whole of the Oxford Road frontage of 3-4 storeys, up to 14m in height and 18m as landmark/gateway features. The central part of the site is indicated as being 3 storeys up to 11.5m in height and the eastern part of the site as 3 storey with up to 10m in height. This has been previously discussed, and concerns remain in respect of the overall building heights, and in particular to the eastern edge where we have previously indicated that development along this edge should not exceed two storeys. Three storey development along this edge is not considered to appropriately respond to Policy PR6a which requires a sensitive relationship with the site's Cherwell valley setting. The concerns raised by Oxford City in respect of building heights in relation to the adjacent Croudace scheme should also be addressed. The building heights proposed are also not in accordance with the Development Brief.</p> <p>The proposed building heights do not appear to address the quite significant change in levels across the site from north to south, with building heights uniform from west to east. The significant change in levels from the public bridleway down to the north are also likely to require retaining walls and features which should also be considered in respect of building heights.</p> <p>It is noted that reference is also made to the provision of buildings of up to 3m in height within the open space related to maintenance/infrastructure. Policy PR6a specifically requires that there should be no buildings within the public open space/extension to Cutteslowe Park, therefore the erection of such buildings here is unlikely to be acceptable, In respect of the green infrastructure corridor along the eastern boundary, the erection of such structures within this corridor are also likely to be unacceptable due to its function and purpose which is to minimise the visual and landscape impact of the development and create an appropriate setting to St Frideswide Farm and Wall and provide a clear distinction between the site and the green belt. This buffer is already compromised by the school site encroachment, provision of SUDS, allotments and proposed play facilities.</p> <p>In terms of Pipal Cottage, the existing building is a small two storey cottage of traditional proportions. The erection of 3-4 storey apartment units up to 14m in height surrounding this residential unit is unlikely to be appropriate both in terms of visual impact, its setting and impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of that property. Objections have also been received from the occupiers of that cottage. This must be further considered.</p> <p>Having assessed the development on site and in respect of the LVIA, I remain of the view that the proposed building heights are too high across the site, both in terms of the eastern edge and the main Oxford Road. There are no buildings of this height within the vicinity of the site which is characterised by interwar 2 storey development. The 2.5 storey newer development adjacent to the Croudace site is quite clearly visible across from adjacent public rights of way. This proposed development at 4 storey (14-18m) would be out of scale with its context and this edge of the city/open countryside location. Further consideration must be given as to how this development can be successfully integrated with the existing built form, by creating a greater variation in building heights and defining more closely the areas where higher buildings might be appropriate and areas where building heights should be kept lower.</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the Building Heights Parameter Plan (477898-33T), including showing a reduction in building heights around Pipal Cottage.</p> <p>These changes include:</p> <p>(i) reduced heights parameters along the Oxford Road frontage from 3-4 storeys (up to 14 metres) and with key buildings (up to 18 metres) to predominantly 3 storeys with occasional 4 storeys (up to 14 metres) and predominantly 2 storeys around Pipal Cottage;</p> <p>(ii) change in reference to storey heights along the eastern edge of the development from 3 storeys (up to 10 metres) to 2-3 storeys (up to 10 metres); and</p> <p>(iii) removal of reference to the potential 3 metre height of low level buildings within the open space and planting areas.</p> <p>Proposed building heights have been assessed in terms of their landscape and heritage impact and no further changes to the Parameter Plan are considered necessary. Precise building heights will be a matter for further discussion at the detailed design stage and will also take into consideration the heights requirements of the adopted Development Brief.</p>
<p>3.4 Green Infrastructure</p>	<p>This currently lacks any commitment to the width of green infrastructure corridors throughout the site, including the Oxford Road frontage which has been the subject of much discussion during the pre-</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) to show minimum widths of buffer alongside Oxford Road. The widths of the green infrastructure corridor along the eastern edge of the site</p>

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
Parameter Plan	<p>application. The reference to the Oxford Road frontage does identify a buffer, but advises that this would be up to 9m, so in theory, only 1m would comply with this which would not be acceptable or appropriate. It is also noted from the arboriculture impact assessment that due to changes in levels along this corridor that earthworks will be necessary. It is not clear how these might impact on the provision of new tree and underplanting along this frontage and therefore how the vision for the site as set out in the Design and Access Statement can be fully realised. The need to identify minimum green infrastructure widths at this stage was discussed at pre-application and remains an issue. In terms of the barrows which states that the offset boundary will be determined at reserved matters, again, I understood that a minimum off-set had been agreed with OXCC Archaeology at pre-application. This should also be a commitment of this parameter plan.</p>	<p>corresponds with the width of corridor identified on the Policies Map of Policy PR6a of the adopted Local Plan Partial Review, and pre-application discussions with the LPA about the width of this corridor. Offset distances to the Barrows have previously agreed with OXCC and are reflected on all relevant plans.</p> <p>Revisions have been made to the Illustrative Masterplan (477898-42T) to demonstrate delivery. Further information relating to levels will be provided at the detailed design stage.</p>
Transport Assessment		
4.1	<p>Policy PR6a and the approved design Brief also requires a scheme for public vehicular, cycle, pedestrian and wheelchair connectivity within the site to the adjacent Oxford Parkway and Water Eaton Park and Ride. The application submission has not addressed this. This matter was also raised at pre-application discussions by OXCC and at this point a satisfactory reason why this cannot be provided has not been made. This issue is raised again in the consultation response from OXCC Transport. This must be considered through the outline submission and not left to reserved matters.</p>	<p>A further pedestrian / cycle access from the site is provided to the Parkway / Station / Park and Ride site to the north. This was shown in the original planning submission and the updated Land Use and Access Parameter Plan also shows the indicative location for this pedestrian / cycle access – it is envisaged that the Section 106 Agreement will secure a pedestrian / cycle link as far as the site boundary in this location.</p> <p>Meeting with OXCC happened on 7 September. All points understood and accepted.</p>
4.2	<p>It is noted that these will be created through green infrastructure links, how will these new accesses which will need to be designed to accommodate large farm and commercial vehicles impact on these links? A greater understanding is required at this outline stage.</p>	<p>The ability to accommodate large farm and commercial vehicles from the accesses from Oxford Road have been designed to accommodate the required vehicles. The detailed design within the site will be a matter for the reserved matters application stage.</p>
4.3	<p>In order to assess the traffic impact of the development, the county council requested that all of the PR sites used the existing North Oxford VISSIM model which has 2018 and 2023 baseline years and collaborated to create a 2031 future year scenario including expected traffic impact from all the sites and other committed development. At the time of the submission of the application this had not been submitted to the county council and as such the full impact of the development on the highway network could not be fully assessed. An objection is therefore currently raised on highway grounds until this information has been submitted and agreed. It is understood that the revised modelling has now been re-submitted to OXCC and is currently being reviewed.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling is now agreed with OXCC (Will Madgwick email 26 October 2023). The traffic impact of the proposed development is not significant and the residual cumulative impacts are not severe. See Section 8 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (WE/TA/P02).</p>
4.4	<p>Cotteslowe Roundabout, which is close to capacity, is also a significant barrier to development from an active travel perspective and this will be worsened by committed development and the application site. Whilst active travel improvements are critical to the success of the site, further delays could significantly impact buses which would not be acceptable. An objection is therefore currently raised by OXCC Transport until a solution can be found to Cotteslowe Roundabout.</p>	<p>Improvements at Cotteslowe roundabout are deemed necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms as they allow residents from the site safe and convenient access by active modes to Oxford City to the south. The scheme will also help convert existing vehicular trips on the network from private car to active modes which in turn helps free up capacity on the network. The roundabout is also considered directly related to the site and the contribution is considered to be reasonable in scale and kind. The contribution request is supported by Policy PR11 of the Cherwell Local Plan (Partial Review). The costs for the Cotteslowe Roundabout Improvements are £1,769,733 (index linked) and this contribution is being split between PR6a, PR6b, PR7a and PR7b.</p>
4.5	<p>A response to the submission has been received from 'Cyclox' who have raised concerns that the proposed cycle and walking routes are not LTN1/20 compliant in that all cycle crossings of side roads along the route should be LTN1/20 no set back, design priority and with no shared (cycle and pedestrian) space. They are also concerned that the details of the connection of this development with the P&R/Station is not resolved. Cyclox have also requested that they are consulted on the cycle/pedestrian improvements around Cotteslowe roundabout. Their response can be read in full on the application documentation.</p>	<p>A full set back raised table priority crossing for the southbound cycle superhighway is proposed as it crosses the access arm. This is LTN1/20 compliant as shown in Figure 10.13 of LTN1/20) and a circa 5m set back is provided and can accommodate traffic flows of around 2,000 vehicles per day on the minor arm. The full set back arrangement is agreed as being appropriate and safe by OXCC. See section 3 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (WE/TA/P02).</p>

