

Introduction

This document refers to and should be read alongside ***The Cherwell Local Plan Review – Community Involvement Paper 2: Developing Our Options Consultation Paper***. We have used the current Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan and our responses to the Oxfordshire 2050 consultation as our guide. Copies are attached separately for ease of reference. This response was discussed and agreed at the Parish Council’s meeting of 19th October 2021. The resolution reads as follows:

1. Bloxham Parish Council (BPC) welcomes the general direction of the key themes in the local plan and the approach being taken to secure sustainability
2. It reaffirms key comments made in its previous response to Cherwell District Council (CDC) on 25 September 2020, namely:
 - a. Bloxham’s schools, retail, health and dental facilities, are at capacity with waiting lists
 - b. The traffic system is now well over capacity particularly at school drop-off and pick-up times
 - c. The revised local plan needs to take into account those villages that are now at capacity and that cannot take anymore new housing developments
 - d. We believe Bloxham fits into this category
3. While recognising the need for affordable housing, BPC notes that Bloxham has grown by around 20% since 2015, whilst Cherwell District as a whole has seen an increase of around 10% in households in the same period. It therefore considers that, for any future potential development to be acceptable, opportunities to strengthen Bloxham must clearly outweigh risks to its character, sustainability and viability as a community and place.
4. BPC will therefore resist developments within the Parish Boundary or nearby which:
 - a. Narrows the gap between Bloxham and other communities (coalescence)
 - b. Impacts negatively on Bloxham’s current spatial 'feel' as set out in the Neighbourhood Development Plan
 - c. Expands the accepted built-up boundary of Bloxham
 - d. Is likely to have a detrimental impact on infrastructure especially schools, shopping facilities and transport routes
 - e. Is larger than developments since 2015 (95 houses)
 - f. Is on a greenfield site
 - g. Seeks development in key ‘Valued Landscapes’¹ (Sor Brook Valley, the Slade, Hobbs Hill, Coates' Spinney Valley) or Local Green Spaces

On the question of expansion and coalescence more generally, in the comments on Oxfordshire 2050 we proposed the idea of protecting the countryside around Banbury along with the current separations and village hierarchies for the Banbury area. The more we think about it, especially having seen these maps, the more it seems like a good idea. Accordingly we strongly recommend specific discussions on this issue with a group of relevant local councils to develop a co-ordinated approach to these ‘Valued Landscapes’.

¹ A ‘Valued Landscape’ is defined in the CDC Local Plan Consultation as ‘*landscape areas or features which although not the subject of statutory designations, should be protected as “valued landscapes” because of their quality.*’ (P.98 para 6.6.16)

Responses on proposed District policies

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
1	Local Plan vision	24	Generally good. This could be strengthened by something about interrelationships. What is Cherwell's distinctive contribution to Oxfordshire and the region, including the Oxford-Cambridge Arc? What can be said about the interrelationship of settlements and their diverse and distinctive contributions to the District? This would recognise the need to ensure an approach to future development which reflects this issue.
2	Key objectives	27	Broadly welcome as a balanced suite of objectives.
3	Employment land (location) – should it be situated: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At our main urban centres of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington 2. At significant transport interchanges 3. Mostly on previously developed land, including in less sustainable locations 4. At the larger villages 5. A combination of all of the above options 	31	We would suggest option 5. Specifically, the first four options should form the hierarchy for employment land development as they seem to be in the right order. So sites should be sought at main urban centres, then significant transport interchanges, then other previously developed land, finally at the larger villages.
4	Employment land (type): When identifying sites for employment land, what should be our priority to balance protecting communities and meeting the needs of our business? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide sites only for general industry(B2) and distribution (B8) 2. Provide mixed use sites to include general industry, distribution (B2 and B8 uses), light industry and other potentially compatible uses such as retail and leisure (E use classes) 3. Provide a mixture of the above 	32	Our preference would be for a different way of looking at this issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development outside existing settlement boundaries should be resisted • Mixed use sites should be adopted where possible, however this should specifically exclude leisure and retail • In order to reinforce the social role of existing town centres, and protect them from further decay, there should be a clear push towards their renewal and out of town retail and leisure should be resisted.
Q.	Supporting employment	32	Attention should be given to developing diverse and sustainable employment opportunities in order to secure a wide spectrum from 'entry' level employment through to very high quality jobs, with the aim of providing a clear career future for the workforce.
5	Town centres - To support our town centres, should we <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide more flexibility within our town centres for different uses including residential development but protect key shopping areas by restricting use to retail, restaurants and cafes 2. Maximise flexibility within the town centre for different uses including residential development and other community and leisure uses. 	34	Rather than trying to write a policy which seeks to anticipate what development should be encouraged across the district, is there not scope to consider each town (and village) centre on its merits and have a flexible plan for each, then explore specific local gaps?
Q	Town centre uses	34	See comments elsewhere
Q	Supporting town centres/retail	34	Village retail development or expansion needs to be carefully balanced against parking etc. as in most villages, especially the larger ones, this is a problem.

