



West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2041

Preferred Spatial Options Consultation

Consultation Summary Report

March 2026



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Consultation Overview	5
Draft Spatial Policy Questions	6
Question 1- Extending the plan period	6
Question 2- Settlement Hierachy	7
Question 3- Settlement Classification	8
Question 4- Proposed Development Scales	10
Question 5- Spatial Strategy	11
Question 6- Housing Need and Infrastructure	13
Question 7- Salt Cross Garden Village Existing Allocation	15
Question 8- Salt Cross Garden Village Quantum of Developemnt	16
Question 9- West Eynsham SDA Existing Allocation	16
Question 10- West Eynsham SDA Quantum of Development	18
Question 11- North Witney SDA Existing Allocatiom	19
Question 12- North Witney SDA Quantum of Development	21
Question 13- East Chipping Norton SDA Existing Allocation	22
Question 14- East Chipping Norton SDA Quantum of Development	23
Question 15- REEMA North and Central SDA Existing Allocation	24
Question 16- REEMA North and Central SDA Quantum of Development	25
Question 17- Site A Land North of Burford Road, Witney	26
Question 18- Site B Land West of Downs Road, Witney (Peashell Farm)	28
Question 19- Site C Land South of Witney	29
Question 20- Site D Land West of Witney	30
Question 21- Site E North of Carterton (Brize Norton and Shilton)	33
Question 22- Site F North East of Carterton (Brize Norton)	34
Question 23- Site G North East of Carterton (Brize Norton)	36
Question 24- Site H East of Brize Norton	38
Question 25- Site I Land at West Carterton (Alvescot)	39
Question 26- Site J East Chipping Norton	40
Question 27- Site K Land South West of Hanborough Station	42
Question 28- Woodford Way Carpark Existing Allocation	44
Question 29- Woodford Way Carpark Site Capacity	45
Question 30- Site L East of Bampton	46
Question 31- Site M North of Aston	47

Question 32- Site N South of Sheep Street, Burford	48
Question 33- Site O Jefferson's Peice	50
Question 34- Site P Land South of Hydac, Charlbury	52
Question 35- Site Q South of Ducklington.....	53
Question 36- Site R Kingham Station	54
Question 37- Site S Middle Barton.....	56
Question 38- Site T The Downs, Standlake.....	57
Question 39- Site U Rousham Road, Tackley.....	59
Question 40- Site V Enstone Airfield.....	61
Question 41- Site W Welch Way, Witney	62

Introduction

- I.1 The Council is preparing a new Local Plan which will help shape the future of West Oxfordshire to 2043. Having an up-to-date plan in place is vital because it provides a vision and framework to guide decisions on how, where and when development can come forward and how we can protect and enhance our surroundings for current and future generations.
- I.2 Preparing a Local Plan falls into two main stages:
- **Plan preparation** (known as the Regulation 18 stage) when the Council carries out informal engagement on the potential scope and content of the plan and explores different options to help identify a preferred approach.
 - **Publication** (known as the Regulation 19 stage) when the Council carries out formal consultation on the final draft version of the plan which it considers to be 'sound' and intends to submit for examination.
- I.3 The Council is currently at the Regulation 18 plan-preparation stage and has held separate public consultations to date:
- In August 2022, an initial scoping consultation took place, seeking general views on the potential areas of focus for the new Local Plan.
 - Next, in August 2023, a further consultation 'Your Place, Your Plan' took place seeking views on draft local plan objectives, the potential pattern of development and potential sites, ideas and opportunities.
 - Then, in June 2025, we undertook a third consultation, seeking views and opinions on the draft 'Preferred Policy Options Paper'.
 - Recently, we held a fourth consultation, seeking views and opinions on the draft 'Preferred Spatial Options Paper'.
- I.4 The purpose of this report is to provide a detailed overview of the fourth consultation including how and when it took place and the main messages arising from the responses that we received.
- I.5 The document provides a summary of key messages received through the consultation. It does not set out the council's response to the consultation findings.
- I.6 The responses to all four previous consultation stages will be taken into account by Officers as they prepare the final Regulation 19 draft version of the Local Plan in mid-2026.

Consultation Overview

1.7 The Preferred Policy Options Consultation was held over a 6-week period from 3rd November – 22nd December 2025.

1.8 We asked for your views on:

- **Extending the plan period to 2043**
- **A revised settlement hierarchy**
- **Whether previously allocated sites should be refreshed and updated**
- **New potential development areas**

1.9 The consultation comprised a mixture of online material via the Council's digital engagement platform and a number of 'in-person' events as detailed below.

Public Exhibitions:

- Chipping Norton Public Exhibition – 11th November 2025
- Tackley Public Exhibition – 13th November 2025
- Witney Exhibition – 18th November 2025
- Long Hanborough Public Exhibition – 20th November 2025
- Brize Norton Public Exhibition – 25th November 2025
- Bampton Public Exhibition – 26th November 2025
- Milton-Under-Wychwood Public Exhibition – 2nd December 2025
- Standlake Public Exhibition – 9th December 2025

1.10 The consultation generated a total of almost 2260 comments from around 880 individuals and organisations by email and via the consultation platform.

1.11 Around 190 comments were received from 139 individuals and organisations via the consultation map.

1.12 The sections below summarise the comments that we received in relation to each aspect of the draft Preferred Spatial Options Paper.

Draft Spatial Policy Questions

Question 1 – Do you support an extended Local Plan end date of 2043?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Extension of the plan period is generally supported**
- **There is a dependency on infrastructure that is insufficient and not currently deliverable**
- **Housing numbers are seen as too high and the growth model is unrealistic**

- 2.1 The majority of comments, from a range of respondents, indicate support for the extension of the Local Plan to 2043, with some supporting a longer extension to 2045 or for twenty years.
- 2.2 Support for the extension of the plan period includes reasons such as better alignment with NPPF requirements, better long-term strategic planning and providing certainty for infrastructure.
- 2.3 Comments also suggest a need for flexibility and robust evidence, ensuring sites are deliverable and support for strategic sites and a spread of small/medium sites.
- 2.4 While the extension is generally supported, comments suggest that this is only if certain conditions are met, with concerns surrounding transport, a need for infrastructure first, housing numbers and above average growth.
- 2.5 Lack of, or poor, infrastructure is the most frequently cited concern, with over-capacity sewage systems, flooding risks, road congestion, parking pressures, GP and dentist capacity, bus and rail service limitation and sustainability particularly highlighted, with calls for infrastructure to be guaranteed first.
- 2.6 It is noted that these concerns are particularly highlighted by respondents in relation to the settlements of Stonesfield, Ascott-under-Wychwood, Bampton, Minster Lovell and Charlbury where comments also indicate concerns about heritage and settlement identity.
- 2.7 Comments which oppose the extension period of the Local Plan cite reasons such as the increase of housing numbers by 1,810, which is considered to be unacceptable and unachievable. Other opposition comments suggest concerns of speculative development if housing targets cannot realistically be met, risks of over development and concerns regarding excessive pressure due to Oxford City's unmet housing need.
- 2.8 Additionally, concerns are expressed about potential future local government reorganisation and a perceived lack of trust in WODC acting on public comments, with concerns that the plan will not be respected or implemented.
- 2.9 Some comments have indicated a criticism of the consultation process and a perceived lack of transparency, with respondents suggesting that there was insufficient time to review the documents, a lack of local consultation events in key settlements, maps which did not show

full development site boundaries and a feeling that public comments will not be meaningfully considered.

- 2.10 Alternative approaches suggested by comments include better use of brownfield land, repurposing unused buildings and land, increasing densities in towns, creating more affordable housing and housing tailored to older people and limiting develop-led growth in rural areas.

Question 2 - Do you support the concept of introducing an additional tier into the Local Plan settlement hierarchy to distinguish between large and medium-sized villages? What are your reasons?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There is broad support for adding an extra tier but there is concern about how villages are classified**
- **Infrastructure capacity and environmental constraints are highlighted - especially concerning the Cotswolds National Landscape and sewage/flooding**
- **How to distribute growth fairly and sustainably, between larger service centres and smaller villages, is questioned**

- 3.1 Comments indicate strong support for the introduction of an additional tier, with many agreeing that distinguishing between large and medium villages is more realistic and helps guide appropriate development levels, helping to protect small and less sustainable settlements from excessive growth.
- 3.2 However, concerns are raised about how the new tiering is applied and the implications for development.
- 3.3 There are repeated concerns that the new hierarchy fails to reflect statutory protections for settlements within the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) and comments call for settlements within the CNL to be placed in lower tiers or for a sub-category to be created for CNL settlements.
- 3.4 Linked to this are comments highlighting that the NPPF restricts major development in the CNL and that failure to incorporate CNL considerations risks legal challenges and unsoundness of the Local Plan.
- 3.5 Comments indicate concerns about the way in which settlements were allocated to the tiers, with criticism of the Settlement Sustainability Report's (SSR) over reliance on population thresholds and insufficient weighting for transport connectivity, sewerage and drainage infrastructure, flood risk, recent development pressure and realistic access to local facilities.
- 3.6 Additionally, comments express that the methodology for the SSR seems too simplistic or based on desktop research that misrepresents reality.

- 3.7 Comments suggest concerns from respondents that being placed in a higher tier will mean more development without infrastructure improvements, with issues raised regarding overloaded sewage systems, limited public transport, inadequate roads, insufficient school places and poor utilities.
- 3.8 This has led to calls for the Local Plan to make infrastructure constraints an explicit criterion and require developers to fund necessary upgrades.
- 3.9 Comments indicate a dispute regarding the tiering of individual villages, particularly in Stonesfield, Enstone, Ascott-under-Wychwood, Curbridge, Fulbrook, Bladon and Stanton Harcourt. Respondents have raised concerns including settlement scores not aligning with 'real-world conditions', inconsistencies compared to neighbouring villages and classification leading to unfair expectations for development.
- 3.10 Conversely, some comments express concern regarding small village risk stagnation, with the risk of them becoming exclusively for wealthier/older residents. These comments highlight that modest development can support infrastructure such as schools, shops and bus routes and maintain community vitality.
- 3.11 Support for '20-minute Neighbourhoods' and recognising clusters of villages that function collectively are also emphasised by comments.

Question 3 – Based on the proposed five-tiered approach, do you think that the settlements listed in Table 2 above have been classified in the correct tier?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There is strong disagreement with settlement tier classifications for specific settlements**
- **Concerns about infrastructure are evident and calls for infrastructure before development are made**
- **It is considered that there are flaws in the Settlement Sustainability Report and HELAA assessment**
- **CNL protections are thought to not have been adequately considered and there are calls for CNL settlements to have their own tier in the settlement hierarchy**

- 4.1 Comments generally support the overall five-tier system, with Tier 1 settlements and new settlements like Salt Cross Garden Village supported, along with development along the A40 and A44 strategic corridors. Comments indicate that developers generally support classifications that allow more growth.
- 4.2 Many comments express strong disagreement regarding the tiering of specific settlements, citing that the hierarchy is too dependent on population size, insufficiently weighted for actual service provision and does not adequately consider overstretched services such as schools, GPs and sewage systems, the presence of sustainable transport or Cotswolds

National Landscape (CNL) protections. Comments have also suggested the sustainability matrix contains errors and a re-evaluation of scorings is needed.

- 4.3 Comments indicate that many Tier 2 and 3 classifications are challenged for reasons including limited or unreliable public transport, high car-dependency and over-valued train station presence.
- 4.4 Calls are made for infrastructure to be secured before the expansion of settlements and Grampian-style conditions to be imposed where needed.
- 4.5 There are calls for villages within the CNL to be classed separately as the NPPF prohibits major development in such areas unless exceptional circumstances and public interest are proven. Commenters from villages that repeatedly cite concerns regarding the CNL includes Stonesfield, Ascott-under-Wychwood, Fulbrook, Combe, Enstone, Milton-under-Wychwood and Shipton-under-Wychwood. Comments suggest the Local Plan currently fails to apply CNL restrictions consistently.
- 4.6 Comments, including from the Cotswold National Landscape Board, propose a separate CNL settlement category, or a “Tier 3A / 4A” specifically for CNL villages.
- 4.7 Repeated comments highlight strong concern regarding infrastructure constraints particularly relating to sewage overflows, water pressure issues, flooding and run-off, narrow rural road networks and the over-capacity GP surgeries and schools. Calls are made for new development to only be allowed where infrastructure exists or upgrades are guaranteed.
- 4.8 Comments strongly suggest that Stonesfield is incorrectly classified in the hierarchy, with repeated concerns that it should be classified as a Tier 4 settlement as opposed to a Tier 3 settlement. Reasons provided for this include the settlement being entirely within the CNL, limited amenities, public transport and employment, narrow lanes with no A/B roads, sewerage problems, landscape sensitivity and a housing needs assessment conducted for the draft Neighbourhood Plan demonstrating a need for only 4-5 affordable homes.
- 4.9 A minority of comments indicate support for Stonesfield as a Tier 3 village, with school viability and attracting families highlighted.
- 4.10 Comments additionally indicate a strong opposition to Long Hanborough being classified as a Tier 2 Service Centre. Objections include the railway station presence being overstated, low levels of public transport use, limited shops and amenities, an over-capacity GP surgery, congested roads and disproportionate recent growth.
- 4.11 Long Hanborough’s continued designation as a Tier 2 Service Centre is supported by some developers, citing connectivity and future growth potential.
- 4.12 Comments suggest mixed views relating to Bampton’s continued classification as a Tier 2 Service Centre.
- 4.13 Comments from developers indicate support for this classification.

- 4.14 There are repeated concerns from residents of Bampton, with comments highlighting a flooding and run-off history, limited public transport, an at-capacity sewage plant, a congested 'medieval' road layout and a practical inability to accommodate growth. Calls are strongly made for Bampton to be classified as a lower or sub-tier.
- 4.15 There are calls from a small number of commenters for Kingham to be reclassified as a Tier 3 settlement for reasons including the rail station, local services and connectivity.
- 4.16 One comment suggests that Ducklington should be upgraded to a Tier 2 Service Centre, due to a range of facilities including a new supermarket and a petrol filling station and its close proximity to Witney.
- 4.17 Some concerns are raised about HELAA Site Assessments, with objections indicating that they ignore CNL constraints for many CNL sites, fail to assess cumulative impact, send misleading signals to developers and include site previously refused on appeal.
- 4.18 Support is demonstrated for the use of brown-field sites, the protection of green-field and CNL sites and the avoidance of exploiting cumulative loopholes.

Question 4 – Do you support the four proposed scales of residential development (small 1–10 units, medium 11–50 units, large 51–300 units and strategic 300+ units)? What could be the implications of defining different scales of development?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **The thresholds for the development Scales are seen as arbitrary or too rigid**
- **The settlement hierarchy and development scales are not thought to be aligned with local variation**
- **There is concern about cumulative impact and infrastructure capacity**

- 5.1 Comments indicate general support for the proposed development scales, with reasons of transparency and helping to guide growth cited.
- 5.2 However, comments also suggest that this support is conditional on refinements, clearer guidelines and safeguards.
- 5.3 Strong concerns are expressed that the 'large' category (51-300 units) covers a too wide range with suggestions that this will risk disproportionate impacts on communities. Concerns are also raised that cumulative impacts of multiple medium-scale developments could equate to a large-scale impact.
- 5.4 Multiple comments call for clarity about how limits apply, with a common question asking if the limits per settlement are over the plan period or per individual application. Comments suggest a concern that developers could submit multiple small applications.
- 5.5 Comments suggest introducing a 'very large category' or splitting the band into two. Comments request additional impact assessments for schemes over ~150 units.