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
4.6	National Highways have responded to a consultation and have issued a holding objection. The Strategic Road Network (SRN) is a critical national asset and as such National Highways are concerned that the proposals will have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the A34 and M40 and therefore require further information regarding: (i) how background flow changes were generated, (ii) a sense check of the walk and cycle proportions which look high and confirmation that the cumulative impact of any adjustments remain within insignificant ranges, and, (iii) estimates of vehicle flows onto and off the A34 and M40.	Following the submission of further information from i-Transport, National Highways lifted its holding position on 11 September 2023 recommending that conditions should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted. See Section 8 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (WE/TA/P02).
4.7	The Transport Assessment includes the potential provision of mobility hubs within the development. The creation of mobility hubs is supported by Policy 23 of the LTP and Action 15 of the COTP and are therefore welcomed. The TA notes potential provision of parking for e-scooters within these hubs and OXCC is currently operating an e-scooter trial in central Oxford in partnership with Voi and DfT, in response to social distanced movement and transport challenges arising from the Covid-19 pandemic. However, it is currently not legal to ride private e-scooters on public highway. Clarity over whether the proposed e-scooter parking is a viable option is therefore required. Neither is it clear from the application who the proposed public EV charging is intended to be used by and further clarification is therefore also required on this point. The details regarding the mobility hub need to be progressed as part of this submission and through the section 106. The Transport Hub Strategy has now been approved by Cabinet Member decision on 20th July 2023 and should therefore be considered as part of the submission.	A Mobility Hub is proposed, details of which will be agreed in any Section 106 Agreement. See Section 4 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (WE/TA/P02).
4.8	Policy 50 of the LTCP and Action 16 of the COTP relating to freight consolidation and opportunities for last-mile freight are noted within the Policy Review within the TA and the Framework Travel Plan notes that the Travel Plan Consultant will be encouraged to consider sustainable freight opportunities. Given the size of the development and combination of residential, education, assisted living facility and local centre proposed, there is a requirement to consider further freight consolidation and last-mile delivery solutions, both through the design of the development and before the implementation of any Travel Plan. An E-cargo bike/last mile freight pilot is being promoted by the LTCP Freight and Logistics Strategy Action and there is a Transport Hub Strategy currently in development at OXCC aligning with LTCP.	Innovation Framework Plan agreed by OXCC. Suggested points are for reserved matters stage.
Public Rights of Way		
5.1	There are two existing public rights of way through the application site which cross the site from east to west. It is proposed that these be retained along their definitive routes but will be upgraded within the built development area for pedestrian/cycle use and which will link the facilities on this development with those on PR6b with a toucan crossing provided on the Oxford Road. This is welcomed and is acceptable in principle. During public consultation however, a request was made for a bridge to be provided over the Oxford Road to link the two sites and this was echoed by Members when the design brief was considered by planning committee. Whilst this was discussed briefly and discounted at pre-application, it was requested that this was included within the application submission along with a justification as to why it was discounted. This does not appear to have been included. I note the references to this in the TA, statement of community involvement and design and access statement, however, these are statements and neither of these assess the proposed bridge in terms of land take, potential design, likely use etc. and therefore why it has been discounted. Further clarification is therefore required.	This matter is addressed in the Transport Assessment Addendum (WE/TA/P02) and is not agreed to be a suitable option, as agreed with OXCC. A bridge is not necessary or desirable in this location given the nature of the road. OXCC do not require a bridge. No design work is necessary. See Section 3 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (WE/TA/P02)