Bloxham Parish Council response to CDC Local Plan Options Paper: October 2021

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
6	Affordable housing type - Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing required on housing developments of 10 or more units? 2. Keep the percentage levels of affordable housing the same as in the 2015 Local Plan? (30% at Banbury and Bicester, and 35% across the rest of the District) 	38	Our preference would be for option 1, it would at least raise the starting point of negotiations with developers.
7	Affordable housing tenure – Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritise the provision of social rented housing above other affordable housing tenures? 2. Keep the same affordable housing tenure mix as set out in the 2015 Local Plan with 70% Affordable and Social Rent and 30% Social Rent? 	38	It would seem to be better to seek different levels in different locations, perhaps driven by local plans and existing levels in particular places
8	Housing Internal Space Standards – Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce a policy which requires all new dwellings to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? 2. Introduce a policy which only requires affordable homes to meet the nationally described space standard and if so, should this be a minimum requirement? 	38	We prefer option 1 as otherwise private rental housing would fall out of this requirement.
Q	Separation distances, should they be introduced?	39	Possibly, but this needs careful consideration in relation to housing density pressures, as mentioned by CPRE
9	Housing accessibility – Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce accessibility standards for a proportion of new homes? 2. Continue to rely on Building Regulations in respect of accessibility? 	39	Unsure what the advantage is in a separate policy over and above the new buildings regulations standards. This needs to be explained.
Q	Travelling communities	40	We have no suggestions at present
Q	Housing policies	40	It would seem sensible to have some clear policies as suggested on conversion of rural buildings, modular housing, retail to housing conversions, housing in multiple occupation etc.
10	Sustainable construction – Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not set further standards in the Cherwell Local Plan leaving this for Building Regulations and the Oxfordshire Plan. Or 2. Set sustainable design and construction standards for new residential and nonresidential development that only meet standards set by Government. Or 3. Set sustainable design and construction standards for residential and non-residential development in Cherwell above those required by Central Government? 	43	Why is a choice required? Whatever standards are set they should be defensible at any planning appeal, straightforward for developers to understand and anticipate, and if locally defined, straightforward to develop and administer. So it would seem sensible to opt for option 1 and/or 2 but retain the right to flexibility for any special local issues.
Q	Retrofitting historic buildings	43	This section seems to conflate 'legacy' properties with buildings that have