- 5.6 Many comments highlight that numeric thresholds are not suitable due to the same number of homes affecting settlements differently. Comments suggest a percentage-based threshold (for example a 10% population increase) and that developments should be proportionate to the existing village size.
- 5.7 Some comments propose that the scales are too rigid, could artificially cap development, could force lower-density or fragmented development patterns and do not account for site-specific sustainability. Several comments suggest flexibility to exceed thresholds where justified.
- 5.8 Repeated comments raise concerns about infrastructure, particularly roads, A40 congestion, transport, schools, sewage, water and GP capacity. Comments suggest that development should only proceed after infrastructure is improved, rather than concurrently or after.
- 5.9 Some comments highlight concern about development in the CNL, with concern that large developments could undermine landscape character, with suggestions that even 10 homes could be significant and that policies should reflect special protections in designated landscapes.
- 5.10 Comments from respondents from specific villages suggest concern about too much development in some settlements, notably Stonesfield, Standlake and Brize Norton.
- 5.11 Some comments suggest that Milton-Under-Wychwood and Ducklington could support higher growth.

Question 5 - Do you support the revised spatial strategy outlined above? Would there be positive or negative implications for people and places arising from the spatial strategy?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Comments note concerns regarding infrastructure capacity (with roads, sewage, water, GP surgeries and schools of most concern)**
- **There is a perception that growth is unevenly or unfairly distributed across the district**
- **There is a strong emphasis on environmental protection, landscape sensitivity and the Cotswolds National Landscape**

- 6.1 Comments suggest mixed opinion about the proposed Spatial Strategy, with many comments supportive of the principles of the strategy.
- 6.2 Many comments indicate support for the settlement hierarchy concept, with some support for focussing larger growth in Tier 1 settlements and a focus on sustainable transport corridors.
- 6.3 Some respondents suggest that too much housing is focused along the A40 corridor, in Carterton/Brize Norton, and on the edges of Witney.

- 6.4 Multiple comments suggest strong concern regarding infrastructure with many respondents calling for an 'infrastructure first' approach with road congestion, particularly on the A40, sewage treatment capacity, flooding, GP and school capacity and scepticism about the Carterton-Witney-Oxford rail proposal of concern to respondents.
- 6.5 Comments also highlight the importance of protecting the Cotswold National Landscape, conservation areas, historic towns such as Burford and Charlbury and floodplains and biodiversity-rich greenfield sites.
- 6.6 Recommendations for the Cotswold National Landscape include strict proportionality limits (approximately 5% growth), with legal obligations to seek to further conservation in the CNL highlighted.
- 6.7 Comments suggest concerns regarding specific settlement areas, particularly those allocated as Tier 2 Service Centres such as Burford, Charlbury and Bampton. These concerns highlight infrastructure that is already under strain, traffic and heritage impacts and doubts regarding suitability for large-scale development.
- 6.8 There is acceptance of some growth in Bampton, however comments indicate a strong demand for phased delivery (max 50 homes every 5 years) and infrastructure alignment. Comments also highlight a disappointment regarding the removal of brownfield or smaller site options.
- 6.9 Comments regarding Carterton suggest Carterton's regeneration is not sufficiently addressed in the plan, with further concerns that Carterton lacks A-road access and strong employment. Additional comments note concerns about excessive growth around Brize Norton.
- 6.10 Concerns relating to Chipping Norton as a Tier 1 Main Service Centre focus on its ability to take strategic-scale development due to landscape constraints.
- 6.11 Many comments indicate concern about some villages placed in Tier 3 of the hierarchy, with comments suggesting unease regarding perceived excessive development, transport, coalescence with other settlements and insufficient growth limitations in protected landscapes.
- 6.12 Some comments are supportive of development in Tier 2 and Tier 3 settlements, suggesting that they could take more growth to reduce pressure on constrained areas.
- 6.13 Many comments call for more small and medium sites with more dispersed growth, enabling villages to remain viable and avoiding a reliance on large strategic sites, which are perceived as slow to deliver.
- 6.14 More flexibility in the scale of development in Tier 2 and 3 settlements is also called for as is a less restrictive approach.
- 6.15 Comments suggest a strong preference for a 'brownfield first' approach, with additional support for higher densities and more local, affordable housing sites, particularly in rural areas, with some specific site suggestions made.

6.16 Many comments suggest strong views that the A40 is unfit for supporting growth without major upgrades. There are mixed view regarding safeguarding land for a rail link, with some comments strongly supportive of the proposal while others question its deliverability.

6.17 Strong support for better bus services and safe cycle and walking routes is indicated.

Question 6 - Do you support the principle of West Oxfordshire meeting its identified housing and employment development needs in full? Are there environmental and infrastructure constraints, beyond those referred to in Section 6, that should influence the development requirements for the plan?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Infrastructure capacity is seen as critically insufficient for the proposed level of growth**
- **The Spatial Strategy and housing numbers are questioned—especially Oxford’s unmet need and over-concentration near Carterton/Brize Norton**
- **There is major concern about the deliverability and reliance on the Carterton–Witney–Oxford Rail Corridor**

7.1 Multiple comments express strong concern regarding the ability of existing infrastructure to support the proposed number of new homes in the district.

7.2 Key concerns that are noted include sewerage and water, which is seen to be underfunded and failing, with sewerage over-capacity with calls for no development until wastewater capacity is upgraded.

7.3 Additionally, comments cite A40 congestion as a crisis and concerns regarding GP surgeries and schools as being over capacity in many places.

7.4 Comments regarding the environment and flooding feature concerns about flood risk and fears of flooding downstream from large, new developments and the ecological damage from sewage discharges, which is perceived as being ‘underplayed’ in the plan.

7.5 There are strong calls to integrate the Local Nature Recovery Strategy more firmly into policy and a widespread desire to protect valued landscapes such as the CNL and agricultural land.

7.6 Many comments indicate strong concerns about the proposed Carterton-Witney-Oxford railway proposal. These concerns included costs, with no funding committed, the perception that a heavy reliance on the railway to justify development is high risk and the doubt that it will ever be built, which could leave unsustainable, car-based developments.

7.7 Other comments demonstrate support for safeguarding the railway route.

7.8 Some comments challenge the housing numbers and targets proposed, citing that they are too high or unrealistic. It is suggested that there should be a fixed cap and a phased

approach, to avoid speculative development, with development focussed on strategic sites, rather than villages.

- 7.9 Other comments question the methodology and underlying population data, along with the accuracy of the Water Cycle Study, whether the environmental evidence is up to date, the sustainability ranking of settlements and the expectation that West Oxfordshire should help meet Oxford City's unmet need.
- 7.10 Some comments are supportive of higher housing targets and consider that more may be required, particularly to meet affordable housing need and to make greater provision for Oxford's unmet housing need.
- 7.11 Linked to Oxford's unmet housing need, some comments acknowledge that, although the Duty to Cooperate is being abolished, cross-boundary collaboration is still required. It is noted by some comments that Oxford City's unmet need is unclear but likely to be substantial and that West Oxfordshire must contribute. Other comments disagree that West Oxfordshire should absorb Oxford's shortfall.
- 7.12 Calls for more small and medium sized sites to be allocated are also made by some comments, not just larger strategic sites.
- 7.13 There are also calls for more balanced, sustainable growth across the district, with suggestions including smaller developments across multiple settlements (dispersal) a greater focus on brownfield land, protecting the unique character of villages and respecting neighbourhood plans.
- 7.14 Comments suggest widespread concern regarding overconcentration around Brize Norton & Carterton, with the draft plan being perceived as adding 40–50% of the district's growth near Brize Norton, which comments consider deeply unfair and impractical. Comments highlight concern that Brize Norton lacks infrastructure and is already affected by RAF base traffic, Noise, sewage issues, flooding and poor road links.
- 7.15 Comments regarding employment land & economic development include the suggestion that Carterton needs better employment opportunities, not just housing, suggestions for science, Research and Development Parks, and improved retail/leisure and concerns that employment land provision is too low in the plan.
- 7.16 Multiple comments indicate community support for a new Carterton Community Sports Hub, with requests for a new hub centred on Carterton Football Club, including new pitches and facilities to support multiple local teams.
- 7.17 Some comments indicate dissatisfaction with public engagement associated with the Preferred Spatial Options Consultation. Comments include the perception that that they were poorly attended, use inaccessible formats and do not reach working families or younger populations. Suggestions for future events include events at schools, weekend sessions, more accessible, plain-language material, business community roundtables and outreach via clubs, churches etc.

Question 7 – Do you support the principle of updating and refreshing the existing allocation for Salt Cross Garden Village as part of the Local Plan 2043?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are concerns about insufficient and uncertain infrastructure delivery**
- **There are scale of growth and overdevelopment concerns**
- **Doubts are expressed regarding delivery timescales, viability and realistic housing trajectories**

- 8.1 Support for updating the Salt Cross allocation is demonstrated in some comments, recognising Salt Cross as a key sustainable growth location. Comments also suggest some support for increasing densities if aligned with design principles and supported by infrastructure.
- 8.2 Supportive comments often highlight that transport improvements, environmental protection and the adoption of the Salt Cross AAP will be required.
- 8.3 Other comments suggest concern with the delivery timescale and viability of the site, remarking that the site has been allocated for nearly a decade with no delivery, the housing trajectory is over-optimistic, legal challenges and viability issues (including Grosvenor’s objections) have delayed progress and that the Council should have reserve sites or consider an early review.
- 8.4 Many comments indicate infrastructure as theme, with concern that infrastructure cannot support the proposed or increased housing numbers. These concerns relate to congestion on the A40, uncertainty about timing, funding and feasibility regarding the Carterton-Witney-Oxford Rail Corridor, parking and car dependency and a lack of sewage capacity, with a lack of upgraded sewage treatment works planned.
- 8.5 Some commenters suggest that no further development should proceed until major upgrades, such as A40 duelling, improved junctions or the rail corridor, are complete.
- 8.6 Other comments express concern that the combined growth of Salt Cross and West Eynsham will result in excessive pressure on the village, loss of Garden Village principles through higher densities, negative impacts on local character and landscape and insufficient green space. There are some calls for the growth to be shared with other communities.
- 8.7 The impact on community services is a significant concern raised in comments, with pressure on healthcare and schools in the area. Comments suggest that new provision should be fully funded and aligned with housing delivery, with careful phasing for schools and early years provision.
- 8.8 Environmental concerns are highlighted in some comments, with recommendations of buffers around ancient and priority woodland, the importance of nature recovery, ecological networks, and GI links, the avoidance of extra land being taken beyond the current allocation and the consideration of hydrological impacts on Oxford Meadows SAC.
- 8.9 A small number of comments propose reconsidering Barnard Gate as a preferred site, expanding Salt Cross to absorb housing from nearby parishes or extending garden village-style development to other rail-linked settlements (e.g., Tackley)

Question 8 – Should the allocation be updated, should it address the quantum of development and CWORC plus any other relevant changes in circumstance since 2018?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are concerns regarding deliverability and uncertainty of the rail project (CWORC)**
- **More evidence is required to avoid a risk to soundness**

- 9.1 Comments of support suggest that the Carterton-Witney-Oxford Rail Corridor (CWORC) could support sustainable future transport needs and help reduce reliance on cars in addition to justifying higher densities.
- 9.2 Other comments suggest support if perceived issues are addressed. Such concerns include that the rail proposal may not be delivered within the plan period, that there are unclear technical feasibility, alignment, noise, topography and visual impacts, a risk of severance within Salt Cross or between Eynsham and the new development, a need for significantly more evidence before incorporating into policy and that any route must minimise impact on existing settlements such as Cassington.
- 9.3 Some comments also suggest that there is a risk that housing would be built but that the rail would never follow, it could disrupt or undermine the masterplan for Salt Cross and that severance impacts and land-take could damage place-making in addition to forcing densities beyond garden village principles.
- 9.4 There are calls from some commenters to rethink or abandon CWORC proposals, citing it could undermine the soundness of the plan if based on an unrealistic scheme, allocation may need to be re-planned entirely if CWORC is pursued and that there are risks of creating unviable development footprints.
- 9.5 It is suggested that an alternative to the CWORC would be alternative transport improvements (for example A40 upgrades or bus/cycle improvements) which are seen as more realistic and urgent.

Question 9 – Do you support the principle of updating and refreshing the existing allocation for the West Eynsham SDA as part of the Local Plan 2043?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There is uncertainty regarding transport capacity and A40 access**
- **Deliverability, infrastructure and scale of growth are raised as concerns**
- **There is concern regarding cumulative impact on Eynsham and local communities**

- 10.1 Many comments support updating and refreshing the allocation, noting that West Eynsham is already an established strategic site in the adopted Local Plan.
- 10.2 Several comments also strongly suggest that West Eynsham should play its part alongside Salt Cross, rather than development pressure falling entirely elsewhere.

- 10.3 Some comments express concern about the cumulative scale of growth when West Eynsham is combined with Salt Cross, with up to 3,750 new homes. These concerns include the perception that increased densities could undermine Garden Village principles, village character, and quality of life and there are calls for development to be shared more fairly across other communities.
- 10.4 Some comments note that, while supporting densification in principle, it should not be at the expense of placemaking, character, and integration, with calls for strong design codes, walkability, and high-quality public realm.
- 10.5 Other respondents suggest that densifying existing allocations should be prioritised over new sites.
- 10.6 Multiple comments question whether the increased housing numbers are realistic given that only ~24% of the original allocation has been delivered to date, planning applications have been withdrawn or stalled and there are perceived issues with fragmented landownership.
- 10.7 There are requests for stronger justification, evidence, and updated master planning before confirming the allocation, with several comments noting the absence of a clear delivery trajectory in the draft plan.
- 10.8 Many comments suggest that transport and the A40 are of concern, with comments noting existing congestion on the A40, particularly at peak times. Other comments highlight concerns that proposed mitigations, such as the park and ride, rail proposals and rapid bus transit, will not be sufficient, funded or delivered in time and uncertainty and delays due to changes to the A40 improvement scope, lack of confirmed access arrangements and no clear approval from the Highways Authority are also highlighted.
- 10.9 Concerns are also noted that continued uncertainty will delay delivery of housing within the plan period.
- 10.10 This has resulted in strong calls for certainty on A40 access, a single, integrated junction solution with Salt Cross and better consideration of bus routing reliability and stop locations.
- 10.11 Calls for other development to not outpace infrastructure are made, with healthcare, education, transport and active travel highlighted. Comments particularly note concerns about secondary school and early years provision.
- 10.12 Priority woodland and archaeological remains are cited in comments as requiring careful treatment and further investigation and concerns are noted that revised road layouts may negatively affect green and blue infrastructure corridors.

