

Potential Development Sites Kirtlington: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AT MEETING ON 5TH OCTOBER 2023 AND BY EMAIL AFTERWARDS

Sorted by subject			
Subject	Site	Comment	Source
Access	Kt 1	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 1	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Access	Kt 1	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Access	Kt 2	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 2	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Access	Kt 2	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Access	Kt 3	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 3	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Access	Kt 3	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Access	Kt 4	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 4	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Access	Kt 4	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Access	Kt 7	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Access	Kt 8	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 1	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 2	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 3	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 4	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Archaeology	Kt 8	Roman Road and ancient road of Portway to north and east.	Meeting
Archaeology	Kt 8	There is the potential for archaeological remains on the site as the Akeman Street Roman Road forms the northern edge of the site.	After
Bridleway	Kt 3	Are there rules about bridleways?	Meeting
Bridleway	Kt 3	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Bridleway	Kt 4	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Cherwell DC	-	Have CDC challenged the housing allocation numbers for large villages?	Meeting
Comments on landowners	Kt 1	Sympathetic to the landowner's concern with securing his future if done carefully.	After
Comments on landowners	Kt 2	Sympathetic to the landowner's concern with securing his future if done carefully.	After
Comments on landowners	Kt 7	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Comments on landowners	Kt 8	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Conservation Area	Kt 7	Acknowledgement of a more sensitive approach required.	Meeting
Conservation Area	Kt 7	Would require sympathetic design as part of the conservation area with fine stone-walling.	After
Current planning applications	-	Effect of current planning applications on MCPN process	Meeting
Current planning applications	Kt 1	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	Meeting
Current planning applications	Kt 2	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	
Current planning applications	Kt 3	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	
Current planning applications	Kt 4	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	
Current planning applications	-	What is the relationship between this MCNP process and the two current planning applications?	Meeting
Encourage further development	Kt 1	Concerned there would be nothing to stop sites 3 and 4 also being covered with houses.	After
Encourage further development	Kt 1	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Encourage further development	Kt 2	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Encourage further development	Kt 3	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Encourage further development	Kt 4	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Green field	Kt 1	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Green field	Kt 2	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Green field	Kt 3	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Green field	Kt 4	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 1	Impact on residents of Oxford Close and Hatch Way.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 1	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 1	Would impact a large number of houses, Station Rd, Oxford Close, Hatch Way	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 2	Impact on residents of Oxford Close and Hatch Way.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 2	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 2	Would impact a large number of houses, Station Rd, Oxford Close, Hatch Way	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 3	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 3	Would impact a large number of houses, Oxford Close, Hatch Way, Woodbank.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 4	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 7	Hope that the Jersey Cottages already occupied could be retained or their residents rehoused at no cost to them in the new buildings.	After