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
			historic/heritage importance. It would seem sensible to develop a set of categories and then have policies for each, including bespoke policies for specific buildings. Heating type and provision is likely to be a huge problem for all existing buildings both in terms of requirements and financing. Special provision will need to be made for Listed Buildings, electric vehicle charging provision likewise.
11	Renewable energy – Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify and allocate specific sites for renewable energy generation 2. Use a criteria-based policy to assess the appropriateness of proposals for renewable energy generation? 	43	Surely this should be both/and rather than either or?! In other words identify potential sites and then the suitability of the type of RE proposed, and also assess any proposals for non-identified sites on the same basis.
Q	Policies for Climate Change, Sustainable Construction and Renewable Energy	44	We need to ensure that there is a requirement to provide electric car charging infrastructure generally and in particular to take the opportunity to provide it in all new builds, not just the parking areas mentioned in NPPF.
Q	Green belt (any other issues that CDC need to consider)	45	We would ideally like to see Green Belt status for key rural areas surrounding Banbury and Bicester, but understand the difficulties in doing this. Instead, we propose securing 'Valued Landscape' status for these and have proposed four for Bloxham.
12	Biodiversity: Where biodiversity net gain or compensatory measures cannot be achieved on site, should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secure as close to the site as possible 2. Prioritise within Conservation Target Areas/those parts of the Nature Recovery Network where habitat creation and restoration is to be focused 3. Secure contributions to local environmental bodies undertaking biodiversity enhancement projects within the district 	48	Again, this seems to be a false "either/or" choice. It would be better if it were seen to be a hierarchy of solutions, with offset payments only used as a last resort.
13	Natural Capital - Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals; or 2. Include a policy in the Plan requiring major development proposals to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. be supported by a natural capital assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposals and b. demonstrate environmental net gain; or 3. Not require major development proposals to be supported by a natural capital assessment. 	48	In this case Option 2 would seem to be the most sensible if the plan's objectives are to be secured.
Q	Biodiversity	49	
14	Children's play - Should we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to provide children's play facilities through a traditional minimum provision LAP/LEAP/NEAP approach 	51	Option 1, as stated, seems to seek to impose planners' and developers' pre-conceptions on play, with attendant high maintenance requirements. It would seem better to ensure an emergent approach such as Option 3. A more flexible approach

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Provide children’s play facilities through minimum provision combined all-age areas of play 3. Seek opportunities to integrate play facilities throughout towns and developments identifying minimum standards and setting expectations through design and other place making policies e.g. inclusion of pocket parks, play streets and informal play within open space areas. 		would seem a good idea, rather than the blanket approach of planting a standard play area in each new development without assessing other factors in the area.
15	<p>Outdoor sports provision - Should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue with the current policy approach of securing new pitch provision as part of strategic development sites 2. Seek to secure and establish sports hubs at our main settlements 3. Use financial contributions from developers in lieu of on-site provision on strategic sites to enhance existing facilities, to enable increased use 	52	We would suggest both option 2 and 3 for the reasons given, provided that it is possible to avoid long ‘commutes’ to hubs. So once again it may require a mixed approach depending on viability and maintenance questions.
Q	<p>Local Green Space (We have added NPPF criteria)</p> <p>(a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</p> <p>(b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</p> <p>(c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p>	53	In addition to those already mentioned in our Neighbourhood Plan, we would also highlight the Weavers fields area between Wellington Park and The Mill Trading Estate. We may need to discuss further at the next stage.
Q	Historic environment	54	Note that conservation area is important and should be mentioned specifically.
Q	Design and ‘beauty’	56	It is good to see that CDC produced an SPD to give further detail on what constitutes ‘good design’ – it is a laudable aim but it is hard to see how it can be achieved without detailed criteria, which presumably could be shared in the eventual Local Plan. Beauty is of course a subjective requirement but even so is, we would suggest, incompatible with, for example, the homes and developments built in Bloxham by Bloors and Millers or by Bloor homes in Chipping Norton. They nod to local characteristics, but are they beautiful? From the evidence we have seen Developers’ principal interest is in mass housing provision, not aesthetics. How is beauty to be assessed and enforced?
Q	20 Minute neighbourhoods	57	Agree that 20 minute neighbourhood is desirable, and that a key feature of Bloxham is that it is one and should remain so!
Q	<p>Transport and connectivity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the proposed transport and connectivity approach to support the Local Plan Review? • Should the approach be different for the rural areas, for example 	58	Yes, the general approach is agreed, with the added point that congestion is a contributing factor to emissions problems. Not sure that the principle of reducing the need to travel should be any different for rural areas, however perhaps time taken rather than distance travel would be a better measure of impact.