Question 10 – Should the allocation be updated, should it address the quantum of development and the updated A40 Access Options Assessment (June 2025) plus any other relevant changes in circumstance since 2018?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are concerns surrounding the A40 capacity and access**
- **Environmental, heritage and utilities constraints are highlighted**
- **An ‘infrastructure first’ approach is called for**

- 11.1 Many comments indicate support for retaining the West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (SDA) in the emerging Local Plan, with further support for the delivery of more dwellings than originally stated, without extending the current boundary. There are calls for the existing allocation to be updated to reflect new evidence, particularly since adoption of the original policy.
- 11.2 Several comments suggest modest boundary extensions to align infrastructure such as the spine road fully within the allocation and to include nearby sites that are considered sustainable, well-located, and capable of early delivery without additional A40 impacts.
- 11.3 It is suggested by a few comments that West Eynsham is critical to meeting West Oxfordshire’s housing requirements and should work in conjunction with Salt Cross Garden Village.
- 11.4 Some respondents emphasise the acute housing shortage in Oxford and see Eynsham as a logical and sustainable solution.
- 11.5 A repeated concern, noted in comments, relates to traffic impacts on the A40. Many comments strongly advocate for significant upgrades to the A40, particularly between Witney and Wolvercote. Concerns are also raised about construction impacts, including road closures, diversions, and travel disruption.
- 11.6 Comments suggest support for acknowledging the updated A40 Access Options Assessment (June 2025), which identifies a signalised crossroads (Option D) as the preferred access solution. However, several comments believe that signalised junctions will worsen congestion, advocating instead for full dualling of the A40 with motorway-style slip roads.
- 11.7 Comments indicate strong concerns regarding the lack of a committed sewage/grey water disposal solution for the SDA, with respondents highlighting that Cassington Sewage Treatment Works is the nearest option but note there is no confirmed capacity upgrade in Thames Water’s AMP8 programme (2025–2030). This is perceived as a major risk, particularly with regard to protecting the River Thames and its Bathing Water Status at Wolvercote, and compliance with national planning policy.
- 11.8 Several comments raise concern that archaeological and heritage matters have not been adequately integrated into access planning, with respondents suggesting that insufficient early consideration could result in delays, increased costs, and risks to delivery, and recommendations are made for formal liaison with the Council’s archaeological adviser.

- 11.9 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements have been noted by some comments, highlighting that the approved 2022 Masterplan did not account for the mandatory 10% BNG, which may require additional land take. Other respondents caution against increasing housing numbers without first assessing BNG implications.

Question 11 – Do you support the principle of updating and refreshing the existing allocation for the North Witney SDA as part of the Local Plan 2043?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Flood risk and environmental constraints are cited as concerns**
- **Deliverability and soundness of the allocation is questioned**
- **Infrastructure dependency, particularly around transport, is featured as a concern**

- 12.1 Comments suggest mixed views regarding the updating and refreshing of the North Witney Strategic Development Area (SDA).
- 12.2 Many comments suggest opposition to or strongly question the principle of updating and refreshing the North Witney Strategic Development Area (SDA), while a smaller number of comments support retaining and refreshing the allocation, often with updated policy wording or reduced housing numbers.
- 12.3 Some comments question the viability and deliverability of the SDA, citing high infrastructure costs (cited figures of £90m+), multiple landowners and lack of equalisation agreements, fragmentation of the developer consortium and slow progress since allocation in 2018.
- 12.4 Concern that keeping North Witney in the plan could undermine the five-year housing land supply and weaken the soundness of the Local Plan is noted in some comments, with suggestions to reduce capacity (from 1,400 to 1,250 or less) and reallocate the shortfall to more deliverable sites.
- 12.5 Other concerns highlighted by comments include loss of agricultural land and biodiversity, landscape impacts and sensitivity of floodplain areas.
- 12.6 Suggestions are made to develop less sensitive parcels only, split the development into smaller sites or consider alternative locations, including land south of the A40 or other sites near Witney with better transport links.
- 12.7 Multiple comments indicate a strong belief that the West End Link Road (WELR) is a non-negotiable requirement, essential for traffic mitigation, public transport reliability, and active travel and an adopted Local Plan commitment.
- 12.8 Comments indicate concern that developers are seeking to downgrade or remove infrastructure commitments, especially by relying on “active travel” instead and many

respondents highlight that without the WELR, the North Witney SDA is not viable and should be removed from the plan.

- 12.9 Perceived worsening congestion is highlighted by many comments, particularly around Bridge Street, West End, New Yatt Road and Hailey Road.
- 12.10 Comments suggest that traffic modelling is incomplete or unrealistic and note that New Yatt Road was excluded from modelling, despite being a main access route. Comments indicate the belief that active travel alone will not significantly reduce car use in a market-town context, with some comments suggesting an expected 2000+ additional cars, worsening bus reliability and increased delays for existing residents.
- 12.11 Flooding is cited by comments as a serious concern, with respondents highlighting that the site is already in a flood-sensitive catchment, Hailey Road and Bridge Street flood regularly, that the Environment Agency has objected to current proposals and that proposed mitigation has been described as inadequate or unproven.
- 12.12 Comments suggest that flood mitigation must protect both the site and downstream areas, be engineered for future climate impacts and be delivered before occupation, not later. Some comments highlight opportunities for strategic, district-wide flood defence but insist this must be secured through firm policy requirements.
- 12.13 Widespread agreement that essential infrastructure must be delivered before any housing is suggested by comments.
- 12.14 Comments indicate concerns about pressure on GP surgeries, schools (especially secondary education) and sewerage and water capacity, with several respondents suggesting that North Witney should be planned as a self-sustaining community and not a car-dependent extension of the town.
- 12.15 Some comments broadly support active travel in principle but indicate that it will be very difficult without the West End Link.
- 12.16 Other comments suggest that distances and routes are not realistic for many residents, with cycling routes involving steep hills and unsafe junctions and that promoting active travel is being used to justify the removal of roads.

Question 12 – Should the allocation be refreshed and updated, do you support a reduced quantum of development (1,250 homes)? Are there any other parts of the allocation that should be updated?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are concerns regarding infrastructure deliverability – especially transport**
- **Questions about the appropriateness and scale of housing numbers are raised**
- **Environmental and servicing constraints are seen as concerns**

- 13.1 Many comments suggest support for a reduction of housing number with the perception that 1,250 homes is already the upper limit of what the site can realistically accommodate.
- 13.2 These comments indicate concerns regarding constraints, including flooding, sewage capacity, land availability and deliverability which it is perceived will result in far fewer achievable homes, in addition to concerns regarding the West End Link Road (WEL), which was seen as a fundamental prerequisite in the 2031 Local Plan.
- 13.3 Other comments indicate support for retaining or increasing housing numbers and emphasise the need to maintain overall housing delivery across the district, accepting 1,250 homes as a pragmatic figure that is perceived to reflect current planning applications.
- 13.4 Some comments suggest that if numbers are reduced at North Witney, alternative or adjoining sites should be allocated, for example land south of Hailey Road. Other suggestions are for sites to be freshly reassessed, rather than carrying forward partially undelivered strategic allocations.
- 13.5 There are also some calls for flexibility in policy, revised boundaries, and early-phase delivery to support the five-year housing supply.
- 13.6 Some comments voice concern that congestion will increase if housing proceeds without the WEL and that it is still necessary and should remain a requirement.
- 13.7 Other comments suggest that the WEL is no longer justified, conflicts with current transport policy, may increase traffic overall and should be removed from future policy.
- 13.8 Comments also suggest that the site risks undermining the Council's five-year housing land supply if infrastructure cannot be delivered in advance.
- 13.9 It is the belief of some commenters that the SDA allocation should be removed entirely from the Local Plan as the site is perceived to be financially unviable, fragmented in ownership, and dependent on unresolved infrastructure commitments and that Witney is already at or near saturation due to past developments.
- 13.10 Many comments regarding infrastructure raise serious concerns about infrastructure readiness, including sewerage capacity and illegal sewage discharges (with calls for Thames Water upgrades before development), flood risk and environmental impacts, including loss of green fields, trees, biodiversity, and landscape character. Strong calls for infrastructure being delivered before development are made.

13.11 Some comments suggest that prioritising “active travel” policies is not appropriate for a rural market town with an ageing population.

Question 13 – Do you support the principle of updating and refreshing the existing allocation for the East Chipping Norton SDA as part of the Local Plan 2043?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Questions regarding deliverability and realism of the CNI allocation are asked**
- **Infrastructure-led development and past delivery failures are highlighted**
- **There is disagreement regarding scale, location and sustainability of growth**

- 14.1 Many comments indicate that the majority support refreshing the allocation in principle, with conditions relating to infrastructure, heritage, sustainability and deliverability.
- 14.2 Comments indicate a widespread perception that the existing allocation cannot continue unchanged.
- 14.3 Supportive comments highlight that Chipping Norton is a Tier I Main Service Centre and one of few locations that is capable of strategic growth outside the National Landscape, with several commenters suggesting that if capacity is reduced, additional sites must be allocated elsewhere to compensate or risk a district-wide housing shortfall.
- 14.4 Several comments support a reduced capacity (c.750 homes) that reflects constraints.
- 14.5 Some comments support a refreshed approach provided that archaeological and ecological assets are protected, with a strong emphasis on respecting the Scheduled Monument, protecting nearby Glyme Valley SSSI and using buffers, green infrastructure, hydrology assessments and LNRS principles.
- 14.6 Less supportive comments suggest that the strategic-scale development is inappropriate and that growth should be below 300 dwellings with several respondents citing a lack of due diligence before allocating the site originally.
- 14.7 Some comments indicate that the current CNI allocation is undeliverable due to scheduling of significant Roman and Iron Age archaeology, failure to deliver the previously envisaged eastern link road and that only 173 of c.1,200 homes have been delivered since allocation.
- 14.8 Comments suggest repeated calls for a single comprehensive masterplan, plan-led growth, phased, realistic and cross-authority accountability (such WODC, OCC, NHS and developers).
- 14.9 One condition noted by many comments is that critical infrastructure should come first, before development, including healthcare expansion, primary school provision, walking and cycling routes which are LCWIP compliant, sports pitches and leisure facilities and public transport improvements. Comments recommend public transport improvements which include an increased S3 frequency, reinstatement of an X8 “Railbus” service and a better rail connectivity to Charlbury / Kingham.

- 14.10 Concerns are raised by comments that past developments failed to deliver promised infrastructure, particularly footpaths and crossings.
- 14.11 Comments concerning transport note strong opposition to car-dependent growth due to congestion on the A44, poor rail access and limited bus services on Banbury Road. There are calls for a travel hub with definition, Oxford express bus services and junction upgrades at the A44 double roundabout.
- 14.12 Some comments regarding sites North-of-London-Road express the belief that the distant from town centre is too great and too steep or inaccessible for less mobile residents.
- 14.13 Many comments suggest that land south of London Road is more sustainable due to proximity to services and buses.

Question 14 – Should the allocation be updated, should it be based on a reduced quantum of development with a northern focus primarily on the land between London Road and Banbury Road plus any other relevant changes in circumstance since 2018?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are mixed views regarding the scale and location of housing development**
- **Concerns about infrastructure capacity and delivery are raised**
- **There are concerns regarding environmental, heritage and landscape impacts**

- 15.1 Comments indicate broad support for updating the allocation, which is thought to be both necessary and appropriate, to better reflect environmental, heritage and landscape constraints.
- 15.2 Responses show significant concern about the scale, location and infrastructure impacts of development in Chipping Norton.
- 15.3 Support in principle is demonstrated by comments, for a reduced quantum of development primarily to address heritage and landscape impacts. Several comments suggest that even 750 homes is too many, given recent and committed development, potentially increasing the town's population by up to 50%.
- 15.4 Many respondents agree development should shift north of London Road, where land is seen as less constrained.
- 15.5 Comments also suggest that green infrastructure, sustainable transport, drainage, biodiversity enhancement, and infrastructure delivery must be integral to any scheme.
- 15.6 Some comments dispute whether the evidence supports reducing capacity below 750 homes, suggesting land south of London Road still has potential.
- 15.7 Others suggest total capacity could be 800–850 homes, combining areas north and south of London Road.

- 15.8 A small number of comments suggest that housing in Chipping Norton should be maximised to reduce pressure elsewhere in the district, while others propose alternative strategies, including a new settlement elsewhere (e.g. near Enstone Airfield) or re-classifying Chipping Norton as a Service Centre rather than a Principal Town.
- 15.9 Comments indicate a strong perception that Chipping Norton lacks the capacity to absorb significant growth with concerns surrounding traffic congestion and road safety, air quality, insufficient sewerage and wastewater capacity, Healthcare capacity, Parking shortages and limited scope for major highway improvements due to the town's topography and setting.
- 15.10 Comments regarding environmental and ecological matters indicate strong concerns about development at this scale due to potential impacts on the Glyme Valley SSSI, Nature Reserve, CTA and LNRS. These comments suggest that the key risks identified include harm to farmland bird populations, rare flora, and limestone grassland; hydrological impacts on the River Glyme and increased recreational pressure, lighting and noise.
- 15.11 Mitigation suggested, if the development proceeds, includes a large on-site nature reserve (suggested minimum of 50 hectares), extensive green infrastructure and off-site habitat creation and long-term management funding

Question 15 – Do you support the principle of updating the existing allocation for REEMA North and Central as part of the Local Plan 2043?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There is support for brownfield regeneration and housing delivery**
- **There are concerns about delivery and infrastructure capacity**

- 16.1 Many comments indicate support for updating and refreshing this site, with respondents noting it as brownfield land and in a highly sustainable location in Carterton, helping reduce pressure on surrounding villages and greenfield sites.
- 16.2 Comments suggest that the site should be maximised for development, with high-density development (particularly 1–2 bedroom and affordable homes) widely supported.
- 16.3 There are strong calls for affordable housing, with support for housing linked to MOD operational needs. A request for a specific Local Plan policy for MOD establishments, addressing Agent of Change principle, noise, transport, and safeguarding issues, recognition of MOD land as brownfield and support for military housing on MOD land, is noted.
- 16.4 Other comments question whether homes intended exclusively for military use should count towards general housing need and whether further town-centre sites should also be allocated to reduce outward expansion.
- 16.5 Several respondents note that development should support the regeneration of Carterton, including links to town-centre renewal.

- 16.6 Comments indicate concern regarding sewage and wastewater capacity at Carterton STW, with investment perceived as being required, in addition to concerns regarding road capacity, parking pressure and construction traffic.
- 16.7 Comments also indicate strong concerns regarding development at Alvescot Downs, citing loss of open countryside, harm to historic character and conservation areas and a risk of coalescence with Carterton.
- 16.8 There are calls for stronger green infrastructure requirements, including increased tree cover and comments indicate concerns about environmental stress from higher densities.
- 16.9 Some comments highlight the perception that there is a long history of stalled or delayed delivery at REEMA sites, with concern that current or pending planning applications (including the December 2025 application for 265 homes) cannot yet be relied upon for housing delivery.

