



Wolvercote’s Draft Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Responses.

Consultation on Wolvercote’s Draft Neighbourhood Plan ran from 6th October 2017 until 17th November 2017. The public was able to make comments via an on-line survey, by email or by filling in paper copies of the survey that were available at the three consultation events held across the ward.

This report contains the unedited comments. The Steering Committee is working through the comments and will publish a new revision of the Neighbour Plan in the new year.

Table of Contents

Green Spaces and Biodiversity.....	2
Built Environment	4
Commerce.....	8
Community, Transport and Health.....	9
Heritage	11
General Comments.....	12
Satisfaction with Wolvercote’s Draft Neighbourhood Plan	13

Green Spaces and Biodiversity

Specific Policy	Specific Comment
GBS2	It's most important to preserve the integrity of the Green Belt round Oxford.
General	They look good.
GBS5 and GBC1	I fully support the need to sustain and promote green spaces and biodiversity. Maintaining wildlife corridors is particularly important, including in runs of domestic gardens. These are at risk from infill developments.
General	Ban the use of glyphosate (as well as neonics).
GBS5	Policy GB55 Destruction of habitats should be resisted
GBS1 and GBS2	I agree with the policies to preserve existing open spaces and amenity. In addition I would like to see proactive policies to add to and improve space, and not just preserve what is there. Like the Greenbelt, we all know that some day there will be pressure to erode protected space, like the liberal disregard of Greenbelt land around the Northern gateway, and this might be prevented in future with policies for active community involvement in such space.
GBS2, GBS4 and GBC5	I very much approve of these: thank you. I especially note with gratitude the mention of allotments and of existing private gardens as important elements, as well as the green belt and its margins.
GBS1	Essential – maintenance of existing green spaces and areas.
GBS1 and GBS2	I strongly disagree with any planning permission to build on the North Oxford Golf course. It provides important leisure and health option for existing residents and new residents to further housing development in the area. It also acts as a green barrier/oasis to break up housing density and maintains habitat for previous wildlife.
GBS3 and CHC1	Adequate children's play areas, sports areas, although Cutteslowe Park has much of these and should be used a main hub for sport to maximise its use and create a community core to focus funding and labour on for all to share and use as a social network including use of Cutteslowe Pavilions for meetings and groups, the cafe, etc.
GBS6	Consideration of adequate trees and foliage in new areas and space for dog walking.
GBS2	Is there a typo in the section "Areas of green belt form are also very important"? The second sentence is not very meaningful or robust ie what does it mean by care must be taken? The section which reads "which could gradually be lost to development." is ambiguous. Does it mean that the Green Belt could be lost to development or does it meant that the edges of the Green Belt could be lost to development - in which case what are "the edges of the Green Belt"?
GBS5	As is recognised elsewhere in the draft plan, it is important to have wildlife corridors rather than isolated sections of land for biodiversity. Could this section be expanded to reflect this fact and seek for it to be taken into consideration in situations where a developer is seeking to provide a replacement habitat elsewhere?