Impact on existing residents	Kt 7	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 7	The development of sites 7 and 8 would have minimal impact on existing residents.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 8	Hope that the Jersey Cottages already occupied could be retained or their residents rehoused at no cost to them in the new buildings.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 8	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 8	The development of sites 7 and 8 would have minimal impact on existing residents.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 1	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 2	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 3	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 4	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 7	Whilst unpopular with residents of the north side of the village, development at Jersey cottages could be managed in terms of access, and could be discreet if developers were required to maintain the wall and trees, and it would balance the line of the village.	After
MCNP Criteria	-	Are any of the different criteria weighted?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	Do the criteria consider flooding issues?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	Do the criteria consider sewage issues?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	From where were the criteria derived?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	Request for confirmation of future consultation on criteria.	Meeting
MCNP Process	-	Does the Planning Inspectorate have the final say?	Meeting
MCNP Process	-	Is the examiner a Government Official?	Meeting
Number of houses	-	Clarification sought for CDC's housing allocation for 500 houses between the larger villages.	Meeting
Number of houses	-	Clarification sought for MCNP numbers, 2030 and future for 2040.	Meeting
Number of houses	Kt 7	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Number of houses	Kt 8	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 1	Plots 1&2 are the most suitable for development followed by plot three.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 2	Plots 1&2 are the most suitable for development followed by plot three.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 3	Plots 1&2 are the most suitable for development followed by plot three.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 7	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 7	The north-east option, sites 7 and 8, Jersey cottages is very much the preferable option.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 8	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 8	The north-east option, sites 7 and 8, Jersey cottages is very much the preferable option.	After
Previous planning applications	-	Will past planning applications be taken into account?	Meeting
Previous planning applications	Kt 1	Previous applications to develop sites 1 -4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Previous planning applications	Kt 2	Previous applications to develop sites 1 -4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Previous planning applications	Kt 3	Previous applications to develop sites 1 -4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Previous planning applications	Kt 4	Previous applications to develop sites 1 -4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Registered Park & Garden	Kt 7	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Registered Park & Garden	Kt 8	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Road Safety	Kt 1	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 1	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Road Safety	Kt 1	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Road Safety	Kt 2	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 2	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Road Safety	Kt 2	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Road Safety	Kt 3	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 3	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Road Safety	Kt 4	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 4	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Screening	Kt 7	There is already a lot of screening with established trees.	After
Screening	Kt 7	Whilst unpopular with residents of the north side of the village, development at Jersey cottages could be managed in terms of access, and could be discreet if developers were required to maintain the wall and trees, and it would balance the line of the village.	After
Screening	Kt 7	Would require sympathetic design as part of the conservation area with fine stone-walling.	After
Screening	Kt 8	There is already a lot of screening with established trees.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 3	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 3	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 3	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After

Settlement boundary	Kt 3	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 4	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 4	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 4	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 7	The village is already developed up to Akeman St on the west side, it seems that such a development would have no potentially negative impact on the village	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 8	The village is already developed up to Akeman St on the west side, it seems that such a development would have no potentially negative impact on the village	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 8	Would need to take into careful consideration its position on the historic crossroads of Akeman Street and the Portway.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 1	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 2	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 3	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 4	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Spoil view	Kt 1	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Spoil view	Kt 2	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Spoil view	Kt 3	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Spoil view	Kt 4	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Stage of assessment process	-	Are the site assessments completed yet?	Meeting
Stage of assessment process	-	Will there be more public consultation on the assessments later in the MCNP process?	Meeting
Type of housing	-	Can MCNP stipulate the nature and size of houses in the plan? (e.g., large houses or affordable homes).	Meeting
Type of housing	-	Is account taken in the MCNP Review of the need for social housing?	Meeting
Village Entrance	Kt 1	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Village Entrance	Kt 2	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Village Entrance	Kt 3	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Village Entrance	Kt 4	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	Confirmation of map evidence of western boundary sought.	Meeting
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	Query on relationship to current public footpath and housing in Hatch Way.	Meeting
Woodstock Way	Kt 2	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 2	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 3	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 3	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 4	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After

Potential Development Sites Kirtlington: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AT MEETING ON 5TH OCTOBER 2023 AND BY EMAIL AFTERWARDS