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
5.2	OXCC Public Rights of Way have assessed the submission and a number of comments and recommendations are set out in their consultation response. It should also be noted that an objection has been received from the Ramblers Association and British Horse Society which need to be addressed/responded accordingly.	The BHS consultation response seeks matters of detail (including route, surfacing, separation, signage, signal controls). The Ramblers Association has not identified a specific issue to which a response needs to be prepared. Matters relating to PRow will be addressed at the detailed design stage.
Affordable Housing		
6.1	In terms of Extra Care provision, none is proposed as part of this submission. Policy PR2 of the Local Plan Review 2020 does not require the provision of extra care housing and currently OXCC have not completed work on an updated Evidence Paper relating to the need for Extra Care provision within the County. OXCC have further advised however in their consultation response, that should the current Market Position Statement and Extra Care Housing Supplement be updated prior to the determination of the application, that this should be reconsidered. The provision of extra care should also be given some consideration having regard to the additional units proposed above the allocation.	Extra Care Housing is not proposed as part of this planning application and no formal request for ECH has been made by CDC or OXCC. Agreed principles of affordable housing provision will be identified in S106 Heads of Terms and details included in the S106 Agreement.
Heritage Assets		
7.1	The nearest designated heritage assets to the site are the Grade II* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse and associated Grade II listed garden wall. There was little discussion regarding the potential impacts and mitigation in respect of Frideswide Farm through the pre-application as no information or heritage impact assessment was submitted at that time. Having assessed the submission, it would appear that little or no assessment has been made in terms of the proposed development heights and the impact of such development on the setting of the farmhouse. No wirelines or photomontages have been included to support this. Having walked the site, I consider that the development will be visible within the landscape and public rights of way around the farmhouse. In the absence of a full assessment, any resultant harm cannot be assessed accordingly. It is also noted that the site is visible through the trees alongside the access track to the farm, where SUDs are proposed within this part of the green infrastructure corridor. It is unlikely therefore that the green infrastructure corridor in this location will afford much protection to this Grade II* Listed Building in terms of its setting. Further clarification is required.	This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) and in ES Addendum Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01). Following further assessment, no changes to building heights are proposed on the eastern side of the proposed development (i.e. relating to St. Frideswide farmhouse). This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) and in Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01). See also, Landscape Parameter Visualisations with Indicative Height Lines (WE/LAN5/P01) which are for information and not included in the ES or LVIA.
7.2	It should also be noted that the farm buildings associated with St Frideswide Farmhouse are curtilage listed buildings and no assessment has been made in respect of the proposed development on the setting of these buildings or the historic farm track which currently serves these buildings and St Frideswide Farmhouse. This must be addressed.	This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) and in ES Addendum Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01). Following further assessment, no changes to building heights are proposed on the eastern side of the proposed development (i.e. relating to St. Frideswide farmhouse). This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) and in Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01). See also, Landscape Parameter Visualisations with Indicative Height Lines (WE/LAN5/P01) which are for information and not included in the ES or LVIA.
7.3	Pipal Cottage and its adjacent farm buildings are non-designated heritage assets. Again, the impact of the development on these buildings must be assessed, with wire frames included. The proposed 4/5 storey development (up to 14m high) immediately adjacent to these small traditional buildings is unlikely to be acceptable. Further consideration must be given to the proposed building heights here. Again, no assessment is made using wire frames to show the proposed development in relation to the cottage and farm buildings.	Amendments have been made to the Building Heights Parameter Plans (477898-33T) to reduce the heights of buildings around Pipal cottage to predominantly 2 storeys. Following assessment, no further changes are proposed to the Parameter Plan.

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
7.4	It is proposed to demolish the farm buildings on the basis that they are non-designated heritage assets which are defunct for agricultural use, but no consideration appears to have been given to retaining the buildings and converting them to residential or other use. It is also noted that the assessment which includes views across the site from the bridleway advise that the complex is screened from view by existing trees and hedgerows, however, these are all to be removed which will result in these buildings being wholly exposed to the development and views across the site. There are therefore inconsistencies in the submission here. The removal of Pipal Barns also appears to evolve around how the site will be developed rather than an assessment of their condition and how they could be retained and converted and integrated with the development. This requires further clarification.	The description of development for the planning application provides the flexibility to either retain or demolish Pipal Barns. This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02).
7.5	I am awaiting a consultation response from the Conservation Officer and Historic England at the time of writing. I will forward the comments once received under separate cover.	These consultation responses have been received and are addressed in Table 2 (see below).
7.6	There are also present on the site the remains of two bronze age barrows, a possible Roman 'ridgeway' and a milestone. Following extensive pre-application discussions, the two bronze age barrows will be retained in situ and protected from development. Appropriate buffers which must be kept free of any development to protect the barrows were agreed at pre-application. OXCC Archaeologist has assessed the submission and raises no objection subject to conditions to be included within any permission relating to Written Scheme of Investigation.	Noted. The presence of a milestone is not confirmed on site.
LVIA		
8.1	In terms of the Oxford Road frontage, it became evident during pre-application that the whole of the tree lined/woodland frontage to Oxford Road would be removed to provide the improvements to Oxford Road in terms of buses, pedestrians, and cyclists. Consequently, the views into the site when approaching from Oxford to the south will be open. The LVIA has not currently assessed these views. Clear views of the site are also visible from the railway line and public right of way over the railway. Again, these viewpoints have not been assessed by the submission. The LVIA must therefore be updated accordingly.	An Environmental Statement Addendum is submitted which addresses this matter. Please refer to Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (WE/ES/P02), Appendix 10.2 Photomontages (previously named as Wirelines) (WE/LAN2/P02), 10.3 Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02) and 10.4 LVIA (WE/LAN4/P02).
8.2	The LVIA advises that given the scale and nature of the proposed development there would inevitably be some adverse effects on visual receptors. However, where views are available, the proposed development would be integrated within an extensive and far-reaching green infrastructure network, which provides many benefits to biodiversity and landscape character. The submitted viewpoints indicate that currently there is a high level of intervisibility between the site and the countryside. Whilst policy PR6a sets out that one of the primary purposes of the eastern green infrastructure corridor is to minimise the visual and landscape impact of the development, I remain concerned about the effectiveness of this green infrastructure buffer for this purpose as a consequence of all the infrastructure proposed within it, including SUDs attenuation basins, play spaces and allotments/community gardens and footpath/cycleway. This leaves very little area for substantial woodland/tree planting accordingly. I therefore remain concerned about the landscape impact of such development with buildings of up to 18m in height and significant building heights of up to 14m along the road frontage.	An Environmental Statement Addendum is submitted which addresses this matter. Please refer to Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (WE/ES/P02), Appendix 10.2 Photomontages (previously named as Wirelines) (WE/LAN2/P02), 10.3 Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02) and 10.4 LVIA (WE/LAN4/P02). Information is provided on the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) and the Illustrative Masterplan (477898-42T) which identifies how the eastern GI corridor could be laid out. This matter will be addressed in more detail at the reserved matters stage. Also included is a separate Landscape document, 'Landscape Parameter Visualisations with Indicative Height Lines' (WE/LAN5/P01). These are for information for the LPA and are not included in the ES or LVIA as they do not add to the assessment and are not considered a component of the GLVIA assessment approach. They provide the same information as the LVIA photomontages, but with Indicative Height Lines that show the 9m, 10m, 11m, 11.5m and 14m heights where applicable on each parameter block in the view.
8.3	In order to provide reassurance that the maturing 'treescape' at 15 years is effective at reducing the significance of the effect, an accurate visualisation should be provided based on the EDP VP 15 Wireframe. It is important to successfully establish woodland for amenity, biodiversity and carbon	An Environmental Statement Addendum is submitted which addresses this matter. Please refer to Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (WE/ES/P02), Appendix 10.2 Photomontages (previously named as Wirelines) (WE/LAN2/P02), 10.3 Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02) and 10.4 LVIA (WE/LAN4/P02).