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
	<p>focusing on low carbon technology rather than a reduction in the need to travel?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What measures would help you drive less or use alternative transport modes with lower emissions? 		Measures might include further public transport improvements, especially those off A361, improved footpaths on the main roads (some of ours are dangerously narrow), car clubs/ sharing and voluntary driver schemes.
	<p>Digital infrastructure – Should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a policy with the requirements expected from new development to provide digital connections and be designed to accommodate future digital infrastructure needs (future proofing). Provide a policy protecting existing telecommunications infrastructure. Provide a criteria-based policy on the location and mitigation requirements for telecommunications development. 	60	These are not mutually exclusive and seem to be sensible elements of a future strategy, with the additional point that some developments may tip a local area into requiring a step change in provision, for example relating to bandwidth thresholds or the viability of different forms of digital infrastructure, and any conditions should reflect this.
Q	Transport development policies	61	It will be interesting to see the LTP4 next year as it seems that CDC will use that to inform some policies perhaps?
17	<p>Infrastructure Delivery - Should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Update the methodology to consider social and environmental benefits of schemes and the contributions they make to Climate Action, Healthy Place Shaping, and a Sustainable Economy? Retain the current methodology? <p>And, should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to prepare the IDP by place or look at areas by catchment and how accessible they are? 	63	<p>It would seem sensible to review and update the methodology in line with the vision and objectives of the local plan, so choose Option 1 over Option 2.</p> <p>Options 3 and 4 are not alternatives to 1 & 2. They are also not mutually exclusive and it would seem sensible to consider both.</p>
Q	Delivering Infrastructure: Are there other infrastructure policies that we should include?	64	There seems to be an omission of anything relating to primary care, hospital and other health provision such as community pharmacy. This seems to be an important gap and should be addressed. Please see our comments on this issue in our response to Oxfordshire 2050. Emerging proposals relating to the Horton Hospital, and the requirements of further developments will need to be monitored carefully.
18	<p>Housing and Employment Growth at Banbury – If Banbury is identified as a location for growth, should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consider further urban extensions into the open countryside. Limit development at Banbury to protect its landscape setting and maintain separation between the town and surrounding villages Focus development at an existing or new settlement well connected to Banbury 	69	<p>Further urban extensions into open countryside should be avoided and the current hierarchy and integrity of settlements maintained. This relationship is as much part of the history of the place as individual heritage assets. Depending on the approach to 19 this might require a limit to development.</p> <p>In line with comments outlined above, and the travel hierarchy, focusing on an existing or new development, rather than Banbury is not desirable. It would be better to work to secure improved environmental, economic and social viability and sustainability of Banbury itself, within a clearly defined boundary.</p>
19	Directions of Development: If additional development is directed to Banbury requiring green field sites should we:	69	Development around Banbury has clearly been defined at least partly by the line of the M40 and the boundary with Northamptonshire, which is understandable,

Bloxham Parish Council response to CDC Local Plan Options Paper: October 2021

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider sites to the north of the town. 2. Consider sites to the south of the town 3. Consider sites to the east of the town (including to the east of the M40 Junction 11) 4. Consider sites to the west of the town? 5. A combination of any of the above <p>We would welcome views on any specific sites identified through the call for sites, or suggestions for new sites.</p>		however this has arguably forced development further to the West, North and South of the centre. Accordingly sites to the East of the motorway should be actively considered. This might require amendment to the County and District boundary in order to address longer term planning and management issues.
Q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should we retain and update the policy that protects views of St Mary's Church (Banbury)? 2. Are there any other specific buildings or locally important views in Banbury that should be protected through the Local Plan review? 	70	Yes, along with the market place and Parson's street area, Horse Fair, South Bar Street.
20	<p>To help support the vitality of Banbury's main shopping area, should we</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. consider steps to remove certain development rights within the town centre to prevent the conversion of shops and restaurants to homes without the need for planning permission? 2. Allow maximum flexibility of uses under permitted development rules. 	71	Our preference would be option 1, particularly focused on the above areas.
21	<p>Banbury Canalside - Should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to allocate the site for residential led redevelopment involving a transition of the site away from commercial uses to a sustainable, well designed residential area. 2. Allocate the site for a more flexible mix of residential and commercial uses creating a sustainable well designed, mixed use area. 3. Allocate the site as a regeneration area to provide the most flexibility to the market, but potentially limit the amount of control we have through planning policy around design standards and numbers of homes 	73	This should be considered in the light of the Canalside's future role in relation to the rest of the town centre. Any development should help support the viability of the existing shopping areas, this could involve a combination of all three, depending on the mix of development in this site and elsewhere. It should not be considered as a separate entity.
Q	Banbury's Open Spaces: How do you think Banbury's network of green spaces, sport and play facilities could be protected and enhanced?	74	
Q	Addressing Inequality in Banbury: Are there other policies we could include to help address inequalities in Banbury?	74	
Q	Reducing Car Dependency in Banbury: What would help you make fewer trips by car in Banbury?	75	
	Bicester, Kidlington, Heyford		We do not seek to comment on these areas at this stage.
30	<p>Housing in the rural areas - If additional development is required should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limit development in the rural areas to that required to meet local 	96	This should be a bottom-up exercise depending on local circumstances. This should probably be based on an assumption that development should be limited to local