Question 16 – Should the allocation be refreshed and updated, should it continue to be based on an assumed quantum of 300 homes plus any other relevant changes in circumstance since 2018?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There is a consensus that the existing housing figure is outdated and should be increased,**
- **Scope for higher-density, well-designed schemes is requested**
- **There is a need for the delivery of affordable and smaller homes**

- 17.1 The majority of comments indicate support for reviewing or refreshing the proposed allocation for this site.
- 17.2 Comments also indicate a strong consensus that housing capacity should be increased, commonly to around 300–350 dwellings, based on updated evidence since earlier plans which is seen as justified and sound.
- 17.3 It is perceived by some comments that this increase would reduce pressure on other, less suitable sites. A fewer number of comments suggest increasing housing numbers further.
- 17.4 Other comments indicate that recent developments (e.g. Brize Meadow) should be factored in and allocations should be reassessed in light of real, current needs.
- 17.5 Comments indicate strong support for higher-density development on REEMA sites, particularly REEMA North and Central, with respondents highlighting a perception of significantly underutilised land within central Carterton, opportunities for infill development and the potential to improve townscape and site appearance.
- 17.6 There is also emphasis from some comments on linking sites to the Country Park to enhance accessibility.

- 17.7 Multiple comments highlight the urgent need for affordable housing, especially one- and two-bedroom homes, with support for high-density but well-designed schemes.
- 17.8 Several comments express concern that private developers may be reluctant to deliver these homes and as a result, many recommend delivery by the local authority and/or not-for-profit housing associations.
- 17.9 A small number of commenters perceive that the draft plan risks failing the tests of soundness and that housing delivery assumptions from existing large allocations are too over-optimistic. They also feel that policy restrictions on smaller settlements may be too rigid.
- 17.10 Some calls are made for modifications to core policies, particularly to allow appropriate development in smaller and medium-sized settlements where impacts can be mitigated. These comments support for a more dispersed approach, relying on small and medium sites to ensure steady housing delivery.

Question 17 Area A – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are concerns regarding environmental and landscape impacts**
- **Concerns regarding flood risk and infrastructure capacity are highlighted**
- **There are mixed views regarding scale of development and housing numbers**

- 18.1 Comments suggest mixed views regarding this site.
- 18.2 Supportive comments highlight that Area A is adjacent to Witney, the district’s largest settlement, close to employment areas, within reach of existing bus corridors and a compact, logical extension of the town.
- 18.3 These comments also place a strong emphasis on Area A being available, viable and deliverable, noting the current severe housing undersupply and failure to meet delivery targets.
- 18.4 Some comments state the belief that 600–800 dwellings is too low, with calls to increase capacity to around 1,200 dwellings. It is thought that this would be an efficient use of land (NPPF compliance) and at a scale needed to support a local centre, public transport improvements and a “mobility hub.”
- 18.5 Suggested mitigations indicate that impacts can be addressed through extensive green infrastructure (often cited as ~40–50% of site), tree belts and landscape buffers, sustainable drainage (SuDS), Biodiversity Net Gain (minimum 10%) and transport mitigation focused on active travel and bus enhancements rather than major new roads.
- 18.6 Comments which indicate objections to the site cite local and environmental factors.

- 18.7 Comments suggest that the site would cause serious harm to the Windrush Valley, described as an area of exceptional beauty and tranquillity and a key “green lung” for Witney.
- 18.8 There are also strong concerns about loss of open countryside and valley views, urban sprawl extending Witney northwards and a visual impact on the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL), especially west of Dry Lane.
- 18.9 Recommendations include reducing the scale, avoiding ridge lines, and possibly excluding land west of Dry Lane altogether.
- 18.10 Comments also suggest concerns regarding flood risk and drainage. There are repeated references to historic flooding in the Windrush Valley and Witney town centre (Bridge Street) and surface water run-off risks from development on valley slopes.
- 18.11 Concerns also highlight that Dry Lane already floods and the perception that development would worsen flood risk downstream.
- 18.12 There are calls for major flood attenuation and natural flood management and for developers to fund flood defence infrastructure.
- 18.13 Comments surrounding biodiversity and ecology indicate strong objections regarding the proximity to ancient woodland, veteran trees and multiple Local Wildlife Sites and the risk of habitat loss, fragmentation, lighting and recreational pressure with the Windrush Valley described as exceptionally rich in biodiversity.
- 18.14 Requests noted by comments include 50m buffers to ancient woodland, a large on-site nature reserve (up to ~40 hectares) and significant reduction in housing numbers (some suggest <350 homes if developed at all) and alignment with the LNRS.
- 18.15 Comments highlight nearby highly designated heritage assets, including the Minster Lovell ruins (Grade I / Scheduled Monument), St Kenelm’s Church (Grade I) and conservation areas and Chartist settlement. Comments also indicate concerns about impacts on the setting and character of Minster Lovell.
- 18.16 There are calls for Heritage Impact Assessments and archaeological evaluation and mitigation.
- 18.17 Comments indicate concerns regarding existing congestion (Burford Road, Dry Lane, Bridge Street) and limited road capacity and the risk of ‘rat-running.’
- 18.18 Comments also suggest that public transport is seen as insufficiently convenient or accessible without major upgrades and that there is a lack of walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure.
- 18.19 Air quality is also an issue which is raised by comments.
- 18.20 One comment suggests that the eastern section of the site does not flood and could be used as land for allotments.

Question 18 Area B – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Questions as to whether the site should be used for employment or residential use**
- **There are concerns regarding transport and infrastructure capacity**
- **There are concerns about the impact on landscape, settlement identity and the environment**

- 19.1 Comments suggest mixed views regarding whether the site would be more suitable for residential or employment use.
- 19.2 Comments that highlight support for employment use suggest that this is due to proximity to the A40, the amenity impacts for housing and the relative distance from Witney town centre.
- 19.3 Comments that highlight opposition to employment use is widespread among indicate key concerns regarding HGV traffic, industrial scale and lack of demonstrated need given that there is vacant employment land elsewhere.
- 19.4 Multiple comments question whether there is a genuine need for additional employment land in this location and there is a perception that existing vacant employment sites have been adequately considered.
- 19.5 Strong support for residential use of the site that is indicated by comments highlights that a live outline planning application for ~370 homes has been made and that there is evidence that housing impacts have been assessed and mitigated with a desire to direct employment land instead to Area D, which adjoins existing employment areas.
- 19.6 One comment suggest that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is inconsistent and flawed, stating that residential use performs well in assessments, employment use could generate greater landscape and visual harm due to scale and building height and that the site is not genuinely “isolated” and has good connectivity potential.
- 19.7 Comments have raised concerns regarding traffic, with recurring comments indicating concerns about the road network capacity (especially Brize Norton Road and Downs Road) and the HGV impact on villages, pedestrian safety, and congestion.
- 19.8 Broad agreement shown in comments suggests that significant transport mitigation is seen as essential, including developer funding for public transport enhancements, a bus turning loop within the site, contributions toward strategic A40 / mass transit solutions and improved walking, wheeling and cycling links to Witney and Carterton.
- 19.9 Some respondents propose a transport hub (bus/rail/park and ride) and safeguarding a potential Oxford–Carterton rail corridor.

- 19.10 Comments express strong concern that development would create continuous development between Witney and Minster Lovell and erode Minster Lovell's separate village identity.
- 19.11 There are therefore calls for a green wedge or undeveloped buffer and reducing the scale of Area B or restricting development to the eastern portion. Some comments also recommend reducing Area B in order for it to be kept further from the Cotswold National Landscape.
- 19.12 Comments acknowledge significant archaeological interest, including Iron Age / Roman features and later medieval and post-medieval remains. Comments suggest further desk-based assessment and field evaluation are required, with archaeological significance that could constrain development form and extent and suggestions that archaeology could be preserved or interpreted on site or in museums.
- 19.13 Comments highlight the presence of Grade 2/3 Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land, a need to retain ponds and embed green infrastructure and the importance of alignment with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).
- 19.14 Comments indicate concerns raised about a partial loss of Witney Lakes Golf Course and sports provision.
- 19.15 There is general support for biodiversity enhancements regardless of land use.

Question 19 Area C – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Flood risk and environmental constraints are raised as concerns**
- **Incompatibility with existing infrastructure (STW and Abattoir) is suggested**
- **Some comments consider it to be an unsustainable location that would cause harm to the settlement pattern**

- 20.1 Many comments suggest significant opposition to the allocation of site C for housing.
- 20.2 Comments indicate that flooding is seen as a major constraint, with references to the land being low-lying, part of an active floodplain, especially around Colwell Brook, which it is highlighted as having a need to protect, including its habitats and nearby ancient woodland. There is also strong concern that development would displace floodwater, worsening flooding upstream (Witney) or downstream (Ducklington).
- 20.3 Concerns are raised by comments regarding Witney Strategic Sewage Treatment Works (STW) and a halal abattoir, which are repeatedly described as incompatible with housing amidst concerns including odour, noise, flies, lighting, health impacts (including respiratory issues) and a risk to future expansion of essential infrastructure.

- 20.4 Some comments suggest strong objection unless buffer zones and safeguards are included, citing conflict with safeguarded waste infrastructure. Comments also state that STW capacity upgrades would need to be substantial, not minor.
- 20.5 Other comments indicate strong concern that development would erode the countryside setting of Ducklington and lead to coalescence between Witney, Ducklington and Curbridge.
- 20.6 Past planning decisions and SHELAA findings have been cited, suggesting that the area is unsuitable due to unsustainable urban sprawl.
- 20.7 Additionally, the A40 is seen as a clear southern boundary of Witney, which it is perceived that this proposal would breach.
- 20.8 Concerns regarding accessibility are noted by comments. The site is described as severed by major roads (A40 and A415), with Witney town centre ~2km and access to Ducklington village amenities is considered unsafe or unattractive, particularly at busy roundabouts.
- 20.9 Many comments believe development here would be highly car dependent and that, while there is some bus provision and proximity to Lidl and services at the A415, most homes would be beyond easy walking distance.
- 20.10 Several respondents suggest Area C would be more appropriate for employment, industrial, science, or mixed-use development, while others indicate that housing numbers should instead be redistributed to more sustainable villages or focused on existing strategic sites higher in the settlement hierarchy.
- 20.11 Comments suggest that existing infrastructure is already at capacity and that further growth would be harmful.
- 20.12 The safeguarded Cowley–Witney–Oxford rail corridor (CWORC) runs through the site.
- 20.13 Some commenters perceive the Carterton-Witney-Oxford rail corridor (CWORC) as an opportunity for a new Witney station or mobility hub. Other comments see it as technically complex, highly costly and likely to reduce developable land and increase severance.
- 20.14 Multiple respondents question whether the rail proposal is realistic or deliverable at all.
- 20.15 Comments indicate mixed views in relation to capacity on the site, with suggested ranges from 600–800 dwellings up to 1,200–1,500 dwellings.
- 20.16 Comments supportive of the higher range indicate that only a very large scheme would justify a primary school and local centre and support public transport improvements.

Question 20 Area D – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are concerns regarding coalescence and loss of settlement identity**
- **Heritage, landscape and countryside impacts are highlighted**

- **Sustainability and infrastructure capacity is questioned**

- 21.1 Many comments indicate that Area D would erode or eliminate the strategic gap between Witney (Tier 1 town) and Minster Lovell (Tier 3 village). There are strong calls for a permanent, meaningful green gap to prevent settlements merging with an emphasis that Minster Lovell must remain a distinct, separate settlement, not subsumed into Witney.
- 21.2 Comments highlight that Area D lies very close to highly designated heritage assets, including Grade I Minster Lovell Hall ruins and St Kenelm's Church, Grade II* Dovecote and Minster Lovell Conservation Area (less than 100m away). The Chartist Estate in Minster Lovell is also highlighted as a non-designated heritage asset of national significance, with its historic linear plot layout and protected backlands.
- 21.3 There are calls for a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) before any allocation.
- 21.4 Many comments highlight that Area D is also within the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape and near the Windrush Valley. Concerns include visual impact from elevated land, a loss of open countryside and harm to tranquillity and dark skies.
- 21.5 Recommendations from comments include reducing the western and northern extent of development, retaining the most northerly fields as undeveloped and strong landscape buffers and green infrastructure.
- 21.6 Repeated comments raise doubts about whether Area D is sustainable without major investment, with significant concern about lack of capacity at Witney Sewage Treatment Works and a risk of increased pollution and illegal discharges.
- 21.7 Comments regarding transport highlight concerns about an over-reliance on the 234-bus route, with concerns about its long-term viability, the distance from bus stops and the town centre reduces sustainability and a fear of increased congestion on Burford Road / Minster Lovell routes.
- 21.8 Concerns regarding pressure on GP services, schools, and other community infrastructure is also raised by comments, along with perception that residents may not feel part of Witney due to distance and poor connectivity.
- 21.9 Comments suggest more support for employment land than for large-scale housing, with several respondents suggesting that Area D should be employment-led, as it adjoins existing industrial estates and that residential development should be directed elsewhere (for example Area B or Ducklington).
- 21.10 Comments that indicate support for mixed-use proposals suggest that Area D performs well for employment access, air quality and economic objectives.
- 21.11 Strong buffers to Minster Lovell, careful design and reduced scale are emphasised.

- 21.12 Indicative capacities of 600–925 homes are widely viewed by comments as too large, with suggested alternatives including smaller-scale or reduced footprint development, relocation or redesign involving the golf course (though this is controversial) and a greater emphasis on green infrastructure, nature recovery, sports provision, and allotments.
- 21.13 Placemaking is highlighted as critical due to the distance from Witney town centre with a risk of creating an isolated or disconnected community.

Question 21 Area E – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are concerns regarding infrastructure capacity and deliverability**
- **Questions regarding whether Area E is suitable for strategic-scale growth at all, and if so, at what scale are raised**
- **Environmental, landscape, and community impact concerns are highlighted**

- 22.1 Comments indicating support for the site suggest that it is deliverable in the short term (potentially within first 5 years), could contribute significantly to housing supply and can function as either an extension of Carterton or a new self-contained settlement if large enough.
- 22.2 These comments suggest 1,200–2,000+ dwellings are appropriate for the site, with some suggesting 1,500 homes are easily achievable, citing that larger scale (1,400+) is essential to support schools, shops, and viable public transport.
- 22.3 Other comments suggest that Area E conflicts with the Local Plan’s spatial strategy and Brize Norton’s Tier 3 village status, risks coalescence between Carterton, Brize Norton, and Shilton and would fundamentally change the character of the area.
- 22.4 Some comment suggest an indicative capacity of 700–800 dwellings, with other suggesting a smaller scale (100–150 homes) may be acceptable.
- 22.5 Comments place a strong emphasis on sports provision, particularly reprovision or protection of Carterton FC pitches and note a chronic shortfall in grass and 3G pitches across Carterton and West Oxfordshire.
- 22.6 Several comments indicate that a new sports hub and pitches must be delivered before any loss of existing facilities and that development should help solve, not worsen, the sports deficit.
- 22.7 Infrastructure capacity is widely cited as a critical issue by comments, with Carterton STW already at or near capacity, concerns about illegal sewage discharges during wet weather and strong calls for infrastructure to be delivered before occupation of homes.
- 22.8 Comments regarding transport indicate poor existing bus provision, long distances to existing services (often over 1km), fear of increased congestion on A40, Upavon Way, and local roads.
- 22.9 Comments indicating support suggest that this is conditional on a new bus route or future rail link.
- 22.10 Healthcare, education and services are indicated as overstretched with concerns that development would not be matched by new facilities.