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
	offsetting/sequestration on the eastern boundary and Cutteslowe Park extension in accordance with a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.	
8.4	I am concerned that the LVIA lacks commitment in terms of retaining existing vegetation as it advises that consideration should be given to retaining all trees where possible, and then goes on to state that this will be dependent upon the proposals. The starting point should be that all trees, hedgerows and vegetation should be retained unless there is clear justification for their removal with adequate replacements proposed. It is noted that the development now proposes to remove the entirety of the existing trees and hedges along Oxford Road. This matter was discussed at length during pre-application where the matter remained unresolved. Following a discussion with the arboriculture officer, EDP advised that if the trees along Oxford Road were removed that from an arboriculture perspective that a specific tree strategy would be included for the site as a whole which would include a more robust planting plan with emphasis on Cherwell suited trees, mixed with non-native trees in order to accommodate climate change and increase biodiversity. The submission does not make sufficient commitment to new tree planting, including a new planted buffer to Oxford Road of an appropriate width.	<p>The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) identifies minimum widths of buffer alongside Oxford Road to accommodate earthworks, ditches and structural planting, whilst also maintain wildlife corridors and promoting BNG along the western edge of the development.</p> <p>Detailed tree planting information and a tree strategy will be a matter for planning conditions and will be dealt with at the reserved matters application stage.</p> <p>The AIA (WE/AIA/P02) also addresses CDC comments. The justification for the amount of tree removal along the Oxford Road, has been driven by OXCC preferred highway standards and that Cat C trees (which most are along the Oxford Road) should not constrain development in line with BS5837.</p>
8.5	There are also changes in levels between the existing highway and the site along Oxford Road which as identified at pre-application is likely to result in the need for some form of retaining feature. The impact of these must also be considered in terms of how wide this buffer needs to be and what its function is in terms of providing a landscape screen, wildlife corridor, potential SUDS and recreation use. The wholesale removal of this vegetation is also likely to impact on biodiversity. The application must be clear in how biodiversity net gain will be achieved in the long-term.	<p>The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) identifies minimum widths of buffer alongside Oxford Road to accommodate earthworks, ditches and structural planting, whilst also maintain wildlife corridors and promoting BNG along the western edge of the development.</p> <p>Further information relating to levels will be provided at the detailed design stage.</p>
Landscape Proposals, Tree and Play Facilities		
9.1	<p>Policies BSC10 and BSC11 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2015 set out the requirements for the provision of open space and recreation provision within new developments. It should be noted that these requirements are specific to the size of the development and will be in addition to the Cutteslowe Park extensions and eastern green infrastructure provision as specifically required by Policy PR6a as compensation for removing land from the Green Belt and ensuring the future protection of the green belt, the setting of St Frideswide Farm and the impact of the development in views from the Cherwell Valley. The submission must therefore be clear that the quantum of open space/recreation space provided for the development accords with those policies. The minimum standard for public open space is 2.4ha per 1000 residents. It must also be noted that any wildlife corridors/ecological areas for biodiversity net gain will be in excess of this as these areas need to be protected in the main from public access. With the exception of the park extension, eastern buffer and central area necessary to protect the barrows, there appears to be little in terms of meaningful landscaped areas and open space provision within the built area of the development itself.</p> <p>Policy PR6a of the Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Need, sets out a number of key delivery and application requirements relating to landscape proposals, these being, provision of 11 hectares of land as an extension to Cutteslowe Park set aside for the creation of wildlife habitats and nature trail/circular walks; the creation of a green infrastructure corridor on 8 hectares of land incorporating a pedestrian/cycle route along the site's eastern boundary which minimises the visual and landscape impact of the development and creates an appropriate setting to St Frideswide Farmhouse and Wall, and provides a clear distinction between the site and the Green Belt. The application submission is also required to include proposals for securing the long-term use, management and maintenance of the public green space/extension to Cutteslowe Park and agricultural land in perpetuity. Place shaping principles of the policy further require the provision of</p>	<p>Open space provision on-site is identified and quantified in the Design and Access Statement (page 81) (WE/DAS/P02).</p> <p>Proposals for securing the long-term use, management and maintenance of the public green space / extension to Cutteslowe Park [and agricultural land in perpetuity] will be secured using a S106 Agreement.</p> <p>Place shaping principles are identified in the Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>Provision will be made within the application site for an extension to Cutteslowe Park and for the creation of a green infrastructure corridor along the site's eastern boundary in the locations identified on the Policy PR6a Policies Map.</p>

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
	connecting green infrastructure corridors running east-west across the site; the provision of an active frontage along oxford Road while maintaining a well treed streetscape and the public open green space/extension to Cutteslowe Park and agricultural land to be kept free of buildings to avoid landscape impact.	
9.2	Policy PR5 – Green Infrastructure requires that the development will protect and enhance green infrastructure and incorporate green assets and the water environment into the design approach within the site. The specific requirements for the application submission are set out in the policy. The landscape strategy lacks a commitment to providing meaningful green infrastructure links through the development for both wildlife corridors and recreation use. As previously mentioned, the width and function of these corridors must be agreed at outline.	See also responses below in relation to Ecology and BNG. Further details to be secured via S106 or conditions.
9.3	The proposed new vehicular accesses into the site, together with the proposed highway improvements to Oxford Road will result in the loss of trees and vegetation along the site frontage which currently provide a good screen and green corridor on this entry into Oxford City. This was discussed at pre-application and a meeting held on site to discuss the implications of the tree loss as a consequence of the highway improvements including a new super cycle highway along Oxford Road. At that meeting it was agreed that further survey work would be undertaken, and cross-sections submitted for further consideration, this however was unfortunately not forthcoming at that time. I remain concerned about the complete loss of the tree belt to the Oxford Road frontage, both in terms of visual impact and loss of wildlife habitat. If it is to be removed, its loss must be adequately mitigated. At a meeting on site at pre-application to discuss this corridor it was agreed that if this belt could not be retained that any new tree belt must be sufficiently wide to accommodate 2 or 3 canopy levels with understorey planting with no public access. This does not appear to be reflected in the submission. This must be addressed, and a commitment made at outline to ensure that it is delivered.	<p>Following on-site meetings / discussions with the District Council and Tree Officer, it was agreed that tree groups lining the Oxford Road required individual survey to allow a better understanding of the trees' indicative (Root Protection Areas) and therefore greater detail regarding the potential impact of the implementation of the proposed highways works on individual specimens. The extra survey (undertaken 30/08/2022) divided groups into individual trees at key access points along the Oxford Road, as agreed with CDC's Tree Officer.</p> <p>Following the above, a detailed standalone plan illustrating removals in relation to the highway improvements has been made. This is included within the AIA (d062d) which clearly shows that the RPA's of existing trees cannot be avoided if the OXCC preferred standard is implemented.</p> <p>It is therefore the default position, after removal, to rely on submitted landscape information and the tree strategy, which CDC can condition and deal with at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Providing mitigation through varying canopy heights has also been addressed in section 3 of the landscape strategy.</p>
9.4	If trees along Oxford Road are to be removed then clear evidence to be provided for replacement planting strategy with sufficient width to re-plant 2 or 3 canopy levels with understorey planting with no public access. Must provide commitment at outline stage to provide.	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (WE/AIA/P02) confirms that mitigation measures can be secured by condition. The AIA also identifies possible mitigation measures, which can be delivered at the detailed design stage.</p>
9.5	In addition, we also discussed the retention of the category B group of trees behind the proposed local centre and the need to keep this group intact with development moved away to allow for future growth. It is again noted that unfortunately, this is all to be removed. If it is necessary to remove to accommodate the cycle superhighway and public footpath along Oxford Road, it must be appropriately mitigated with new woodland tree planting which will be of benefit as a wildlife corridor as well as helping mitigate the visual impact of the development.	These trees cannot be retained given the extent of the OXCC preferred highway improvements. New planting along with a tree strategy to be dealt with at the reserved matters application stage and can be secured by condition to provide a suitable mitigation.
9.6	Green infrastructure links must be provided east-west through the development to ensure that the wildlife corridors currently on site are retained.	<p>East-West green infrastructure links are shown on the revised Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M), the Design and Access Statement (WE/DAS/P02) and Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02).</p> <p>This point has been addressed in the Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02) and BIMP (WE/BIM/P02) in detail and there is adequate room to provide a meaningful wildlife corridor. Currently there is very little existing vegetation on the western edge of the development, with significant further planting being proposed.</p> <p>It is also important to clarify, that an AIA is not meant to assess nor decide, if the wildlife corridor is adequate. The AIA only assess the impact of the proposed and therefore should not be relied upon to determine the merits of the wildlife corridor. Again, the Landscape strategy deals with such issues, along with the biodiversity management plan.</p>