Sorted by site			
Subject	Site	Comment	Source
Cherwell DC	-	Have CDC challenged the housing allocation numbers for large villages?	Meeting
Current planning applications	-	Effect of current planning applications on MCPN process	Meeting
Current planning applications	-	What is the relationship between this MCNP process and the two current planning applications?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	Are any of the different criteria weighted?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	Do the criteria consider flooding issues?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	Do the criteria consider sewage issues?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	From where were the criteria derived?	Meeting
MCNP Criteria	-	Request for confirmation of future consultation on criteria.	Meeting
MCNP Process	-	Does the Planning Inspectorate have the final say?	Meeting
MCNP Process	-	Is the examiner a Government Official?	Meeting
Number of houses	-	Clarification sought for CDC's housing allocation for 500 houses between the larger villages.	Meeting
Number of houses	-	Clarification sought for MCNP numbers, 2030 and future for 2040.	Meeting
Previous planning applications	-	Will past planning applications be taken into account?	Meeting
Stage of assessment process	-	Are the site assessments completed yet?	Meeting
Stage of assessment process	-	Will there be more public consultation on the assessments later in the MCNP process?	Meeting
Type of housing	-	Can MCNP stipulate the nature and size of houses in the plan? (e.g., large houses or affordable homes).	Meeting
Type of housing	-	Is account taken in the MCNP Review of the need for social housing?	Meeting
Access	Kt 1	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 1	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Access	Kt 1	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 1	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Comments on landowners	Kt 1	Sympathetic to the landowner's concern with securing his future if done carefully.	After
Current planning applications	Kt 1	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	Meeting
Encourage further development	Kt 1	Concerned there would be nothing to stop sites 3 and 4 also being covered with houses.	After
Encourage further development	Kt 1	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Green field	Kt 1	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 1	Impact on residents of Oxford Close and Hatch Way.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 1	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 1	Would impact a large number of houses, Station Rd, Oxford Close, Hatch Way	After
Linear pattern	Kt 1	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 1	Plots 1&2 are the most suitable for development followed by plot three.	After
Previous planning applications	Kt 1	Previous applications to develop sites 1-4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Road Safety	Kt 1	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 1	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Road Safety	Kt 1	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 1	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 1	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Spoil view	Kt 1	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Village Entrance	Kt 1	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	Confirmation of map evidence of western boundary sought.	Meeting
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 1	Query on relationship to current public footpath and housing in Hatch Way.	Meeting
Access	Kt 2	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 2	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Access	Kt 2	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 2	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Comments on landowners	Kt 2	Sympathetic to the landowner's concern with securing his future if done carefully.	After
Current planning applications	Kt 2	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	After
Encourage further development	Kt 2	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Green field	Kt 2	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 2	Impact on residents of Oxford Close and Hatch Way.	After

Impact on existing residents	Kt 2	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 2	Would impact a large number of houses, Station Rd, Oxford Close, Hatch Way	After
Linear pattern	Kt 2	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 2	Plots 1&2 are the most suitable for development followed by plot three.	After
Previous planning applications	Kt 2	Previous applications to develop sites 1 -4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Road Safety	Kt 2	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 2	Concern with very problematic unsafe access because of reduced visibility on a corner.	After
Road Safety	Kt 2	When South Farm sold the field that is now Corner Farm, it was sold because the access was so blind and unsuitable for taking cattle and horses across the A4095 from South Farm.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 2	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 2	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Spoil view	Kt 2	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Village Entrance	Kt 2	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 2	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 2	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Access	Kt 3	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 3	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Access	Kt 3	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 3	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Bridleway	Kt 3	Are there rules about bridleways?	Meeting
Bridleway	Kt 3	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Current planning applications	Kt 3	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	
Encourage further development	Kt 3	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Green field	Kt 3	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 3	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 3	Would impact a large number of houses, Oxford Close, Hatch Way, Woodbank.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 3	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 3	Plots 1&2 are the most suitable for development followed by plot three.	After
Previous planning applications	Kt 3	Previous applications to develop sites 1 -4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Road Safety	Kt 3	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 3	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 3	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 3	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 3	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 3	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 3	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Spoil view	Kt 3	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Village Entrance	Kt 3	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 3	Hatch Way was built within the boundary formed by the historic Woodstock Way.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 3	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Access	Kt 4	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Access	Kt 4	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Access	Kt 4	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Agricultural land	Kt 4	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Bridleway	Kt 4	There is no automatic access from North Green past the listed Thatched Cottage onto Mill Lane, as Mill Lane is just a bridleway.	After
Current planning applications	Kt 4	Explanation of planning derivation of site boundaries for 1, 2, 3 and 4.	
Encourage further development	Kt 4	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Green field	Kt 4	Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4 are all viable agricultural land and should not be considered for housing.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 4	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 4	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Previous planning applications	Kt 4	Previous applications to develop sites 1 -4 have been turned down on appeal.	After
Road Safety	Kt 4	Access to and from site 1 would be hazardous, as it's a sharp bend on the busy A4095	After
Road Safety	Kt 4	Access would be through site 1, possibly the most dangerous access of all, on Station Rd on a bend with limited visibility coming up the hill, where there have been accidents in the past.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 4	Are Sites 2 and 4 only 'adjacent' if Sites 1 and 3 go ahead?	Meeting
Settlement boundary	Kt 4	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 4	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Settlement pattern	Kt 4	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Spoil view	Kt 4	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After