- 22.11 Many comments indicate concern about a perceived impact on Kilkenny Lane Country Park, with the park valued for biodiversity, dark skies, tranquillity and a sense of separation from urban areas.
- 22.12 Comments suggest strong concerns about lighting, commuter cycle routes and increased footfall and “cut-through” use, with requests to pull development back from the park edge and retain or extend green buffers.
- 22.13 Comments note that the area lies within the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape and issues which are raised include visual impact and topography (110m contour debated), light pollution affecting dark skies, archaeological interest (Iron Age and Roman remains) and priority woodland and LNRS ecological corridors.
- 22.14 There is general agreement that further assessments (HIA, archaeology, landscape, noise) are essential.
- 22.15 Comments note RAF Brize Norton considerations including aircraft noise and safeguarding, the importance of not constraining RAF operations and strategic road access for military transport.
- 22.16 Some comment note that the RAF is not expected to expand employment, weakening arguments for housing growth linked to the base.
- 22.17 One comment objects to the proposed site due to the area lying within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for crushed rock and the risk of sterilising a strategic mineral resource. Calls for a Mineral Resource Assessment before allocation are made.
- 22.18 Some comments express that Questions 20–24 cannot be meaningfully answered without a full spatial strategy.
- 22.19 Comments also note confusion over the relationship between strategic sites and settlement hierarchy and differences between council housing figures and developer proposals.

Question 22 Area F – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Major infrastructure deficiencies (transport, sewage/water and services) are highlighted**
- **There are concerns about disproportionate growth and settlement identity**
- **Environmental and land-use constraints (landscape, minerals, biodiversity and heritage) concerns are raised**

- 23.1 Many comments suggest that the site could function as a new standalone settlement or “garden village”, rather than an extension of Carterton, with some comments suggesting it could house 3000+ dwellings.

- 23.2 Some comments indicate that Area F is deliverable (single ownership, single developer) and can provide new homes, employment land, schools, health facilities, sports, and open space and a new link road improving access to Carterton and RAF Brize Norton.
- 23.3 These comments also suggest that the site performs better than other Carterton options against national policy on sustainable growth and offers a rare opportunity to deliver high-quality public transport, fund strategic infrastructure and create a planned, comprehensive community rather than piecemeal growth.
- 23.4 Strong concern from comments suggests that the scale would overwhelm Brize Norton, alter its village character and lead to coalescence with Carterton and Minster Lovell. Comments also suggest that Carterton has reached its physical limits and that all options are inherently disjointed, making Area F no worse than alternatives.
- 23.5 Concerns are voiced regarding infrastructure, with repeated claims that the existing sewerage and wastewater system is already failing.
- 23.6 Other infrastructure concerns that are voiced include pressure on GPs, with surgeries already at capacity, primary and secondary schools being oversubscribed and water supply capacity and pressure issues. There are calls for infrastructure to be in place before occupation.
- 23.7 Comments regarding transport highlight congestion on the A40 as a major concern and estimates suggesting that development could add 20,000+ vehicle movements per day.
- 23.8 Concerns are also raised regarding 'rat-running' through Brize Norton village and capacity and safety at Burford Road and Station Road.
- 23.9 Some comments suggest scepticism that a future railway (CWORC) would solve short- to medium-term traffic problems.
- 23.10 Limited access points into the site are noted by some comments.
- 23.11 Comments which highlight support for the site indicate that Area F sits on an existing strategic bus corridor and that it offers the best opportunity for bus priority, mass transit, and a new A40–Monahan Way link road. It is suggested by comments that development could help justify CWORC and other rapid transit investment.
- 23.12 Comments which concern environmental and landscape impacts suggest strong objections to loss of farmland and agricultural land, biodiversity impacts, including farmland birds, hares, deer, owls, lapwings, and woodland habitats and proximity to the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL).
- 23.13 Other concerns highlighted by comments include light pollution and dark skies, potentially extending deeper into the CNL, insufficient buffer zones (many call for 200m green buffers) and flood risk and downstream impacts, including on RAF Brize Norton.
- 23.14 Supportive comments suggest that impacts can be mitigated through careful master planning, setbacks from the A40 and CNL, Biodiversity Net Gain (10%+) and green infrastructure and woodland planting.

- 23.15 Comments regarding heritage and historic assets suggest significant concern about impacts on Minster Lovell's Chartist Estate, identified as a non-designated heritage asset of national importance and ancient rights of way, drove roads, and Roman routes (for example Ting Tang Lane).
- 23.16 Comments also suggest concerns that development would permanently erode historic settlement patterns and rural identity.
- 23.17 One comment expresses a strong objection due to the site's location within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for crushed rock, a risk of sterilising mineral resources and the proximity to active quarrying, recycling, and waste operations. The comment further states that Area F currently conflicts with adopted Minerals & Waste policies unless further evidence (e.g. Mineral Resource Assessment) is provided.
- 23.18 Comments regarding aircraft noise and safeguarding constraints, the protection of operational capacity and flight paths, the need to ensure flood risk does not affect the airfield and the importance of maintaining strategic road access for military vehicles are also voiced.

Question 23 Area G – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are infrastructure and environmental constraint concerns**
- **There is a questionable need for additional employment land in this location**
- **Concerns about cumulative impact on Brize Norton and the settlement character are raised**

- 24.1 Support is indicated by some comments for the allocation of this site for employment land as it is seen to offers jobs near proposed new housing, could align with RAF Brize Norton-related innovation and could be part of a bigger cluster of growth to the east of Carterton. Calls for it to be more broadly defined (for example care, education, food growing, co-working) are made by some comments.
- 24.2 A small number of comments express support for the allocation without conditions.
- 24.3 One comment strongly supports the allocation, with the suggestion of a 10.8 ha of employment land integrated with a new village of up to 3,000 homes (Area H) in addition to the delivery of a relief road bypassing Brize Norton, a country park and extensive GI, a cycling/walking network, mobility hub, A40 upgrades and land safeguarded for a future railway.
- 24.4 This comment also suggests that there are no major ecological or heritage constraints and that landscape effects can be reduced through a revised masterplan.
- 24.5 Suggestions for the site include an indoor sports facility, hotel, pub and a technical college.

- 24.6 Some comments suggest employment should instead be incorporated within Area F.
- 24.7 Many comments indicate the belief that additional employment land here is unnecessary due to existing employment sites in Carterton and Witney remaining vacant, employment land at Brize Meadow and Monahan Way has failed to attract occupiers and the growth in home-working reduces demand.
- 24.8 Comments that highlight landscape and environmental aspects suggest concern about the visual impact on Brize Norton village, the loss of farmland, and the harm to local wildlife, including hares, deer, barn owls, lapwings, and other farmland birds.
- 24.9 Comments highlight the need for a landscape-led approach with woodland and buffers, concerns over habitat loss, especially given cumulative development nearby, requests for 200m green buffers, structural planting, and strong GI networks and it is noted that some land lies within an area mapped for river and riparian habitat restoration.
- 24.10 Some comments highlight the need for a proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment, with potential effects on nearby listed assets, especially Astrop Farmhouse noted.
- 24.11 Comments also note the archaeological potential including cropmarks, ring ditch, enclosures, and possible Anglo-Saxon cemetery and highlight that a geophysical survey is required.
- 24.12 Many comments suggest that transport is of concern, with significant existing congestion on the A40, Station Road, Brize Norton Road and surrounding routes and concerns regarding increased HGV traffic and safety issues on narrow village roads.
- 24.13 One comment highlights a lack of clear walking, cycling, and public transport connections to surrounding settlements and other comments suggest that sloping topography makes the site unsuitable for large-scale employment uses.
- 24.14 Insufficient wastewater treatment capacity (for example, reliance on Brize Norton SPS), the historic failure by Thames Water to deliver improvements, the need for better-than-greenfield runoff rates to avoid downstream flooding, especially affecting RAF Brize Norton and concerns over freshwater supply pressure are voiced by some comments.
- 24.15 One comment notes that development must not constrain operational activity associated with RAF Brize Norton and must ensure that aircraft noise is accounted for, that it protects transport access for heavy equipment, it ensures no increase in flood risk to the airfield.
- 24.16 Comments regarding strategic / spatial concerns suggest an unequal distribution of development, with it noted that Brize Norton is already hosting over 46% of proposed district growth and that current/future growth risks overwhelming a designated small village, undermining its identity.
- 24.17 Some comments suggest concern about cumulative impact with Areas E, F, H, I and highlight potential conflicts with neighbourhood plan policies.
- 24.18 Some comments suggest that the proposal would be more appropriate as part of Area F or H, is poorly aligned with a credible public transport corridor and would contribute to car-dependent sprawl.

Question 24 Area H – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Major infrastructure constraint (highways, transport and utilities) concerns are raised**
- **The suitability of the location – environmental, landscape & RAF constraints – is questioned**
- **Stakeholders highlighted conflict with spatial strategy and a disproportionate impact on Brize Norton**

- 25.1 Many comments indicate strong concern regarding the allocation of this site.
- 25.2 Comments regarding the environment and landscape highlight concerns about the loss of agricultural land and harm to landscape setting, biodiversity loss, especially farmland birds and flora, proximity to ancient woodland (Round Copse, Ten Acre Copse, Huck’s Copse) and the need for buffers and flood risk and concerns about impacts on the Shill Brook with the area seen as a major incursion into open countryside.
- 25.3 Comments also highlight infrastructure constraint concerns including that sewage and wastewater capacity are already insufficient, freshwater supply pressures, congestion on the A40, highways costs and bypass infrastructure considered “inordinate” and the perceived questionable viability of sustainable transport or mass transit serving this isolated location.
- 25.4 Comments regarding transport and connectivity note concerns regarding the site distance from existing bus corridors which are seen as unlikely to generate demand for frequent services, concerns that it will become a car-dependent satellite settlement, the thought that cycling/walking routes are currently inadequate and the anticipated need for mass rapid transit before occupation.
- 25.5 Comments which reference RAF Brize Norton highlight concerns that large areas of the site lie directly under or near main flightpaths with noise and military operational constraints noted and the unsuitability of housing close to the airbase emphasised.
- 25.6 Some comments indicate the perception that the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy is inconsistent with Brize Norton’s role as a Category 3 village (small-scale development only) and the plan’s strategy focusing on growth in Carterton, yet most sites are around Brize Norton.
- 25.7 Comments perceive an over-concentration of growth with Brize Norton taking 40–50% of the district’s housing needs which would ‘swallow up’ Brize Norton and alter its rural character. Calls for more even distribution are made.
- 25.8 A need for a proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment due to nearby scheduled burial mound and listed assets is highlighted by comments.
- 25.9 Comments which indicate support for the allocation suggest potential benefits of the site including the ability to deliver substantial housing needed in the district, that, if master planned well, could create a vibrant new community and opportunities for new

infrastructure, including a relief road, schools, healthcare facilities, a country park and walking and cycling routes.

- 25.10 Other strategic location benefits suggested by comments include a good relationship to proposed employment at Area G, could allow improved access to A40 and support future rail/MRT options and offers potential east–west links without impacting Brize Norton village.

Question 25 Area I – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Environmental and landscape constraints (including flooding and biodiversity) are raised**
- **It is thought to be an unsustainable location with transport/connectivity failures**
- **Infrastructure capacity and settlement impact are considered to be of concern**

26.1 Many comments suggest strong opposition to this allocation.

26.2 Comments regarding environmental, landscape and heritage highlight concerns that this is a sensitive landscape forming Carterton’s long-standing soft western edge, including the Shill Brook Valley – a Conservation Target Area (CTA) and part of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, rolling, open countryside with high landscape value, important views, tranquillity, and rural character and priority habitats, ancient woodland links, and multiple red-listed farmland bird species.

26.3 Several comments note that the area previously formed an Area of High Landscape Value and was rejected in earlier local plan examinations for the same reasons.

26.4 One comment states development here would cause “devastating” ecological impacts, including habitat fragmentation, recreational pressure, hydrological impacts, and loss of wildlife corridors.

26.5 Other comments include concerns about flooding, drainage and sewage infrastructure failures across many parishes including that land is regularly flooded and waterlogged in winter, sewage infrastructure already overflows illegally into the Shill Brook, SUDS are unlikely to function due to poor ground permeability and a risk of increased downstream flooding, including in Alvescot, Langford, Clanfield, Broadwell and others. Reference to flooding in 2007 and 2023 was made by many comments.

26.6 Respondents suggest that the site is poorly connected and fundamentally unsustainable and is physically separated from Carterton by the Shill Brook corridor, would operate as a stand-alone estate, not a well-integrated neighbourhood, access routes (B4477, Shilton Lane) are narrow, dangerous, and already at capacity, there is an increased risk of rat-running through Alvescot, Filkins, Kencot, Langford, and others, bus travel times to Oxford already exceed 90 minutes and no credible improvement planned, walking/cycling links are currently poor and require new bridging of Shill Brook and the site is not near A40 or strategic roads.

- 26.7 Several comments also note that it is poorly located for commuting, locking in car dependency.
- 26.8 Pressure on services and utilities is also noted by comments, with concerns regarding healthcare capacity, primary and secondary schools, sewage treatment and water supply, electricity, broadband, drainage capacity and emergency services.
- 26.9 Comments suggest concerns regarding a loss of agricultural land and rural identity with a perception that productive grade 2/3 agricultural land would be lost, a threat of coalescence between Carterton, Alvescot, Filkins, Kencot, harm to the Cotswolds visitor economy and rural character and concerns that this creates a precedent of urban sprawl.
- 26.10 Comments regarding the Carterton–Witney–Oxford rail line note that it has no committed funding, is unlikely within the plan period, is not justified to extend to Alvescot Down and could cause substantial landscape impacts.
- 26.11 One comment requires safeguarding for flight paths, bird-strike concerns from SUDS/ponds and control of floodwater impacts downstream in relation to RAF Brize Norton.
- 26.12 There are concerns about the site being described as “scalable”, which some commenters interpret as a threat of long-term westward expansion, which is strongly opposed.
- 26.13 One comment supports the allocation, considering the site to be deliverable at an early stage with one landowner, provides opportunities to “balance” Carterton’s growth westward, can deliver 1,000 homes, primary school land, local centre and green infrastructure, can enhance the Skill Brook corridor and landscape structure and suggests good walking/cycling access to Carterton and potential improvements to bus services.
- 26.14 This commenter also states that technical work shows drainage, ecology, heritage, and landscape impacts are manageable and supports the railway concept, but that development should not be dependent on it.
- 26.15 A few comments express that there are some potential advantages to the site (for example, the proximity to a secondary school and its compact form although these comments also highlight major concerns about sustainable travel and bus viability).
- 26.16 Some comments support growth around Carterton in principle, but not this site.