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
9.7	<p>It is noted that the current vehicular access to the Water Eaton Estate will be closed to vehicular traffic but the bridleway which runs along it will be retained and improved for pedestrians and cyclists through the development and with additional planting for wildlife purposes and to act as a green finger through the development. This is something that has been advocated throughout the pre-application process, including public consultation events and Design Review. This principle is welcomed. However, it is noted in the Arboriculture Impact assessment that to maintain a 70m deep development plot, the resultant development will likely be very close to this feature, resulting in this corridor being of very little value from an ecological/wildlife perspective due to its likely heavy pedestrian/recreational use and minimal offset. This must be re-considered.</p>	<p>This point has been addressed in the Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02) and BIMP (WE/BIM/P02) in detail and there is adequate room to provide a meaningful wildlife corridor. Currently there is very little existing vegetation on the western edge of the development, with significant further planting being proposed.</p> <p>It is also important to clarify, that an AIA is not meant to assess nor decide, if the wildlife corridor is adequate. The AIA only assess the impact of the proposed and therefore should not be relied upon to determine the merits of the wildlife corridor. Again, the Landscape strategy deals with such issues, along with the biodiversity management plan.</p>
9.8	<p>In terms of the Frideswide Farm access, the surveys have identified that the existing boundary hedge is a species rich hedge which should be retained. During the consideration of the pre-application, the proposed cyclops junction was moved slightly northwards resulting in that proposed access and main access road into the development impacting that hedgerow. Clarification and justification for this realignment was requested during our pre-application discussions but I do not believe any were forthcoming. Please refer to my letter of 6th February 2023 which remains relevant in this respect. Further justification and clarification is required.</p> <p>It is also further proposed to push an access road through this hedge to connect development parcels. As above, this has always been identified as a green infrastructure link for pedestrians as well as an important wildlife corridor. It is unlikely that this can be achieved as indicated with relatively short broken stretches of this hedge remaining and development as proposed so close either side of it. Minimum widths for this green corridor must be set out at outline stage to ensure that the vision for the site and the development can be successfully delivered, this must be given further consideration and justification. These concerns are also referred to below in respect of ecology comments.</p>	<p>The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) has been revised to exclude showing an indicative route for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians through this hedge. Further consideration of the suitability of creating an access between development parcels through this hedge will be a matter for further discussion at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Buffers alongside the hedge will be maintained, taking account of relevant considerations (including root protection areas) and the guidance in the adopted Development Brief (Page 52) on the minimum size of buffers at the detailed design stage.</p>
9.9	<p>In terms of the proposed footpath/cycle link into Cutteslowe Park, the indicative location appears to be between two category A trees, having regard to the significant loss of existing trees and vegetation across the development site, any proposals which would compromise the long-term retention and health of these trees would not be acceptable. The repositioning of this route must be considered.</p>	<p>Following review by EDP, it is confirmed that the footpath / cycle link can be delivered without any impact on the two Category A trees.</p>
9.10	<p>The submission has been assessed by the Landscape Officer who has raised concerns regarding the position of proposed play areas and facilities. There is concern in respect of child safety due to the proximity of play areas to water bodies/balancing ponds. Play areas should be located well away from water bodies. Play areas and allotments/community gardens must also benefit from natural surveillance from the surrounding development and not placed behind structural planting.</p>	<p>The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) shows indicative locations for play areas and the MUGA. The precise location of these areas will be a matter for the detailed design stage and take into consideration their proximity to other aspects of the proposed development including water bodies and balancing ponds. Play areas and allotment / community gardens / orchards have also been located to enable natural surveillance.</p>
9.11	<p>The community gardens/allotments should also have vehicular access for deliveries etc. The position of these facilities within the park area and eastern buffer requires further consideration.</p>	<p>The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) shows indicative locations for allotments, community gardens and orchards. Allotments are proposed in the northern part of the site and will be capable of being accessed by vehicles (i.e. to allow drop offs of gardening materials) and will include space for a limited number of vehicles to park. Community gardens and orchards will be capable of being accessed by non-car modes, to encourage local use by PR6a residents.</p> <p>Details of the allotments, community gardens and orchards and their precise locations will be a matter for the detailed design stage.</p>