Village Entrance	Kt 4	Would have a very adverse effect on existing houses, and on views within and approaching the village.	After
Woodstock Way	Kt 4	If any of sites 1 to 4 were built on, breaching the old Woodstock Way, it could invite development along the whole western side of the village, including west of Crowcastle Lane.	After
Access	Kt 7	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Comments on landowners	Kt 7	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Conservation Area	Kt 7	Acknowledgement of a more sensitive approach required.	Meeting
Conservation Area	Kt 7	Would require sympathetic design as part of the conservation area with fine stone-walling.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 7	Hope that the Jersey Cottages already occupied could be retained or their residents rehoused at no cost to them in the new buildings.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 7	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 7	The development of sites 7 and 8 would have minimal impact on existing residents.	After
Linear pattern	Kt 7	Whilst unpopular with residents of the north side of the village, development at Jersey cottages could be managed in terms of access, and could be discreet if developers were required to maintain the wall and trees, and it would balance the line of the village.	After
Number of houses	Kt 7	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 7	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 7	The north-east option, sites 7 and 8, Jersey cottages is very much the preferable option.	After
Registered Park & Garden	Kt 7	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Screening	Kt 7	There is already a lot of screening with established trees.	After
Screening	Kt 7	Whilst unpopular with residents of the north side of the village, development at Jersey cottages could be managed in terms of access, and could be discreet if developers were required to maintain the wall and trees, and it would balance the line of the village.	After
Screening	Kt 7	Would require sympathetic design as part of the conservation area with fine stone-walling.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 7	The village is already developed up to Akeman St on the west side, it seems that such a development would have no potentially negative impact on the village	After
Access	Kt 8	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Archaeology	Kt 8	Roman Road and ancient road of Portway to north and east.	Meeting
Archaeology	Kt 8	There is the potential for archaeological remains on the site as the Akeman Street Roman Road forms the northern edge of the site.	After
Comments on landowners	Kt 8	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 8	Hope that the Jersey Cottages already occupied could be retained or their residents rehoused at no cost to them in the new buildings.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 8	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Impact on existing residents	Kt 8	The development of sites 7 and 8 would have minimal impact on existing residents.	After
Number of houses	Kt 8	Sites 7 or 8 would impact far fewer houses and access is easier from Heyford Road.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 8	Development of sites 1 to 4 would involve a greater departure from the current settlement boundary and from the historical linear pattern of the village, than at sites 7 and 8.	After
Preferred site/s	Kt 8	The north-east option, sites 7 and 8, Jersey cottages is very much the preferable option.	After
Registered Park & Garden	Kt 8	Sites 7 and 8 will only benefit the landowner/s and not the wider village due to substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden.	After
Screening	Kt 8	There is already a lot of screening with established trees.	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 8	The village is already developed up to Akeman St on the west side, it seems that such a development would have no potentially negative impact on the village	After
Settlement boundary	Kt 8	Would need to take into careful consideration its position on the historic crossroads of Akeman Street and the Portway.	After

Potential Development Sites Kirtlington: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AT MEETING ON 5TH OCTOBER 2023 AND BY EMAIL AFTERWARDS

Subjects

Access
Agricultural land
Archaeology
Bridleway
Cherwell DC
Comments on landowners
Conservation Area
Current planning applications
Encourage further development
Green field
Impact on existing residents
Linear pattern
MCNP Criteria
MCNP Process
Number of houses
Preferred site/s
Previous planning applications
Registered Park & Garden
Road Safety
Screening
Settlement boundary
Settlement pattern
Spoil view
Stage of assessment process
Type of housing
Village Entrance
Woodstock Way