Question 26 Area J – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Suitability and sustainability of the location is questioned**
- **Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impact concerns are highlighted**
- **There is concern surrounding infrastructure capacity and delivery**

- 27.1 Supportive comments for this site suggest that the area is suitable, highlighting good access to supermarkets, health facilities, and bus services and suitability for commuters due to links to Oxford, Banbury, Milton Keynes, Birmingham.
- 27.2 Some comments also suggest preference for this area over previously proposed sites near Charlbury Road and a view that Chipping Norton needs to take more housing growth, with it perceived that the north of the district needs to accommodate a fairer share of development.
- 27.3 Comments suggest that support is strongest where development is seen as less intrusive than other options and capable of delivering needed homes and growth.
- 27.4 Other comments suggest strong opposition to the allocation, stating that the site is too far from the town centre (up to 2km) to encourage walking/cycling, is car-dependent, worsening traffic, parking, and air pollution, is poorly coordinated with Oxfordshire County Council's land south of London Road (Tank Farm), which it is thought is a more sustainable and central location and is vulnerable to over-development, as other development may still bring forward additional land south of London Road, leading to >750 homes overall.
- 27.5 Comments suggest major landscape, environmental and biodiversity concerns including impacts on Glyme Valley SSSI, BBOWT nature reserve, Local Wildlife Sites, and Conservation Target Areas, recreational pressure on sensitive habitats, hydrological impacts on the Glyme watercourse, impacts on dark skies, tranquillity, and the rural landscape and the development increasing Chipping Norton's footprint by 23–24%, far exceeding what is considered proportionate (10%).
- 27.6 Recommendations made by commenters to reduce the impacts of these concerns include the consideration of reducing the allocation from 750 to <400 homes, requiring large-scale green infrastructure, including a minimum 15 ha nature reserve and the avoidance of development near the most ecologically sensitive fields.
- 27.7 Further suggestions include the strengthening of buffers, tree planting and SuDS features. It is also highlighted that traditional orchard and archaeological issues need careful treatment.
- 27.8 The presence of a scheduled monument south of London Road is seen by comments to create a major constraint and it is expressed that additional archaeological evaluation is needed north of London Road.
- 27.9 Some comments welcome that the new proposal is perceived as avoiding harm to the monument, unlike the former strategic allocation.
- 27.10 Infrastructure needs are highlighted by comments. There are calls for a new or expanded primary school and for land to be safeguarded for health centre expansion.
- 27.11 Comments also express concern that the cricket club lies within the draft allocation and is at risk, in addition to Chipping Norton lacking public football pitches. Suggestions include a new sports hub, including 3G pitches and changing facilities and working with the Field Reeves Trust to secure land.

- 27.12 Sewage capacity is also highlighted as a concern by comments, with widespread agreement from comments that Chipping Norton sewage treatment works must be upgraded before any development.
- 27.13 Comments regarding transport suggest that the previously planned eastern link road may not be delivered, raising concerns about traffic impacts, that bus services would require reconfiguration and that the double roundabout at A44/Banbury Road is already poor for active travel.
- 27.14 One comment suggests a concern regarding the proposed use of Russell Way as an access route, highlighting that it is a closed-end road and the only vehicular access to both Chipping Norton Health Centre/Community Hospital with concerns relating to how safe it would be with the number of users.
- 27.15 Some comments suggest that additional alternative sites around Chipping Norton should be assessed, with the perception that previous strategic allocations failed partly due to infrastructure issues. It is also suggested that smaller sites (for example, Land West of Burford Road) should also be allocated to ensure delivery across the plan period.
- 27.16 A significant number of commenters advocate reconsidering Tank Farm (south of London Road) as a site, which is closer to the town centre (approximately 500m), has better walking access via Rockhill, Rowell Way, Wards Road and Fox Close and is more integrated with existing community facilities.

Question 27 Area K – Is this a suitable location for strategic-scale development? What are the reasons for or against strategic-scale development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **It is considered that severe infrastructure constraints (physical, social and utilities) exist**
- **There are significant environmental and biodiversity impacts**
- **Suitability of Long Hanborough for further large-scale growth is questioned**

- 28.1 The majority of comments express the belief that Long Hanborough is incorrectly classified as Tier 2, strongly suggesting that it functions as a large village (Tier 3) and lacks the amenities of a service centre.
- 28.2 Many comments further state that existing growth has been far above proportionate levels, with ~35–56% growth since 2011 (four times district average) and that with North Field and Area K, the total increase would exceed 32% above 2021 levels. It is perceived that proportional growth should be around 10%, not 30–50%.
- 28.3 Comments strongly suggest that infrastructure capacity is ‘already beyond breaking point’, with concerns regarding the GP surgery and pharmacy being at capacity, with long waits and severe parking pressure and no physical space for expansion, the primary school and

Bartholomew Secondary School are full and early-years childcare is described as critically oversubscribed.

- 28.4 Water and sewerage are also noted by comments as a major concern, with insufficient capacity and frequent flooding of the pumping station near the site cited, along with reports of sewage spills, odours and contamination of local rivers (the Evenlode and Windrush Rivers). Comments also note that Thames Water has no deliverable upgrades before 2030–2035.
- 28.5 Concerns from comments indicate perceived transport Issues, with the A4095 and Lower Road described as dangerous, narrow and over capacity. Comments also suggest that Lower Road junction with A4095 is a known accident hotspot.
- 28.6 Comments suggest that both railway bridges (Lower Road and A4095) present severe safety and capacity constraints and that there is a significant risk of increased congestion, pollution and accidents.
- 28.7 The sustainability of the railway station is questioned, with comments indicating that the car park is full by 7.20–8.00am and that 81% of station users arrive by car. Comments further suggest that trains are often overcrowded, delayed or cancelled and that bus services are infrequent and poorly aligned to train times, especially from villages like Freeland.
- 28.8 Comments suggest that the A4095 cycle/pedestrian path is too narrow, with poor visibility and near-misses, which is perceived to affect active travel.
- 28.9 Environmental & biodiversity issues, which are repeatedly cited by comments, include concerns about Pinsley Wood ancient woodland, with the perception that development will affect wildlife corridors, bat foraging areas, badger setts (largest known in Oxfordshire) and bluebell carpets and understorey habitats. NPPF 183 (protection of irreplaceable habitats) is repeatedly cited in comments.
- 28.10 Comments state that Site K sits in a major corridor connecting Cogges Hill → Freeland → Church Hanborough → Pinsley Wood → Evenlode Valley → Burleigh Wood, with confirmation of at least 11 species of bats (including Barbastelle & Greater Horseshoe), roe deer routes and multiple active badger setts.
- 28.11 Flooding is also cited as a concern, with comments stating that fields in Area K regularly flood and that Lower Road and the A4095 frequently become impassable. Further concerns indicate a risk that further hard surfacing would worsen downstream flooding.
- 28.12 Some comments suggest that development would urbanise open countryside forming the rural setting of Long Hanborough, Pinsley Wood and The Evenlode Valley and cause harm to the historic landscape character, public rights of way views and a potential visual relationship with Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site.
- 28.13 Comments cite that Site K sits on the far eastern edge of an already elongated village and concerns suggest that it will create a “bolt-on” estate, detached from the community, with suggestions that residents at Hanborough Park already report feeling isolated from the main village.

- 28.14 One comment that expresses support for the allocation of Area K consider that the site should deliver 650 homes, citing proximity to the railway station and the Government’s proposed “default yes” for housing near stations, with infrastructure upgrades and large green-infrastructure buffers proposed.
- 28.15 Support for development is also suggested in order to improve viability of bus routes, enable a new link road to serve Salt Cross and to create cycling connections to the station. These comments acknowledge heritage constraints, the sensitivity of Pinsley Wood and a need for careful design and buffers.
- 28.16 Other objections noted by comments include that the site would sterilise a safeguarded mineral deposit, that it is unsustainable and harmful, warns of impacts on ancient woodland and the LNRS corridor, requires a 50m buffer as a minimum and is too damaging to the site’s ecology. It is also noted that a full HIA, due to risks to Blenheim Palace’s setting, would be required.
- 28.17 Comments further suggest concerns regarding dark skies and tranquillity.
- 28.18 Many calls are made for the removal of Site K from the Local Plan, reclassification of Long Hanborough to Tier 3 and growth capped at no more than 10%, tied to deliverable infrastructure.

Question 28 - Do you support the principle of updating and refreshing the existing allocation for Woodford Way car park, Witney, as part of the Local Plan 2043?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There is strong opposition to loss of parking capacity**
- **Conditional support would be considered only if parking is retained or re-provided**
- **Wider strategic concerns - transport, growth and infrastructure planning - are raised**

- 29.1 The majority of comments suggest an objection to, or express serious concerns about, the development of Woodford Way car park for housing.
- 29.2 Many comments suggest that the car park is heavily used and often full and that its removal would worsen parking pressures for shoppers, town centre workers, visitors and patients at local surgeries and the community hospital. It is also expressed that reduced parking could harm the town centre economy by lowering footfall.
- 29.3 Comments also indicate that Witney already struggles with parking availability, cycling uptake and public transport and that new housing developments in North and East Witney (and others proposed to 2043) will significantly increase parking demand.
- 29.4 It is also suggested that there is no clear parking strategy for Witney, making the allocation premature and that without a replacement car park of equal or greater capacity, development should not proceed.

- 29.5 Some comments express concern that reducing parking would increase illegal parking and congestion.
- 29.6 Several comments suggest alternatives, indicating that they may support development if a multi-storey car park is built on-site to retain or increase existing capacity.
- 29.7 Additional suggestions for alternatives include housing built above retained parking and building higher-density housing due to the central urban character.
- 29.8 Improved bus routes, including a potential express service via the new A40 slip road, are also suggested.
- 29.9 An assessment of traffic and placemaking impacts, archaeological assessment and clarity on housing numbers are also called for.
- 29.10 A smaller number of comments express support for the allocation due to it being a sustainable location, the policy aims to prioritise sustainable transport and it meets local housing need.

Question 29 – Should the allocation be refreshed and updated, do you agree that this should better reflect anticipated site capacity (75 homes) plus any other relevant changes in circumstance since 2018?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are strong concerns about the loss of car parking**
- **There is a need to consider heritage and environmental impacts**

- 30.1 Many comments suggest that parking in Witney is already under pressure and should not be reduced. High demand, future population growth, and the needs of people travelling from rural areas with limited public transport are highlighted.
- 30.2 Comments also note that the car park serves important local facilities (for example for the doctors' surgery and the hospital).
- 30.3 Several comments call for retaining the existing car park, providing a multi-storey option, or ensuring a net increase in parking if development happens. One comment suggests that free/affordable parking for core users should be retained.
- 30.4 Comments suggest that an evidence-based approach is necessary before making capacity changes. It is also recommended that any review must consider impacts on the conservation area and Unterhaching Park.
- 30.5 Some comments suggest support for updating the capacity to 75 homes.

Question 30 Area L – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Infrastructure capacity and settlement sustainability are questioned**
- **There is disagreement over the scale, location, and direction of growth**
- **Statutory constraints are highlighted - minerals, archaeology and transport**

- 31.1 Many comments indicate concerns regarding infrastructure, highlighting the perception that GP surgeries, school places, and local shop provision are currently inadequate.
- 31.2 Comments also indicate that roads around Bampton are prone to flooding, sewage infrastructure needs upgrading (with upgrades not due until 2028) and that bus services are limited, particularly in the evenings and on Sundays, which is seen to increase car dependency.
- 31.3 Concerns about overdevelopment and cumulative expansion since 2017 have been highlighted, with a desire to avoid coalescence with Aston. Other commenters feel the village is already overcrowded with limited parking.
- 31.4 A lack of active travel connectivity is highlighted, with a need for walking and cycling improvements.
- 31.5 Some comments raise minerals safeguarding constraints for the site with further evidence required and archaeological sensitivities are noted, with Roman finds nearby.
- 31.6 One comment challenges a lack of evidence for the 150-home figure. This comments also notes that a previous HELAA identified much larger potential capacity and highlights that the allocation may lead to pressure for far more than 150 units.
- 31.7 A further comment suggests other rail-connected villages may be more appropriate for larger allocations.
- 31.8 Comments indicating support for the allocation support distributing growth more evenly across the district rather than focusing on larger towns.
- 31.9 Several comments agree that Area L relates well to the built-up area, suggesting that the location is sustainable, outside the conservation area, and well-contained in landscape terms.
- 31.10 Some commenters feel that the 150-home figure is too low, highlighting that full capacity could be upwards of 300 dwellings if multiple land parcels are included, suggesting that the allocation should extend north/east (e.g., along Mount Owen Road and Aston Road). These comments suggest that Bampton is under-utilised given its Tier 2 status.
- 31.11 One comment of support suggests that the HELAA assessment relied on incorrect flood zone mapping.

- 31.12 Another comment that supports development suggests that demand helps sustain bus services and should contribute to service enhancements, especially during the evenings and on Sundays.
- 31.13 One comment notes that growth in Bampton could support wider Carterton-area infrastructure.
- 31.14 Alternative site proposals which are suggested by comments include Land south of Aston Road, Land west of Station Road (which is suggested as a more sustainable location with better access to the village centre) and North of Bampton as it is perceived as better for traffic movements and avoiding pressure on the village centre.

Question 31 Area M – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Infrastructure capacity and service deficiencies exist**
- **There are concerns regarding the conservation area & character impact**
- **Suitability of Aston as a development location is questioned**

- 32.1 Many comments suggest community opposition, citing major concerns that Aston cannot accommodate further development, having already experienced significant recent growth without matching infrastructure improvements.
- 32.2 It is suggested that roads are in very poor condition (such as North Street, Aston Road and the B4449) and narrow, unsafe with lorry issues and only patch repairs.
- 32.3 Comments also highlight public transport as a concern, with infrequent bus service and no evening or Sunday services, which is seen as promoting car dependence.
- 32.4 Other infrastructure concerns include flooding and drainage, with existing surface water flooding, no sewage capacity and a risk of environmental harm. It is also cited that Bampton GP is oversubscribed and understaffed, Aston Primary School is at/near capacity with no planned expansion and there is only one, volunteer run shop and one part-time pub.
- 32.5 Many comments emphasise Aston's Conservation Area status, suggesting that development would harm rural views, openness and heritage setting with a request for a proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment. Some commenters note the perception that they face strict restrictions on home alterations while large developers appear exempt.
- 32.6 Some comments suggest that Aston is less sustainable than other settlements (such as Milton-under-Wychwood and Bampton). It is noted that walking/cycling routes are inadequate, with no continuous safe links to nearby towns in existence.
- 32.7 Potential increases in noise, pollution and harm to biodiversity are also noted.

- 32.8 One comment notes that previous archaeology investigations have revealed features and that further mitigation is required.
- 32.9 Another comment states that sustainable access details are lacking and must be addressed.
- 32.10 Comments note that Area M is already subject to two active applications, and the consultation document should not prejudice their determination.
- 32.11 One comment suggests that the map is inaccurate as it does not show the new development north of Marsh Furlong where 30+ dwellings have been built.
- 32.12 Some supportive comments suggest that it appears to be a logical infill/consolidation and that Aston should contribute to overall district housing needs as smaller rural developments help distribute growth more equitably across the district.
- 32.13 One comment also suggests that some bus service improvements could be supported by development.
- 32.14 One comment supports allocations in Aston generally suggests that the current site may not deliver 40 homes due to sensitivity.