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
	<p>needs or</p> <p>2. Direct proportionately more development to the rural areas over the plan period to meet wider district needs</p>		<p>housing need, unless otherwise stated. for example a settlement might have direct housing need X, but may welcome further housing provision of Y to secure the future of, or introduce, much needed local services or infrastructure. So careful communication and negotiation with local communities, and cross-border co-operation, will be required before a District-wide picture could be produced.</p>
31	<p>Meeting Rural Housing Development Needs - Should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work with communities to allocate specific sites to meet identified housing needs or 2. Provide a parish level figure to each area to allow flexibility for Neighbourhood Planning or other community led plans 3. Use a combination of the above 	97	<p>It would seem sensible to use a combination of both. Our approach to the proposed options sites sets criteria based on our neighbourhood plan and assesses each site on that basis.</p>
32	<p>In developing a rural settlement hierarchy should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give additional weight to the availability of certain services and facilities (which do you think are the most important?) 2. Give additional weight to the accessibility of the settlement to our urban centres by public transport, walking and cycling? <p>Please tell us if there are other factors that we should consider in developing a rural settlement hierarchy</p>	98	<p>A settlement hierarchy could be useful, but that also depends on the categories used. A factor could be the relationship between each settlement and others, with the total 'weight' on facilities considered. So for us that might include Milcombe, South Newington, Wigginton, Milton etc. The methodology would be key.</p> <p>We think this is worth discussion during the development of any policy. Is what is needed a classification system rather than a hierarchy? For example, two villages might have similar facilities but, like Bloxham, one may be very stretched while the other may have capacity. Yet in a hierarchy they might be assigned the same level, based on population and the facilities available. So while any scheme needs to be simple it also needs to accommodate nuance.</p>
Q	<p>Settlement Boundaries: Do you think we should define settlement boundaries, beyond which development would not normally be permitted?</p>	98	<p>Yes, they should be defined, if they reflect the Neighbourhood Plan and improve on it with further specific consultation.</p>
33	<p>The Rural Economy - In support of the rural economy, including agriculture and tourism, should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply criteria-based policies to assess development proposals 2. Allocate specific sites in the rural areas to meet the needs of the rural economy 3. Use a combination the above? 	98	<p>Probably best to consider a combination of the two, to allow for good opportunities that tie in with the plan's vision and objectives, but we would want to discuss how that would work in practice.</p>
34	<p>Historic and Natural Environment - Should we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain the current approach of seeking to conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape character of the whole district 2. Define valued landscapes/landscape features in the district which would be the subject of additional policy guidance. 	99	<p>Not sure these are mutually exclusive. It would be sensible to look at how both can be achieved in line with the points about Green Belt above. We would identify the following as 'Valued landscapes' in and around Bloxham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sor Brook Valley • Slade Nature Reserve • Hobb Hill and its setting

Option	Subject	Page	Comment/ response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1227 209 2078 268">• Land around Coates Spinney (North of Milton Road and close to St Mary's Church)
Q	Neighbourhood Planning: How could we best support Neighbourhood Planning through the Local Plan in those communities that wish to prepare a plan?	99	Help with facilitation to revise ours would be much appreciated.
Q	Development Management Policies: Are there other areas where a local development management policy would be helpful?	102	We have no suggestions at this stage.