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
Flood Risk and Drainage		
10.1	The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy as required by Policy PR6a. The proposed built development is located in Flood Zone 1 although it is understood that a small section in the south-eastern corner of the site (the retained agricultural land) is within Flood Zone 3. The scheme proposes a series of wet and dry attenuation basins and ponds across the site, with the majority located within the green infrastructure corridor. It would be useful to have an understanding of the size and depth of these SUDs features at this stage so that their appropriateness can be assessed in terms of their impact on the provision of the landscaped eastern green infrastructure corridor etc. The provision of deep basins that need to be fenced for safety reasons would not be acceptable. All SUDs basins/ponds must be properly integrated with the open space.	<p>The water depths and volumes are already indicated in the Flood Risk Assessment (WE/FRA/P02). The precise details of the SuDS features, including their integration with open space, will be a matter for the detailed design stage. At that time, the review of such details will be undertaken by the LLFA and CDC Drainage Officer.</p> <p>Such details will be informed by a site earthworks model and noting that the storage features are likely to reduce in size once all upstream SuDS features are taken into account.</p>
Ecology and BNG		
11.1	It is noted that the application is accompanied by an Ecological Appraisal which summarises the ecological interest within and around the site which has been identified through standard desk and field-based investigations. It is noted that an Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey was undertaken in February 2015 and that update walkover surveys undertaken in May 2017 and 2021. These surveys are now more than two years old and should therefore be further updated.	<p>Original Phase 1 ecological survey work was verified through incidental surveys which were undertaken in 2022. These 2022 surveys are referred to in the original Ecological Appraisal submitted with the planning application (WE/ECO/P01)</p> <p>Further survey work has been undertaken by EDP in September 2023 on behalf of the applicants including updating Phase 1 habitat and bat surveys. This is recorded in the ES Appendix 9.1 Ecology Baseline (WE/ECO/P02) and also referenced in the Ecology ES Chapter where relevant.</p>
11.2	It is further noted that the application specifies that habitat loss will be mitigated through areas of habitat creation within public open space. This is acceptable in principle, but an assessment must be made as to how effective this will be for wildlife habitat creation and biodiversity net gain if these areas are accessible to the public/dog walkers etc. The landscape and green infrastructure buffers must be sufficiently wide to ensure that the two uses co-exist. As specified above, there must be a commitment through the green infrastructure parameter plan which sets out the minimum width/size of these areas. This was discussed at pre-application but has not been adequately addressed through this submission.	<p>ES Chapter 9 Biodiversity (WE/ES/P02) sets out the principles for the effective delivery of new and enhanced habitats for wildlife. Any uncertainty relating to the effectiveness of such measures is accounted for in the precautionary approach taken to the assessment of effects. This is adequate at the outline stage to establish the principle that habitat creation measures will contribute to wildlife conservation/enhancement within the site.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) identifies minimum widths of buffer alongside Oxford Road to accommodate earthworks, ditches and structural planting, whilst also maintain wildlife corridors and promoting BNG along the western edge of the development.</p> <p>The widths of the green infrastructure corridor along the eastern edge of the site corresponds with the width of corridor identified on the Policies Map of Policy PR6a of the adopted Local Plan Partial Review, and pre-application discussions with the LPA about the width of this corridor.</p>
11.3	A consultation response has been received from BBOWT who have raised a number of objections to the proposals. The first objection relates to the inadequate provision of green space and suggest that a 50-hectare nature reserve be provided as part of the development which would also necessitate an increase in the red line area for the application. In making the request they also refer to PR6b as providing insufficient green space. It is considered that such a request would not be reasonable in this case. It should be noted however that the requirements of PR5 and PR6a are relevant here in terms of improving and enhancing biodiversity. The policy requires that the public green space provision as an extension to Cutteslowe Park will also create wildlife habitats/nature trails. The submission must ensure that this is successfully delivered accordingly with some areas set aside for wildlife habitats with limited public access.	<p>The revised Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) states in the legend that within the 'public open green space' that land will be set aside for the creation of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Indicative proposals for a Wildlife Enhancement Area, in the northernmost part of the site, are provided in the updated Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (WE/BIM/P02). The Wildlife Enhancement Area comprises a pond, grassland, scrub and woodland habitats with no public access. The area will be fenced with gated access for management only.</p> <p>Further details about restrictions on public access within certain parts of the site will be a matter for the detailed design stage and the subject of planning conditions.</p> <p>The creation of wildlife habitats / nature trails within the public green space will be a matter for the detailed design stage and the subject of planning conditions / S106 Agreement. Such provision will be guided by the principles established in</p>

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
		the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M), Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (WE/BIM/P02) and Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02).
11.3	The second objection relates to the management of green space for the benefit of nature in perpetuity. BBOWT advise that to provide substantial benefits for wildlife to achieve biodiversity net gain on site, that as above, there should not be public access across the entire area of the green infrastructure. To achieve this habitat creation and enhancement must also be managed for wildlife in perpetuity (125 years). The Local Planning Authority agrees with this advice and the application must address this accordingly.	<p>The Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02) includes a Wildlife Enhancement Area in the northernmost part of the site. This area will be fenced with no public access. The Wildlife Enhancement Area is also illustrated on the Biodiversity Net Gain plans appended to the Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (WE/BIM/P02). However, it is considered to be important for the long-term future and management of the Wildlife Enhancement Area, that the local community values this space and, as such, the intention is for the design to allow for public engagement through provision of a wildlife trail. If this approach is strongly disagreed with, no public access to this area can be secured at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan(WE/BIM/P02) states that habitats will be managed in perpetuity. This will be achieved through production and execution of the LEMP at the detailed design stage, which will include capacity for review and amendment throughout the lifetime of the development</p> <p>Agreed principles of wildlife management will be identified in S106 Heads of Terms and details included in the S106 Agreement.</p>
11.4	The third objection relates to the loss of farmland bird habitat and suitable mitigation. This issue was raised in our pre-application discussions and is a specific requirement of Policy PR6a. This issue must be addressed.	The Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (BIMP) has been amended. The BIMP states that a mitigation strategy will be agreed with the relevant parties to mitigate the loss of opportunities on-site for ground nesting birds (WE/BIM/P02). The BIMP does not set out specific details of mitigation but agreed principles of mitigation will be identified in S106 Heads of Terms and details of the agreed mitigation strategy included in the S106 Agreement.
11.5	The fourth objection advises that the application does not provide evidence that it will achieve the aims of the Thames and Cherwell at Oxford Conservation Target Area which is located very close to the site. Policy ESD11 – Conservation Target Areas is relevant here. BBOWT advise that given the proximity of the site to the CTA that information should be provided to illustrate how the development will 'secure biodiversity enhancement to help achieve the aims of the Conservation Target Area'. It is agreed that this point must be considered further.	New habitat creation will seek to contribute towards the conservation objectives of the Conservation Target Areas (CTAs). References to Conservation Target Areas is now included in Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (WE/BIM/P02) and the Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02).
11.6	Oxford City have advised in their consultation response in respect of biodiversity net gain that insufficient information has been submitted to assess the proposals. The submission should be updated using the latest Biodiversity Metric 4.0 as the application was made after its release on April 20th, 2023, and the actual metric spreadsheet itself should be submitted, rather than a series of screenshots. Oxford City have also advised that with regard to the content of the metric, while some information has been submitted to support the habitat characteristics and condition assessments made, there are some omissions, namely with reference to the UKHab definitions and the relevant Condition Assessments Sheets for both baseline and proposed habitats. The existing field margins should be categorised as such, rather than incorporated within the wider habitat of 'Modified Grassland'. Based on the description provided, the woodland is not monospecific, or obviously a plantation, and therefore would be better categorised as 'Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland'. Regarding the proposed habitats, if the other neutral grassland will be in a mix of poor and good condition, these areas should be separated in the metric, rather than an assessment of 'fairly' poor assigned uniformly.	<p>A new biodiversity net gain calculation has been made using the latest version of the metric released in December 2023 (the 'Statutory Biodiversity Metric'). this information is submitted in PDF and Excel format to the LPA (WE/BNG/P02).</p> <p>This calculation is made based on the revised Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) and the proposals contained in the Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (WE/BIM/P02) and Landscape Strategy (WE/LAN3/P02).</p> <p>Regarding detailed comments, the following is noted in relation to information which is not included in the calculation:</p> <p>Margins: Within UKHab v.2.01 (upon which the Defra Metric is based), arable field margins are defined as 'Herbaceous strips or blocks around arable fields that are managed specifically to provide benefits for wildlife'. The margins of the fields on-site are not managed to provide benefits for wildlife. Furthermore, the habitat description implies a minimum width of 2m. The margins on-site are significantly narrower.</p> <p>Woodland: The woodland was categorised as 'other broadleaved woodland', described in UKHab as including 'Woodlands of non-native species or Sycamore... that have developed through recent succession, typically on verges or alongside railway lines'. The description of the woodland has been clarified in the ES Appendix 9.1 Ecology Baseline (WE/ECO/P02).</p>