Question 32 Area N – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Stakeholders consider that the site is fundamentally unsuitable for development due to its protected landscape, heritage setting and environmental constraints**
- **Respondents highlight that Burford’s infrastructure cannot support more development — especially roads, school capacity, drainage and the GP surgery**
- **Feedback indicates that there is little or no proven local need for the development**

- 33.1 Comments suggest a strong opposition to the allocation of this site.
- 33.2 Many comments emphasise that building here would cause unacceptable harm to protected landscape as the site lies wholly within the Cotswolds National Landscape, with NPPF paragraph 190 stating that major development in an AONB should be refused except in exceptional circumstances, with it cited that none have been shown.
- 33.3 Comments also suggest that development would cause urban sprawl, harm veteran/ancient woodland and erode the historic rural edge of Burford, with it recommended that the whole site not be allocated, or at most only half (much smaller) could be considered.
- 33.4 Severe traffic and road safety problems are emphasised by comments as being a strong concern. Daily gridlock, dangerous driving, ‘rat-running’ and narrow medieval streets

unusable for modern traffic are cited. Sheep Street is described as a single-lane that is regularly blocked, with vehicles parked on both sides. Tanners Lane is described as a single track with no pavements, used by primary and secondary school children and for nursery drop-offs, dog walkers, families and recreation ground users. Priory Lane and High Street are described as already congested and unsafe.

- 33.5 Comments perceive that adding ~150 cars (70 houses + service vehicles + coach park) would make all routes unsafe for pedestrians, increase air pollution, risk blocking emergency access and drive more 'rat-running' through Witney Street, Barns Lane and Pytts Lane.
- 33.6 These traffic impacts are seen as severe and unacceptable.
- 33.7 Other infrastructure concerns which are raised by comments describe Burford Primary School as oversubscribed (50% over in one year), with the site seen as unable to expand further and Burford Surgery as at or beyond capacity, with the registering of new patients suspended.
- 33.8 Many comments suggest that the development is socially unfair, as it causes wider educational inequality.
- 33.9 Historical and archaeological importance of the site is noted, with it cited that the site includes or borders Battle Edge (AD 752), ancient woodland belonging to Burford Priory and proximity to Grade I listed Burford Priory and the Conservation Area. A full Heritage Impact Assessment is requested along with an archaeological survey (human remains have previously been found).
- 33.10 One comment suggests that the historic harm alone should prevent allocation.
- 33.11 Flooding and drainage is a concern which is highlighted. Multiple comments note that the field lies on a steep slope, with water regularly running onto Sheep Street, creating flooding and dangerous ice. Commenters believe that hard surfacing (roads, roofs, car park) would worsen flooding, runoff into Priory Woods and downstream sewage overflow in the Windrush. It is cited that the infrastructure delivery reports show Burford's drainage and water supply are already fragile.
- 33.12 Comments suggest concern regarding environmental and biodiversity harm, including the impact on ancient woodland and wildlife, loss of green space essential for wellbeing, the threat to mental health, ecology, and views and negative impact on dark skies and tranquillity.
- 33.13 One comment insists the site must be avoided or buffered to protect ancient woodland.
- 33.14 Comments indicate a perceived lack of demonstrated housing need, citing many unsold homes at Cotswold Gate and across OX18. It is also stated that Burford has already grown by 25% from the new estate and that another 70 homes would equal 34% growth in 4 years which is seen as disproportionate for a historic small town.
- 33.15 It is stated by some comments that WODC must show "exceptional local need", which it is seen to not have done.

- 33.16 Comments highlight concern regarding harm to Burford’s economy and tourism, stating that Burford’s economy relies on its medieval character, heritage setting, landscape and visitor appeal.
- 33.17 Comments indicate the perception that more housing and traffic will result in fewer visitors, with a coach and car park on Sheep Street harming Burford’s brand. It also cites that tourism reports show traffic is already the town's greatest weakness.
- 33.18 It is noted by some comments that a 70-home scheme on Cole’s Field (similar context) was strongly opposed by Burford Town Council and WODC in 2023 and it is seen that the same reasons apply here, yet some councillors now support Area N.
- 33.19 It is noted that Burford Town Council formally asks WODC to remove Area N entirely from the Local Plan.
- 33.20 Some comments propose alternative sites, including Tannery Yard / Burford Laundry (brownfield land), Burford Caravan Park (brownfield land), smaller infill only (≤ 10 homes per site) and A40 corridor options for coach parking, not Sheep Street.
- 33.21 Several supportive comments suggest that the site is sustainable and could include parking. One comment recommends using S106 money to enhance infrastructure.

Question 33 Area O – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Access and highway safety constraints are raised**
- **Landscape, conservation, and biodiversity impacts (Cotswolds National Landscape) are highlighted**
- **Insufficient local infrastructure and community capacity highlighted.**

- 34.1 Many comments express concern regarding access and highways, citing the perception that safe and suitable access cannot be achieved.
- 34.2 Comments suggest that access would rely on narrow 1970s residential streets, with heavy on-street parking, functioning as single-lane roads.
- 34.3 Comments also suggest that removing the Cottsway garages, to create access would eliminate vital parking and worsen congestion.
- 34.4 It is also cited by comments that it would be impossible for construction traffic to manoeuvre safely.
- 34.5 It is suggested that the Ditchley Road/The Slade junction already experiences blind corners, congestion and agricultural machinery conflicts and that emergency vehicles already struggle and would be further impeded.

- 34.6 Comments also note that Hundley Way is a bridleway, unlit and unsuitable, and already ruled out by Oxfordshire County Council.
- 34.7 Other concerns regard the impact on the Cotswolds National Landscape with the emphasis that the site lies wholly within the CNL, with this development seen as constituting major development, requiring “exceptional circumstances” which are not demonstrated.
- 34.8 It is also considered by some comments that a large estate on a prominent sloping site would introduce a hard urban edge, harm key views from Banbury Hill, Enstone Road and Hundley Way, diminish rural character and tranquillity and increase light pollution.
- 34.9 Some comments state that development *may* be possible if reduced in scale and subject to strong landscape mitigation.
- 34.10 Comments regarding ecology, wildlife and biodiversity suggest that the field and boundary trees are reported to host bats (protected species), barn owls, deer, foxes, hedgehogs, wild orchids and roman snails.
- 34.11 Other ecological issues raised include that the site lies within a Great Crested Newt impact risk zone, that tree/hedgerow removal on the boundary is alleged, some during nesting season, the emerging Local Plan requires 20% Biodiversity Net Gain, which the scheme is said not to meet and the site is identified within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).
- 34.12 Further infrastructure concerns highlight that Charlbury’s infrastructure is at capacity including that the primary school is full, the medical centre cannot meet current demand, town centre and station parking are heavily oversubscribed, sewerage and power supply issues already exist (such as frequent power outages and drain overflows) and public transport (buses) is seen as too infrequent to mitigate car dependency.
- 34.13 Many comments cite conflict with Charlbury Neighbourhood Plan, Local Plan policies (current and emerging) and the NPPF. Charlbury Neighbourhood Plan emphasises small-scale, locally needed housing, not major greenfield expansion.
- 34.14 Other comments highlight Charlbury’s locally assessed affordable housing need (23 homes) which is seen as far fewer than the 40 proposed. It is also cited that this site was previously rejected during the last Local Plan examination.
- 34.15 Social, safety and community impacts are emphasised by comments, including concerns regarding the loss of children’s safe play areas and cycle training zones, a fear of increased accidents, unsafe pedestrian routes, and conflict with elderly residents, a loss of green space used informally by the community, concerns about noise, dust, disturbance during construction and long-term and some references to potential antisocial behaviour from poorly integrated high-density development.
- 34.16 Concerns regarding flooding, drainage and run-off state that the site is on a sloping field, increased impermeable surfaces would cause runoff into existing homes, no credible SuDS strategy has been proposed and that it contradicts Local Plan policy on flood risk (EH7).
- 34.17 A smaller number of comments suggest that Charlbury needs new housing or affordable housing, with good rail and bus links and that development could support local services.

- 34.18 Another comment emphasises that the site has passed HELAA/SHELAA assessments and that the proposal can enhance open space provision (a new play area).
- 34.19 A further comment suggests that the site is “potentially suitable” if the scale is reduced, the layout avoids western slopes, strong landscape mitigation is applied and the design uses Cotswold stone and local vernacular.

Question 34 Area P – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Access and movement constraints (highways, pedestrian safety and sustainability) are highlighted**
- **Environmental, landscape and heritage impacts (CNL, conservation area and the setting of assets) are of concern**
- **There are flooding, drainage and ground condition concerns**

- 35.1 Comments indicate strong highways & access concerns, with Fawler Road (B4022) seen as narrow, twisting, with blind bends, fast traffic, and no pavements. Roads are considered unsafe for vehicles, especially with increased traffic from 40 homes and it is highlighted that there is no safe pedestrian route to Charlbury, the school, station or services.
- 35.2 Other comments indicate issues with flooding and drainage, with water flowing from Woodstock Road and Stonesfield Lane into the site. It is stated that a persistent pond forms near the proposed access, lasting for weeks in winter and the main sewer runs along the high point of the field, raising questions about capacity for additional homes.
- 35.3 Landscape and environmental harm is indicated, with the site lying within the Cotswolds National Landscape and Charlbury Conservation Area. Development here is seen as highly visible on approaches to the town, damaging to the scenic rural character and potentially harmful to wildlife (hedgehogs, bats, birds, hares and toads).
- 35.4 There are also comments which indicate concern about illegal earthworks already altering landscape and habitat.
- 35.5 One comment states concern that the site has not been assessed for major development status.
- 35.6 Comments which emphasise infrastructure highlight concerns that town centre parking is already saturated, the school and GP surgery capacity is under strain, development is seen as an isolated satellite, not integrated with the town and there will be an increased car dependency, due to lack of walkable access.
- 35.7 Comments suggest that public transport is infrequent and walking/cycling infrastructure substandard. It is highlighted by one comment that investment is required to make active travel realistic but that it would be unlikely to be viable.

- 35.8 Heritage concerns highlight a close proximity to Grim’s Ditch (Scheduled Monument), Cornbury Park (Grade II*) and Cornbury House (Grade I). Potential harm to key views and archaeological assets is suggested.
- 35.9 A proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment is requested by one comment due to multiple heritage assets.
- 35.10 It is suggested that there is a high potential of archaeological due to proximity to Grim’s Ditch.
- 35.11 Conflict with planning policy is suggested, including conflict with the Charlbury Neighbourhood Plan 2031. It is also suggested that the site does not align with principles of sustainable development, represents major development in the CNL without exceptional justification and exceeds the identified local need (23 homes), which are seen as already met by other proposals.
- 35.12 One comment suggests that they would expect development to meet local need for smaller/affordable homes.
- 35.13 Comments also suggest that the site lies beyond the defined edge of Charlbury and extends development southwards onto higher ground, altering the settlement pattern.
- 35.14 One commenter supports development in principle, emphasising that Charlbury is a Tier 2 Service Centre and a sustainable location and that the site’s constraints can be addressed with good design. This commenter disputes flooding issues and highlights an existing field access.
- 35.15 A smaller number of comments express support for the site, noting that Charlbury needs more housing, if access and infrastructure issues are addressed.
- 35.16 One commenter considers that this area is preferable to Area P.
- 35.17 Another comment suggests that Area P could be acceptable only if it is significantly reduced and confined to lower ground, following historic field boundaries.

Question 35 Area Q – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Minerals and waste safeguarding is seen as a major policy obstacle**
- **There are concerns regarding connectivity, infrastructure and settlement form**

- 36.1 Several comments consider Area Q as suitable and logical location for development, with it described as a logical extension of the village, preferable to development west of the A415 and proportionate in scale.

- 36.2 One comment emphasises Ducklington’s sustainability (a Tier 3 settlement, proximity to Witney and good public transport) and indicates that the site integrates well with existing built form and is unconstrained.
- 36.3 One comment notes concerns which include a previous appeal dismissal (2018) due to landscape/character impacts, depth/size of the site and resulting proximity to existing homes, flooding and drainage issues in the area, design concerns in the current application (such as traffic calming, bus stops and open space).
- 36.4 Other comments note that the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sharp sand and gravel and that development could sterilise mineral resources, with a conflict of Policy M8 – a Mineral Resource Assessment is therefore recommended.
- 36.5 Some comments suggest that the site is quite isolated and additional footpath links and bus stop improvements are needed. It is perceived that there is insufficient information on sustainable access—walking, cycling and public transport.
- 36.6 It is noted that the site is adjacent to a priority habitat and is near to Ducklington Mead SSSI and that careful consideration is needed.
- 36.7 Comments indicate that archaeological evaluation has found Roman and Saxon features, including a Roman trackway, enclosure, field system and pottery and Saxon pits and requires mitigation excavation prior to development.
- 36.8 One comment opposing the site suggests that it is detached and poorly integrated, infrastructure-constrained, dependent on sewage capacity improvements and less suitable than growth in Milton-under-Wychwood.

Question 36 Area R – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **The perceived unsustainable, isolated location is seen as conflicting with policy and landscape protection**
- **There is inadequate infrastructure (sewage, roads and services)**
- **Flood risk and downstream impacts are highlighted**

- 37.1 Many Comments cite flooding as a concern, stating that the field forms part of the functional floodplain for the River Evenlode and its tributaries and floods annually and often severely, sometimes causing road closures.
- 37.2 It is suggested that building on the site would increase flood risk downstream, particularly in Bledington, which already experiences repeated property flooding and that approximately half of the site lies within Flood Zone 3 or 3b, where housing is prohibited.

- 37.3 Comments also indicate concern that the sewage infrastructure is already over capacity, stating that the Chipping Norton Sewage Treatment Works (which serves Kingham/Bledington) cannot currently manage flows, causing frequent raw sewage discharges into the Evenlode and with upgrades not expected meet targets until 2040-2045. It is felt that adding further housing would worsen pollution and increase environmental harm.
- 37.4 Poor road access and traffic impacts are noted by comments as concerns, with commenters describing narrow rural B-roads, single-track sections, and a weak bridge in addition to heavy and fast traffic already posing a risk to pedestrians, livestock, cyclists and horse riders. It is perceived that development would intensify dangerous conditions and increase car dependency.
- 37.5 It is also suggested that congestion is exacerbated by the Festival and station users.
- 37.6 Many comments suggest that, despite being next to a railway station, the site is 1–2 km from Kingham or Bledington, with no safe footpaths and that local facilities (such as shops, schools and health services) are too distant for walking, especially given dangerous roads.
- 37.7 It is also noted by comments that there is no meaningful bus service and that development would create an isolated housing estate, disconnected from any village.
- 37.8 Conflict with the proposed settlement hierarchy is also indicated by comments, highlighting that Kingham is a Tier 4 medium village, where only 1–10 dwellings are supported and that 70 dwellings is considered wholly disproportionate. It is suggested that, because the site is detached, it can instead be viewed as Tier 5 open countryside, where no allocations are permitted.
- 37.9 Many comments raise landscape concerns, emphasising that the site lies within the Cotswold National Landscape and that development here would be major development, which requires exceptional circumstances which it is not seen to have demonstrated in this proposal.
- 37.10 Comments suggest that development of the site would harm settlement separation between Kingham and Bledington, views of the Evenlode Valley, tranquillity and dark skies and local ecology including otters, kingfishers, egrets and deer, with a detailed landscape assessment concluding that the proposal is not acceptable.
- 37.11 Other infrastructure concerns indicated by comments include that Kingham and Bledington schools are already full, the proposal would deliver an estate with no natural community identity, there are risks of it becoming a commuter/second-home enclave, not addressing local housing need and local roads and emergency access already strained during major events.
- 37.12 A small number of comments express support including proximity to the rail station, which offers a sustainable travel option, that it can help address housing and affordability needs and provide the potential for business units, biodiversity net gain, transport hub, and environmental design measures. These comments indicate that significant constraints must be addressed, including public transport upgrades, power and water capacity, flooding constraints and careful landscape integration.