GBS6	This is an extract from page 16: "Designs for new developments should try to include a mix of private and public open space of at least 15% of the total area of the development. More than 50% of that should be green space, designed and if possible planted to ensure the protection of wildlife corridors and biodiversity (see GBS5)." I appreciate that it is difficult to be prescriptive but elsewhere in the draft plan words like "should" and "must" are used. Using words like "try" and "if possible" are invitations for the guidance to just be ignored by developers. Would it be possible to make this guidance as robust as possible?
GBC4	Page 18, Policy GBC4 – New designated local green spaces: Thank you for seeking to designate Cutteslowe & Sunnymead Park a Local Green Space. (Please note it should be Park not Parks as this is one park). Do you think it would be worth adding in a sentence to describe what this designation means? For example "Local Green Space designation is a way to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities." Also do you think that you need to acknowledge in this section that only part of Cutteslowe & Sunnymead Park falls into the Wolvercote Ward?
GBS3	I applaud the idea that not only Five Mile Drive recreation ground but also OUP sportsground should remain public amenities and be protected from development. Within the triangle between the ring road and Banbury Road we have no other facility of any kind than Five Mile Drive recreation ground and it is a vital part of our part of Wolvercote. I think it should be focused more than it is what on the needs of nearby residents (it is currently almost entirely dominated by pitches for Summertown Stars and the demographic of this part of Wolvercote is relatively older than that). Incorporation of OUP playing field into the FMD Rec would have a hugely beneficial effect in this regard. At present there is no pavilion or community building of any kind and possibly incorporating OUP playing fields would also resolve that issue.
GBS2	to forbid all GB developments is not necessarily wise – some non- SSSI sites , of modest visual or amenity value , could well be considered for development eg Northern Gateway . Plans could insist on extra non- GB land being re-designated as in Cambridge – where GB land actually increased in area .
GBS3	part of the OUP sports ground could be used for housing , with the retention of the cricket pitch and pavilion [to be used as a community centre] .
GBS3	Wolvercote Cemetery cannot be extended west – the water table is too high for coffin security !
GBC3	Concern about water courses and associated land. 'More information needed' (I take it this means keeping them clear should be mentioned.) Will the river and the canal be dredged.?
General	More tree planting needed to replace felled trees for construction. (Is this not strong enough?)
GBS5, GBS2	Strong defence of common land and SSSI. Large developments should provide protection for SSSI etc. Firmer statements needed to protect land from land use change
GBS1	Some policies too woolly want things generally stronger eg. Remove 'unless' from GBS1.
GBS1, GBS5	Objective criteria to assess and replace any loss of Green Space. Firm requirement that there should always be a net gain in biodiversity
GBS2	Concern to protect Green Belt. Fear that OCC will try to over ride Green Belt protection.

Built Environment

Specific Policy	Specific Comment
BES9	Can we not say that there should be no building AT ALL on land liable to flooding? - not given certain conditions because developers will always get round them. Overall I like the ideas expressed but I wonder whether they are emphasised strongly enough - too much "encourage" things rather than enforcing them.
BES3	I would also like to see more discussion on noise pollution and its degrading effects on public open spaces as well as homes and gardens. It became very apparent in recent battles with Chiltern Rail, Network Rail and Oxford City Council that protection of private property is a secondary consideration to the easing of bureaucracy, budgets and "up/down" thinking - thought processes limited to business and budget considerations rather than the populations which in theory the public bodies are supposed to serve. Wolvercote Common would be a more tranquil place without the A34 traffic noise pollution, and we should expect that to change.
BES2	Monitoring and elimination of air pollution should be high on the agenda.
BES6	Diversity of housing is important in any new development.
BES8	Synchronize development in tandem with provision on appropriate improvement of infrastructure.
General	The policies are sensible. In particular on the heights of buildings, reduction of noise and air pollution, and maintaining a good mix of homes at densities no greater than at present. Developers need to be held to their commitments.
BES2	I agree with the policies around air pollution. I believe that our thinking on this subject is too limited however, since plan policies seem to be biased largely to monitoring traffic generated by the need to travel to work and so on. I believe that more attention should be given to changing our work patterns to reduce the need to travel at all, as well as making public transport more accessible. With joined up thinking, we already have the technology to allow home or local working for a large number of people. There are examples of towns and cities which have built in community needs from shops to symphony orchestras, and reduced needs to constantly travel. Oxford is a prime example of a demand for walking and cycling. The huge amount of road traffic could be avoided by preventing Oxford increasingly being promoted as a commuter base for London workers, or a work centre for Oxfordshire town and village workers. We daily export vast numbers to London and import vast numbers to work here. A clear long term strategy on working practices could solve this.
BES1, BES4 and BES5	On demolition, we have local house developers like Gomm who are regularly getting permission from Oxford City Council to demolish houses and rebuild. In Blenheim Drive the OCC ignited 60 objections to such a development, the development went ahead and has now set a convenient precedent to the Council to allow through all similar applications. This erodes the character of an area, is against the wishes of the local residents, and suggests a total disconnect between the Council and its resident population. Residents feel disenfranchised, resigned and less likely to engage in community initiatives. This sentiment flows through into design, which too often is bland and out of context with the neighbourhood, a homogenisation of our environment. If Policy BE5 changes this, great, but it