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
		Grassland: the decision to use the condition category 'fairly poor' was taken to cover the possibility of some of the area of wildflower grassland being negatively impacted by soil compaction, nutrient enrichment, litter etc. This will largely be influenced by how the site is used once occupied and exact areas of 'moderate condition' and 'fairly poor condition' cannot be predicted at this stage. Furthermore, this level of target condition was specified precautionarily – the measures specified in the BIMP, if executed with appropriate care and preparation, are capable of creating grassland in 'good' condition.
11.7	Having regard to the comments above, the biodiversity section of the Environmental Statement requires further consideration.	An updated Biodiversity chapter is submitted with the ES Addendum (WE/ES/P02).
11.8	The comments of CDC Ecologist are awaited at the time of writing. Any additional comments will be sent under separate cover.	See table 2 below (CDC Ecology (30/8/23)).
Health Impact Assessment		
12.1	The Health Impact Assessment submitted with the application has been assessed by OXCC who considers it to be generally acceptable but requires further information and amendment of the Assessment to reflect people with poor mental health as a particular vulnerable group and identify the gap in access to health care and clarification of proximity of housing to Oxford Road and mitigation of potential impact of air and noise pollution. The comments can be read in full on OXCC's consultation response dated 30th June 2023. A revised HIA is awaited which addresses these matters.	A revised Health Impact Assessment is submitted and addresses CDC and OXCC's consultation responses (WE/HIA/P02).
Sustainable Development and Climate Change		
13.1	The proposals have been designed around sustainable modes of transport and pedestrian/cycle connectivity, reducing the need to travel by car. It proposes new bus stops on Oxford Road and provides vehicular access to the site that prioritises safe crossing movements for pedestrians and cyclists. These are welcomed. However, the submission appears to lack detail and commitment regarding the proposed mobility hubs and how these will be provided / managed / funded / maintained / located etc. This requires further explanation and commitment as part of this submission. It is not acceptable to leave all the detail to the reserved matters.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change proposed. 2. Information on mobility hubs is included in the Transport Assessment and the Transport Assessment Addendum (WE/TA/P01 and WE/TA/P02). 3. To be secured via condition/S106.
13.2	The Sustainability and Energy Statement also lacks any real detail, substance and information relating to energy efficiency and the approach to zero carbon and any commitment at this stage. It must not be left to reserved matters. Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaption measures is also a key design and place shaping principle, and it is essential that this is considered at the initial stage so that it can be properly integrated with the development design and not considered as an afterthought once outline consent is gained for the development of the site.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change proposed. 2. The document commits to follow or exceed local requirements, including to Future Homes, all electric solutions and fabric first approach. 3. To be secured via condition/S106.
13.3	The provision of green roofs should be considered as these can also provide valuable habitats for wildlife and would aid in increasing biodiversity net gain throughout the development.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change proposed. 2. Green roofs are not proposed or required to meet BNG targets.
S106		
14.1	Your submission includes suggested heads of terms; however, no detail is included. At pre-application, both CDC and OXCC set out the potential infrastructure requirements and contributions in some detail. An updated response is now required, and this will be forwarded under separate cover. However, there are matters which you need to give additional consideration to at this point, including the long-term management of ecology and wildlife areas, management of community facilities and	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A S106 Heads of Terms table will be agreed with CDC and OXCC and reported to Planning Committee. 2. Detailed provisions in the S106 Agreement will be drafted when design principles and draft HoTs are agreed.

TABLE 1 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Cherwell District Council's Letter of 15th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
	provision and management of the mobility hub which will need to be included within ant Section 106 Agreement.	

TABLE 2 – RESPONSES RECEIVED SINCE CDC CASE OFFICER RESPONSE

TABLE 2 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Consultee Comments Received since 16th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
CDC Ecology (30/8/23)	Request survey updates where required. [See 11.1 above]	Following survey work undertaken in 2022 and 2023, all Phase 1 habitat surveys are up-to-date.
	Request clarity on value of area to south east, outside the red line.	This area has not been included in EDP's ecological assessment as it is outside of the application boundary and is not currently the subject of any proposals.
	No farmland bird compensation (at least a preliminary proposal). [See 11.4 above]	See response at 11.4 in Table 1.
	Request areas of green space managed for biodiversity alone. Agree with BBOWT for a large area of 'nature reserve' (could include farmland bird mitigation).	Green space: See response at 11.3 in Table 1. Farmland birds: See response at 11.4 in Table 1.
	BIMP: biodiversity enhancements fall short of levels usually sought (e.g. one provision per dwelling) and provide assessment if green roofs/walls are viable.	The provision of bat and bird boxes has been increased in line with expectations and is outlined within the Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan (WE/BIM/P02). Green roofs / walls: See response at 13.3 in Table1.
	BNG assessment: further request for nature reserve to deliver better quality / priority habitats. [See 11.6 above]	BNG: See response at 11.6 in Table 1. A Wildlife Enhancement Area is proposed in the northernmost part of the application site. See response at 11.3 in Table 1.
CDC Arboriculture (1+22/9/23)	High number of tree removals proposed which are unavoidable, and that the majority of these are low quality. Request a detailed landscape / tree planting strategy. [See 9.4 above]	No change proposed. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (WE/AIA/P02) confirms that mitigation measures can be secured by condition. The AIA also identifies possible mitigation measures.
Environment Agency (1/9/23)	No objection.	Noted.
Oxfordshire County Council (5/9/23)	S106 related requirements (library related).	Agreed principles of off-site library provision will be identified in S106 Heads of Terms and details included in the S106 Agreement.