Parish profile/ site submissions

Our assessment of proposed sites as set out on page 1 of the Parish Profile is presented below.

For all of the maps it would have been better to circulate these with aspects of the key policies maps from the existing local plan showing all currently approved sites, and not just those that have been built-out, in order to be able to assess the cumulative impact of new developments. We have developed some thoughts on principles to adopt for this and about how to test each of the sites as set out in the plan, including those relevant ones in other parishes. All of them present challenges. If all were accepted they would represent around a doubling of Bloxham's population, but any response would need to be based on a careful assessments on each site on its merits and risks. We therefore need to think about underlying principles and criteria for a good assessment.

Principles

We have based our response on the tried and tested Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan, in particular relating to housing numbers and impact on the feel of the village. They drive the criteria used to assess potential sites, assuming that parallels may be drawn from the developments at Barford Road, Tadmarton Road and Milton Road. The criteria are as follows:

- Community identity
 - Community viability (Environmental, Social, Economic): Will the site provide an opportunity to strengthen Bloxham as a community, provide for specific local housing needs or address other capacity issues?
 - Coalescence: Does the site narrow the gap between Bloxham and other settlements?
 - Spatial identity: Would the site have a detrimental impact on the current spatial 'feel' of Bloxham as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan
 - Infrastructure: Would the site have a detrimental impact on the infrastructure issues outlined in the local plan, particularly on school places and transport links and congestion
 - Avoid development in 'Valued Landscape', in particular:
 - Sor Brook Valley (already noted as an issue in the consultation document)
 - The Slade (already noted as an issue in the consultation document)
 - Hobb Hill
 - Coates Spinney Valley
- Proportionality:
 - Would the size of individual site proposed be disproportionate in the context of the rest of the village and the Neighbourhood Plan. The test for this could be that it is more than 10% larger than the Weavers Fields/ Milton Road development, the largest new development noted in the Neighbourhood Plan which at 30 dwellings/hectare would be 95.
 - Would the combined size of all sites be disproportionate in the context of the rest of the village [NB: We would need perhaps to set a percentage] (
 - If the second proportionality test is failed, any notionally acceptable sites should be ranked in order of overall acceptability until the level is reached.

We also developed criteria for use with surrounding sites of concern, in other parish areas. Would they?:

- Lead to further coalescence?
- Put an additional strain on Bloxham facilities?
- Increase traffic congestion
- Have a detrimental impact on 'Valued landscape'/ green corridors

Potential housing allocations

We have assessed the various sites on the basis of development at 30 homes per hectare. We have also looked at potential housing allocations based on a pro-rata from the Oxfordshire requirements. The following paragraphs show that methodology.

Number of households 2021	Total
Oxfordshire	277807
Cherwell	59349
Cherwell's percentage share of Oxfordshire's households	21%
Bloxham	1350
Bloxham's percentage share of Cherwell's households	2.3%

Source: Local Insight profile for Cherwell and Bloxham areas, Oxford City Council and District Data Service, 4 February 2021

Housing need to 2050 not already in local plans	Assessed need	Cherwell's pro-rata share	Bloxham's pro-rata share
Oxfordshire lowest estimate	16126	3445	78
Oxfordshire highest estimate	67336	14385	327

Source: Oxfordshire 2050 Consultation Paper

The above figures provide a starting point for thinking about the scale of new development that might be required assuming that Cherwell and Bloxham both received an allocation of new housing in line with their current proportion of Oxfordshire households. This is for illustrative purposes. The eventual figure could be either higher or lower depending on the options chosen, so the above figures indicate the likely order of magnitude only. It is highly unlikely to be accurate because the Oxfordshire 2050 plan and the Cherwell District Local Plan will both target housing development according to strategies developed through the current consultations.