- 37.13 Some comments suggest alternative sites, including smaller-scale development within Kingham village (for example KING002), higher-density development limited to the site's eastern flank and prioritising more sustainable sites in Milton-under-Wychwood.

Question 37 Area S – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are sustainability and transport constraints concerns**
- **Environmental sensitivity and flood risk is highlighted**
- **The adequacy of local infrastructure (schools, services and roads) is questioned**

- 38.1 Many comments suggest that Middle Barton is not sustainable for development due to a lack of public transport, high car dependency with no realistic prospect of change and an inability to meet “genuine choice of modes” required by the NPPF.
- 38.2 Concerns regarding infrastructure and local services are highlighted by comments, with perceived insufficient school capacity, medical services, traffic management and flood mitigation, especially relating to the Dorn and recent flood impacts.
- 38.3 Some comments suggest that Middle Barton does not meet the criteria of a “large village” with everyday services and should not be within Tier 3 of the settlement hierarchy.
- 38.4 Environmental and biodiversity concerns raised by comments relate to the proximity to Middle Barton Fen SSSI and the need for hydrological assessment, the potential loss of priority habitats and red-list species nesting areas and the risk of increased flooding to existing homes.
- 38.5 Minerals and waste concerns are noted with the northern boundary touching a soft sand Mineral Safeguarding Area. It is recommended that mitigation should be incorporated to avoid sterilising mineral resources, although the site does not pose a major constraint.
- 38.6 Some comments suggest planning process and policy concerns including the recent planning approval for 80 homes “slipping through” after previous refusals, perceived contradictions with WODC policies on sustainable development, car dependency reduction, and environmental protection and critique of the settlement hierarchy (for example why Tier 5 exists if no villages were moved).
- 38.7 A comment suggesting support for the site considers that Middle Barton does have a good range of facilities (as per WODC hierarchy), that development helps meet local housing needs, including affordable housing, that population stagnation threatens the viability of the primary school and that environmental impacts are manageable through mitigation, including measures for the SSSI.

- 38.8 One comment suggests alternative settlements (for example Milton-under-Wychwood), which are seen as more sustainable, better connected, larger and more capable of absorbing growth and less likely to compromise plan soundness.

Question 38 Area T – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Severe infrastructure constraints (sewage, flooding, utilities and roads) are highlighted**
- **There are scale, suitability and spatial strategy conflict concerns**
- **Environmental, mineral and heritage constraints are raised**

- 39.1 Flooding and drainage concerns are cited by many commenters, with it noted that Standlake lies within or near the Upper Thames floodplain and has a history of frequent flooding, groundwater issues and surface water run-off into the village, with regular reports of flooding of homes, roads and sewers, including historic events in 2007.
- 39.2 Comments suggest that the fields at The Downs act as a natural sponge / flood attenuation area and development is feared to exacerbate village flooding, especially downhill in the High Street and surrounding areas. SuDS solutions are viewed as insufficient in prolonged wet conditions and many comments describe sewage backflow, tankers operating 24/7 in winter, and sewage entering gardens.
- 39.3 Further comments highlight that the sewage network is already over capacity, regularly requiring tankers and emergency pumping, with failed upgrades to ageing infrastructure. These comments indicate concerns that 200 new homes would worsen sewage discharge into watercourses and increase pollution.
- 39.4 Comments suggest that the proposed scale of development is disproportionate, with many respondents highlighting that 200 homes is incompatible with Standlake's classification as a Tier 3 Large Village, which are intended for 1–50 homes (small/medium scale growth).
- 39.5 Comments consider that 200 homes would a 33% increase, which is seen as far above policy guidance and there are claims that such a proposal contradicts the Local Plan's own spatial strategy.
- 39.6 Comments highlight that Tier 2 centres (such as Charlbury and Burford) will receive fewer homes.
- 39.7 Comments indicate that there are infrastructure limitations, with very limited village facilities. Respondents highlight that there is no GP surgery or NHS dentist, no secondary school and no local medical services. There is one small shop and Post Office with comments suggesting that a new shop at The Downs would undermine the existing one.

- 39.8 It is also noted by commenters that the primary school is close to capacity, with children already sent to other villages, that there is no mains gas and unreliable electricity supply with frequent outages and that the village has narrow roads, limited pavements, poor cycle links, and traffic congestion on the A415, especially at Newbridge.
- 39.9 Standlake is described by comments as car-dependent, with limited opportunities for modal shift. It is highlighted that bus services exist but are seen as infrequent, slow or poorly aligned with commuting needs and that a lack of walking/cycling infrastructure makes the site remote from village centre amenities (over ½ mile to school).
- 39.10 Comments suggest that the site is productive agricultural land, contributing to local food security. There are also concerns that development would destroy habitat corridors used by migratory birds, deer, hares, and other wildlife and would have impacts on the Lower Windrush Valley, a sensitive ecological area.
- 39.11 Comments indicate strong concern that the development would destroy the linear historic character of Standlake and that The Downs site is physically detached, creating a “bolt-on estate” separated from the village. It is suggested that there is a risk of creating a fragmented settlement rather than strengthening the existing village form.
- 39.12 There are multiple references to known and potential Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman, Saxon, and medieval remains, with archaeological evaluations already showing significant features; comments suggest that more investigation is required.
- 39.13 Comments suggest major objections to the site’s proposed allocation, citing that the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sharp sand and gravel—a strategic reserve. It is highlighted that development could sterilise mineral resources, conflicting with Oxfordshire’s Minerals & Waste Local Plan. Comments also suggest that a Mineral Resource Assessment is required as one is yet to be provided.
- 39.14 Comments highlight concerns about impacts on neighbouring councils, including the flood-sensitive Thames catchment, the A420 Kingston Bagpuize roundabout capacity and the need for coordinated infrastructure planning.
- 39.15 A smaller number of comments indicate support for the site, with some suggesting that it could support 300–500 homes, a new school and facilities and that it is relatively unconstrained and has good bus links.
- 39.16 Two comments suggest support for the development if it delivers nature recovery or enhanced services.

Question 39 Area U – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **Fundamental infrastructure failures (sewage, flooding and drainage) are highlighted**
- **The scale of development is seen as disproportionate and not justified by need**
- **It is considered that village services, transport and social infrastructure cannot support growth**

- 40.1 The vast majority of comments suggest strong opposition to the proposed allocation of this site.
- 40.2 Concerns are raised regarding flooding, drainage and surface water. It is suggested that Area U is low-lying and functions as a flood catchment/sink, protecting the village and that a bund already exists on the site because of severe runoff from Fox Hill and surrounding slopes.
- 40.3 Multiple comments offer evidence that roads become 'rivers', houses require sandbagging, floodwater overtops the bund and that surface water flows directly across Area U into the village. Comments suggest that flood events are increasing with climate change and voice concerns that development would be unsafe, unsustainable and would worsen flooding for existing homes.
- 40.4 Many comments suggest a sewage and wastewater system failure, citing permit breaches by Tackley sewage treatment works, dry-weather discharges, raw sewage emerging through manholes near the school, shop and hall and discharges into local brooks. Comments highlight that no confirmed upgrade exists and that it would be irresponsible to allocate new housing without fixing current failures.
- 40.5 Some comments suggest that Tackley has already experienced large recent growth, with 96 new homes since 2016. It is highlighted that this is equivalent to ~25–30% growth in under 10 years with it perceived that this is far beyond "proportionate rural growth" and that the village has already 'done its bit.'
- 40.6 Infrastructure constraints are highlighted by comments, stating that Tackley CE Primary is full, already stretched by taking extra pupils from a closed neighbouring school with no space/capacity for additional children. Comments additionally state that Woodstock and Kidlington GPs cannot accept new patients and are already overstretched.
- 40.7 Roads are described by commenters as narrow, with poor drainage and limited parking. Congestion at school/station pinch-points is noted, in addition to speeding concerns.
- 40.8 Train services are considered to be infrequent, unreliable and not viable for commuting, with the Up-platform cited as inaccessible due to a 'temporary' footbridge.
- 40.9 One comment notes that walking access to station inadequate and requires major upgrades.

- 40.10 Community services are described as one small, volunteer-run shop and it is noted that there is limited employment in the village. Commenters suggest that the village lacks the services of a 'large village' and designation as such is misleading.
- 40.11 Comments note that Area U is near / partly within a Nature Recovery Zone, which supports deer, hares, curlew and farmland birds and daily sightings of red kites, sparrowhawks. Other comments suggest concerns about loss of wildlife habitat, light pollution from new development and damage to ecological networks.
- 40.12 One comment notes ancient woodland nearby, requiring a 50m buffer if the site is allocated.
- 40.13 Several commenters suggest that the land could instead become a community nature recovery project.
- 40.14 Comments suggest concerns about suburbanisation of a rural village on the edge of the Cotswolds, due to a heightened visual impact due to topography, incongruous modern architectural style of recent developments and the impact on the conservation area and listed buildings.
- 40.15 One comment requires a needs Heritage Impact Assessment due to the proximity of listed buildings.
- 40.16 A further comment highlights cropmarks as being present with an archaeological assessment required.
- 40.17 Misalignment with local housing need is also cited, with a Housing Needs Survey (2025) showing that only 13 households are needed over 3–5 years, with mostly small, 1–2 bedroom affordable homes. A 70-home estate is seen as wholly disproportionate.
- 40.18 One comment concludes that Area U is unsound based on the NPPF tests, with it cited that it contradicts the NPPF on flood risk, pollution, infrastructure first, rural proportionality and nature recovery. It states that the site is not justified, not effective and not positively prepared.
- 40.19 This comment requests that Area U is removed entirely from the Local Plan and that any growth at Tackley should be small, locally led, linked to demonstrable need, supported by infrastructure and potentially delivered via rural exception/infill and not estates.
- 40.20 Two submissions indicate support for the inclusion of Area U, with one stating that the village has good rail and bus links.

Question 40 Area V – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **There are transport unsustainability and access constraint concerns**
- **Boundary accuracy, aviation safeguarding and brownfield extent is questioned**
- **There is debate over the appropriate future use of the site**

- 41.1 Some comments support the expansion and modernisation of the employment cluster, suggesting potential for mid-tech and light industrial businesses, upgrading an underperforming site and strengthening an existing northern district employment hub (including proximity to SOHO Farmhouse and the Mullin project).
- 41.2 Some other comments suggest support for the proposal conditional on major road upgrades and sustainable transport solutions being provided.
- 41.3 Several comments express strong concern about the site's unsustainable location, with it highlighted that there is no realistic public transport access (the nearest bus stop is over 1 hour's walk or 20+ minutes cycle), cycling conditions are perceived as unsafe on fast B-roads with no cycle infrastructure and that a heavy reliance on private car travel is seen as inevitable.
- 41.4 Some commenters suggest that the site cannot meet National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) standards for directing significant development to sustainable locations and there are doubts about whether innovative transport solutions or travel plans could meaningfully offset car dependency.
- 41.5 Several comments note that the northern boundary overlaps or comes too close to the runway, sometimes directly intersecting it – this is seen as either an error or a threat to aviation safety and an important local amenity.
- 41.6 Other concerns indicate that large parts of the site are not brownfield, stating that only areas with buildings qualify, while much of the airfield is greenfield.
- 41.7 A few commenters suggest redirecting expansion east or west instead of north, to avoid the active runway.
- 41.8 Comments highlight evidence of nearby Iron Age, Bronze Age and other archaeological remains, which may indicate features within the site, especially in the less-developed western airfield area. It is suggested that further assessment likely required.
- 41.9 One comments notes that a permitted waste management site lies within the proposed allocation and that future policy must ensure it is not compromised.
- 41.10 Multiple comments emphasise the need for the protection of the runways and grass airstrip, calling them a valued community and recreational resource.
- 41.11 There is also a suggestion that aircraft hangar space could be integrated into a revised plan.

- 41.12 Some comments advocate for major housing development rather than employment, suggesting that it is a brownfield site and should be treated similarly to constrained sites in towns like Witney or Carterton.
- 41.13 One comment proposes extending the employment allocation to include the former Enstone Quarry, which they consider to be brownfield and suitable for remediation.

Question 41 Area W – Is this a suitable location for non-strategic development? What are the reasons for or against development in this location?

Key matters arising from feedback:

- **The protection and future of essential public services (Hospital, GP and Police) is imperative**
- **The impact of losing Woodford Way Car Park is of concern**
- **Deliverability and infrastructure capacity concerns exist**

- 42.1 A number of comments agree that the site has potential for redevelopment and could support higher-density, mixed-use development, including new housing (potentially including affordable/social rent homes), better use of brownfield land, upgraded healthcare facilities, with suggestions for a modernised community hospital and expanded services, potential expansion space for Witney Abingdon College and improved placemaking and urban design.
- 42.2 Several comments suggest support for redevelopment if existing essential functions (healthcare, policing, parking) are retained or relocated appropriately, high-quality design, density and placemaking are prioritised and evidence-based decision-making is applied.
- 42.3 One comment suggests that, despite being brownfield, constraints mean the site is unlikely to be deliverable within the plan period.
- 42.4 Many comments raise strong concerns about the loss of Woodford Way car park, which is described as essential for residents with limited public transport, important for workers and hospital/library visitors and already heavily used.
- 42.5 Comments suggest that replacement long-stay parking must be found first that Witney still depends on car access and that loss of central parking would damage access to key services.
- 42.6 Concerns about losing healthcare and emergency services are made by comments, with strong opposition to any redevelopment which results in the relocation or loss of Witney Community Hospital, GP surgeries or the Police station and associated services. These existing services are seen as vital for safeguarding and health access and providing a rapid response and that relocating these to car-dependent areas would be a policy failure.
- 42.7 Other concerns that are expressed include limited bus access in the area, the need for evidence of utilities and service capacity and the importance of integrating any development with wider local infrastructure.
- 42.8 Some comments highlight low tree cover in central Witney and the need for clear ecological protections and increased tree cover in any redevelopment. The presence of

priority deciduous woodland and good-quality semi-improved grassland within the area boundary is also noted.