

## CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN REVIEW 2040

### RESPONSE BY SHIPTON-ON-CHERWELL AND THRUPP PARISH COUNCIL

**Q5.** We support the three overarching themes of the Plan.

**CP3.** Shipton-on-Cherwell & Thrupp Parish Council has recognised the climate emergency and therefore supports the many positive proposals to ensure that new housing developments between 2025 and 2040 will be climate or carbon-neutral. More emphasis is needed to improve the carbon efficiency of all aspects of the local economy and local housing stock. The Parish Council would therefore prefer to see a greater/additional emphasis on adaptation measures alongside mitigation responses. This could include additional support to housing and community retrofit measures that both mitigate and adapt to likely future climate impacts - notably increased heat, drought, and rainfall/flooding extremes.

**CP11&12 / Q7.** The Plan adheres to the proposed England Biodiversity Net Gain policy framework but does not recognise the challenge this will place on the Council to assess, approve, and monitor compliance with proposals. Recent research, emanating mostly from the University of Oxford, highlights this - see <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cobi.14198>. Shipton-On-Cherwell & Thrupp Parish Council recommend that the Cherwell District Council request the University to collaborate with the Council to apply the environmental mitigation hierarchy to all large-scale developments.

**CP34 / Q20.** Plans for a significant ECO Village in Shipton Quarry are not included in this consultation although these are discussed in the Sustainability Appraisal (LPR 1, §5.4.59) and are being discussed with officers. Please explain how these would interface this Plan and with plans for 300 houses at The Moors, Kidlington. We are unclear how these plans are consistent with designating the Parish of Shipton-On-Cherwell and Thrupp as smaller villages “where any development should be modest and proportionate in scale and primarily be to meet local needs.” (CDC2040, p80) No arguments have been put forward to justify the exceptional release of green belt land at The Moors.

**CP34 / Q20.** The plans for 450 houses SE of Woodstock are said to contribute to Kidlington’s needs. However this development is adjacent to Woodstock and will most naturally be integrated into Woodstock Town Council, which is in WODC. Please explain how these can be considered Kidlington housing, when the development might be transferred to WODC.

**CP47 / Q26.** As a popular visitor destination, Thrupp needs investment to ensure that its character is protected by designating the green area in Canal Yard as a ‘Local Green Space’ and ensuring that Kidlington’s Local Cycling and Walking Plan links to the villages of Hampton Poyle, Islip, Yarnton, Bedbroke, Thrupp, Shipton-on-Cherwell and extends to Bunkers Hill.

**CP60&61.** It is surprising that there is no mention of any joint work with the Canal & River Trust, a major national player in the local leisure infrastructure.

**CP78 / Q49.** Although the long-distance transport infrastructure for Kidlington is well connected (links to London, Birmingham, Southampton, East Midlands, etc), the local transport infrastructure is poor. Without significant investment in safe footpaths, cycle lanes, park & ride hubs, bus & light railway services, and infrastructure for electric vehicles, the economic and

housing developments planned will not bring the benefits intended. CDC is far below an acceptable level of investment in green transport infrastructure.

**CP80 / Q51.** Two major planned developments, the Oxford United stadium south of Kidlington and the Botley West Solar Farm are hardly mentioned, and no opportunity is given to comment.

**CP80 / Q51.** The Parish Council supports an urgent transition to renewable energy, especially roof-top and brown-field solar, and rapid phase-out of fossil fuels, but does not support large-scale solar farms impinging on green belt land and local communities. The Parish Council does not support plans for West Botley Solar Farm which is grossly disproportionate and would disfigure large areas of the rural environment.

**CP81 / Q52-4.** Although Kidlington is designated as a 'Service Centre' it has lost services, e.g., banks, building societies, pharmacies and adult education provision. Its health and leisure services are barely adequate. This Plan must put more emphasis on encouraging local services to invest and develop in Kidlington. With an enormous number of new houses, pressure from Science and Technology Parks, and the potential impact of the move of Oxford United stadium, there is significant danger that the quality of life of residents of Kidlington will be negatively impacted by congestion, noise & light pollution.

**CP87 / Q65.** There are many instances of §106 proposals being delayed, modified or never happening. Developers know that their promises can be broken with impunity as local councils are too weak to take enforcement action and so compromise. We suggest that §106 schemes are started before or contemporaneously with the development, so these are baked into planning permission.

- Ends -