TABLE 2 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Consultee Comments Received since 16th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
National Highways (11/9/23)	No objection / no comments.	Noted.
Planning Policy (19/9/23)	The development of 800 homes is accepted in principle subject to all other policy requirements being met. It is understood that the primary school and local centre in a more central location is safe and more easily accessible. Officers should consider whether the additional 110 homes proposed are contributing to a layout that may make it more difficult to achieve the delivery of the GI corridor in the vicinity of St. Frideswide Farm.	Noted. The Green Infrastructure corridor identified on the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) is deliverable.
CDC Strategic Housing (27/9/23)	Response on affordable housing mix.	Agreed principles of affordable housing provision will be identified in S106 Heads of Terms and details included in the S106 Agreement.
CDC Conservation Officer (3/10/23)	Heights Parameter Plan: Concerns over heights in relation to the heritage assets (incl. St Frideswide Farmhouse or farmstead and Pipal Cottage and barns). Housing should be 2 storey near St. Frideswide farmhouse. Concerns over heights of key buildings. [See also 3.3 above]	Amendments have been made to the Building Heights Parameter Plans (477898-33T) to reduce the heights of buildings around Pipal cottage to predominantly 2 storeys. Following further assessment, no changes to building heights are proposed on the eastern side of the proposed development (i.e. relating to St. Frideswide farmhouse). This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) and in Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01).
	Request more assessment work for key views including heritage assets, including from the St Frideswide farmhouse. [See also 7.1 -7.4 above]	This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) and in ES Addendum Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01). See also, Landscape Parameter Visualisations with Indicative Height Lines (WE/LAN5/P01) which are for information and not included in the ES or LVIA.
	Request clarification of the location of local centre (Land Use PP vs. Illustrative masterplan).	See Land Use and Access Parameter Plan (477898-32W) and the Illustrative Masterplan (477898-42T), which provides further indication of where the local centres buildings could be located.
	Concern over impact on listed farmhouse building through changes in ground levels affecting the water table. [See also 7.1]	Matters relating to flood risk and drainage are covered in the Flood Risk Assessment (WE/FRA/P02).
	Oppose demolition of Pipal Barns. [See 7.4 above]	The description of development for the planning application provides the flexibility to either retain or demolish Pipal Barns. This is considered in ES Addendum Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02).
	Existing access points onto Oxford Road: Any access changes should not be reserved matters due to the potential impact on the setting of the heritage assets.	The applicants are seeking approval for the location of the accesses into the site. These have been assessed (see Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02)).
Historic England (6/10/23)	Require photomontages and site wide elevations.	See ES Addendum Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01).
	Require heritage related public benefits of the scheme (i.e. in relation to "St Frideswide and the group of historic farmstead buildings within its curtilage").	See ES Addendum Chapter 11 Heritage (WE/ES/P02) and Appendix 11.1 Archaeology and Heritage Assessment Report (WE/HER1/P02) for an updated assessment regarding St Frideswide Farmhouse and farmstead buildings.

TABLE 2 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Consultee Comments Received since 16th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
		<p>Listed below are public benefits associated with the delivery of development in relation to the PR6a allocation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The delivery of the PR6a allocation, as included in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review. 2. Provision of housing, including important contribution towards CDC achieving a five year housing land supply. 3. Provision of affordable housing. 4. A primary school. 5. Financial contributions towards secondary school provision (off-site). 6. A local centre. 7. Economic benefits from construction of the development. 8. Employment, skills and training plan to be conditioned to promote local employment, apprenticeships etc. 9. Public open space (incl. allotments, community gardens and orchards). 10. Contributions towards off-site sports provision. 11. Biodiversity net gain. 12. Public transport improvements, including the cycle superhighway and bus service improvements. 13. Off-site highways improvements. 14. Connectivity with Cutteslowe Park.
	Request condition surveys for St Frideswide farmhouse and the group of historic farmstead buildings within its curtilage.	No surveys have been undertaken. These buildings do not form part of the application site.
CDC Landscape Officer (2/8/23)	<p>LVIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reservations about the significance of effects in relation to the EDP Viewpoints (see detailed comments in CDC response). 2. Comments on users of PRoW and Permissive Footpaths (see detailed comments in CDC response). 3. Comments on maturing 'treescape' at 15 years, including an accurate visualisation based on EDP VP 15 Wireframe (plus associated comments). 4. Comments on a establishing a woodland on the eastern site boundary in accordance with a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-3. See ES Addendum Appendix 11.5 Heritage Photomontages (WE/HER5/P01). 4. Woodland will be provided along the eastern site boundary and further information will be provided at the detailed design stage. A detailed LEMP will be provided at the detailed design stage and would be the subject of a planning condition.
	<p>Illustrated Masterplan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns about play areas (blue asterisk) located very close to water bodies/balancing ponds, and minimise risk. 2. Community gardens must be able to have clear surveillance; and request for 2m minimum high fence and 3m wide gates. Comments on location of community gardens being hidden behind structural vegetation with no means of vehicular access. Request for community gardens specification. 3. Landscape consultant to consider https://www.tdag.org.uk/tree-species-selection-for-green-infrastructure.html. 4. Revised illustrated masterplan should comply with 'Secure by Design' principles. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The blue asterisks represent the illustrative position of drainage ponds within the proposed development (not play areas). 2/3. Further information on community gardens and tree species will be provided at the detailed design stage, taking account of the comments made by the Landscape officer. 4. The revised illustrative masterplan does comply with secure by design principles.
	Play Provision and MUGA: Detailed requests for the provision of a LAP, a Combined LAP/LEAP, NEAP + MUGA/Teenage Facilities – including size and locational criteria.	<p>Indicative locations for play areas and a MUGA are shown on the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (477898-58M) and Illustrative Masterplan (477898-42T).</p> <p>Agreed principles of the number, type and location of the play areas will be identified in S106 Heads of Terms and details included in the S106 Agreement.</p>

TABLE 2 Bellway and Christ Church's Response to Consultee Comments Received since 16th August 2023

Topic	Summary of Point	Response
		Further details will be provided at the detailed design stage.