Details				Pro rata housing requirement estimates						
Rep No.	Site Name	Size (ha)	Homes @30/ha	Percentage of Cherwell's uncommitted housing requirement to 2050 (Lowest estimate)	Percentage of Cherwell's uncommitted housing requirement to 2050 (Highest estimate)	Percentage of Bloxham's share uncommitted housing requirement to 2050 (Lowest estimate)	Percentage of Bloxham's share uncommitted housing requirement to 2050 (Highest estimate)	Percentage increase on Bloxham's current households (1350)	Number of affordable household plots provided at 30% of developments of over 10 properties	Affordable housing as percentage of current Bloxham nominations on waiting list
Estimated housing need (See note)				3445	14385	78	327			
049	Land at Tadmarton Road	9.7	291	8%	2%	373%	89%	22%	87	32%
052	Land at Tadmarton Road	8.5	255	7%	2%	327%	78%	19%	76	28%
067	Newland Caravan Site, Milton Road	1.86	56	2%	0%	72%	17%	4%	16	6%
070	Land South of Ells Lane	2.58	77	2%	1%	99%	24%	6%	23	8%
075	Land East of South Newington Road	7.75	233	7%	2%	299%	71%	17%	69	25%
094	Land at South Newington Road	6	180	5%	1%	231%	55%	13%	54	20%
100	Land North and South of Milton Road	15.8	474	14%	3%	608%	145%	35%	142	52%
115	Orchard House, Barford Road	0.4	12	0%	0%	15%	4%	1%	3	1%
151	Land North of Bloxham	5.58	167	5%	1%	214%	51%	12%	50	18%
Total		58.17	1745	51%	12%	2237%	534%	129%	520	192%

Details				Proposed acceptability criteria								Bloxham PC response
No.	Site Name	Size (ha)	Homes @30/ha	Strengthens Bloxham as a viable community	Does not narrow gap between Bloxham and other community (coalescence)	Does not harm current spatial 'feel' as set out in NDP	Does not expand the accepted built-up boundary of Bloxham	Does not have detrimental impact on infrastructure especially transport routes	In proportion to recent devts (<95 houses)	Develops Brownfield Site	Avoids development in key green areas (Sor Brook Valley, the Slade, Hobbs Hill, Coates' Spinney Valley)	
049	Land at Tadmarton Road	9.7	291	☺	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	Strongly object
052	Land at Tadmarton Road	8.5	255	☺	☺	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	Strongly object
067	Newland Caravan Site, Milton Road	1.86	56	☺	☹	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	Potentially acceptable
070	Land South of Ells Lane	2.58	77	☺	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☹	☺	Object, significant issues at Ell's Lane junction
075	Land East of South Newington Road	7.75	233	☺	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☺	Strongly object
094	Land at South Newington Road	6	180	☺	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	Strongly object
100	Land North and South of Milton Road	15.8	474	☺	☺	☹	☺	☹	☹	☹	☹	Strongly object
115	Orchard House, Barford Road	0.4	12	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	Attractive on surface but object as counter to NP infill policy BL2 (usual upper limit of 5)
151	Land North of Bloxham	5.58	167	☺	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	Strongly object
Total		58.2	1745									

Surrounding sites of concern

No.	Site Name	Details		Size		Reason for objection			Comments
		Parish Area	Size (ha)	Houses (@30/ha)	Coalescence	Additional strain on Bloxham facilities	Traffic congestion	Impact on 'Valued landscape'	
116	Wykham Park Farm, Wykham Lane, Banbury	Banbury	2.9	87	☹️	☺️	☹️	☹️	Strongly object: The map for Banbury shows only the existing developments, not those that are in the process of being built. These two proposals would further undermine the dwindling space between Banbury and Bloxham significantly continuing the trend towards coalescence, increase congestion and have an impact on the viability of the Sor Valley as a 'Valued Landscape' and green corridor between settlements.
185	Land at Wykham Park Farm, Wykham Lane, Banbury	Banbury	33.0	990	☹️	☺️	☹️	☹️	
156	Land to the west of Banbury Road, Adderbury	Adderbury	14.2	426	☹️	☺️	☹️	☹️	
258	Land to the South of Milton Road, Adderbury	Adderbury	3.5	106	☹️	☺️	☹️	☹️	Object: These three proposals, together with the significant proposals to the East of Adderbury would continue the trend towards coalescence, increase congestion and have an impact on the viability of the Sor Valley as a 'Valued Landscape' and green corridor between settlements.
091	Land South of Wards Crescent, Bodicote	Bodicote	4.5	135	☹️	☺️	☺️	☹️	
137	Land off Bloxham Road, Milcombe	Milcombe	6.0	181	☹️	☹️	☹️	☺️	Strongly object: These three proposals are a step change and start a new trend towards coalescence between Bloxham and Milcombe. Taken together, and given Milcombe's comparatively smaller range of facilities, they could lead to over 500 new households seeing Bloxham as a natural 'centre' and the most direct route to Banbury and the main roads north and south, worsening an already challenging situation.
158	Hollies Farm, New Road, Milcombe	Milcombe	8.4	252	☹️	☹️	☹️	☺️	
231	Land at Fern Hill Farm, Milcombe	Milcombe	3.7	111	☹️	☹️	☹️	☺️	
Total			76.3	2288					

Sites - Conclusion

The figures show that even if Bloxham is required to take a pro-rata allocation, only 5% of the current proposed sites' total area would be needed at the lowest estimate. Even at the highest estimate just 19% of the proposed sites' total area would be required.

However once the Bloxham sites are assessed against our criteria we consider that only one borders on acceptability (067 Newland caravan site) and another is potentially close but is not in line with our Neighbourhood Plan policy (BL2) relating to infilling.

The proposals for up to 2300 further houses on sites between Bloxham and other centres would put significant strain on the village and the surrounding area for the reasons described in our assessment.

Comments on Bloxham Parish Profile

Subject	Comment/ suggested response
General/ Maps	Site submissions: For all of the maps it would have been better to circulate these with aspects of the key policies maps from the existing local plan in order to pick up developments that are in the current plan but not yet built-out. Please could such maps be provided in the next iteration? Employment: There are no comments on employment in the profile which seems strange, for example Bloxham School is a significant local employer and there is a wide range of businesses in the village, ranging from those at Bloxham Mill to a large number of small/working from home-based businesses.
Map of Bloxham	Note that we will need to comment on surrounding parishes with developments affecting Bloxham or near the boundary, namely Adderbury, Banbury, Milton, Milcombe and Bodicote. Assessment of options sites follow later.
Page 1	It would have been helpful for the demographic information to show the current number of households in Bloxham. This would place the 232 completed dwellings since 2015 in context (17% of the 1350 noted in the Oxfordshire district data site, or a 21% increase on household numbers from 2015). https://www.oxford.gov.uk/districtdata/downloads/file/1204/2020_bloxham_parish_report . NB. By contrast, Cherwell had an estimated 66,693 dwellings in 2018, with the annual increase expected to be approximately 1,100 p.a. that would equate to around 6,600 since 2015, or a 10% increase, half that of Bloxham. (Source: Cherwell District Council, state of the District's Housing, 2018)
Page 2	No comments
Page 3	Noted and welcomed comment relating to Ell's lane/Bloxham Grove and the Sor Brook Valley. This concern should also be extended specifically to other key green corridors/ 'Valued Landscapes' including Hobbs Hill and the Coates Spinney Valley to the East of St Mary's Church/North of Milton Road.
Page 4, 5	Odd not to mention Bloxham School on this list, or anywhere in the profile as a major property owner and Bloxham's largest employer. Ell's Lane Nursery should also be included as a facility/employer. It is also worth noting that unlike many other villages, Bloxham has no allotments and thus lacks an important, if small scale, contributor to good health and low food miles, any new development should be required to help facilitate this provision.
Page 6	Wording of first bullet point of constraints needs checking, including river naming. Is it Sor Brook on both tributaries? Noted need to avoid development at or near the Slade Nature Reserve Also to note range of bat species year-round in the area as well as swifts Wording of opportunities section needs checking We continue to endorse the comment re: development management companies and green space