	would suggest a sea change from the Council's existing attitude and approach. Ditto with Policy BEC1.
BEC4	BEC4 sounds great, but Oxford City Council are known to be very weak on enforcement where it matters most to residents. Enforcement should extend to the Council being enforced to apply enforcement policies where appropriate.
BEC5	BEC5 smart homes - sounds good but this should become part of a wider strategy having regard to the high sophistication of smart city development and the need for smart homes to be capable of linking to local grid systems. It is easy to see smart home tech becoming quickly obsolete.
General	I agree with all that's been proposed.
BES4	Strongly disagree with Policy BES4 on demolition. If housing policy is not to build on Green Belt land nor to give up garden space (which I support for environmental amenity reasons) then that means that the existing development footprint needs to become denser, and therefore higher to support a greater number of households. Moreover, many of the older buildings in the area are probably highly energy inefficient, are not well suited to the needs of modern and future society (cycle storage, electric cars etc), and may not be well designed to cope with potential flooding. I see no amenity value in the post-war housing stock referred to in the policy, and the WNP should not stand in the way of their demolition in place of buildings that better meet the needs of current and future generations. I do however, support the proposal to stimulate diversity of new housing stock.
General	In terms of other policies, there is a clear need for infrastructure planning in this area to improve public transport, cycling, schools, and reduce road congestion. This must come BEFORE the Northern Gateway or any other development is considered in or around the area. The WNP should not support any housing or commercial development until this is enacted.
BES3	The discussion of pollution very wisely includes noise as an important problem (p.11). Any large-scale planning in the Wolvercote area should aim to reduce the present noise levels. This, like cleaner air, would be a significant health benefit to aim for.
BES2	Ensure guidance on proximity to busy roads for housing is adhered to in relation to harmful health impacts.
BES5	Attention to overall views and perspective across the landscape and limited height of buildings to ensure everyone has opportunity to not feel overlooked or to have any views obscured to countryside (gaps between buildings etc.)
BES2	Page 11, point 11: The whole of Oxford City has been identified as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) because of the levels of nitrogen dioxide. Cutteslowe Roundabout and the Wolvercote Roundabout have been identified as localised Air Quality (AQ) hotspots where levels of nitrogen dioxide exceed target levels. Could the statement in respect of both of these roundabouts be made more robust?
BES3	Page 20, Policy BES3 - Noise Pollution: Should be "VAT" not "vat"!

BES2	I also applaud the idea of preventing development in areas which do not meet the air quality standards (it would include part of Northern Gateway I think). It does not make sense when we have a health crisis induced by traffic pollution to build close to the main roads and roundabouts that are creating much of the pollution. This would not only increase the number of people exposed to harmful emissions but also generate even more congestion and hence higher pollution levels. I would also suggest some encouragement of the planting of roadside trees and bushes should be incorporated. This is shown to improve air quality as well as the visual contribution to the area.
BES2	I note that Wolvercote and Banbury road roundabouts are areas of high pollution As far as Wolvercote roundabout is concerned , surely with the development of the Northern Gateway , this will acerbate this problem. There is one outstanding feature that proves how bad this area is . If any of the committee wishes to view the roof of Manor Farmhouse , this was newly constructed with Golden Cotswold tiles about four or five years ago , they are now BLACK .
BES5	With reference to house design , I am sure the committee will agree that garages were originally designed to contain cars , now days they are furniture depositories or whatever . These should be designed as car ports , where it is not too much trouble for residents to drive straight in rather than park on the road. A notable design in Monks Risbro,Bucks, of mixed style housing no-one is allowed too leave their cars on the road , They have to park in the garage or on the drive leading up to the house . This not only makes good sense , but is safe for pedestrians and has a very attractive appearance.
BES5	T>V Ariels . They too should be integral to new builds .I notice you have included arrangements for bins .These have become a plight on all streets .
General	Energy and Resource Allocation--- could mention that factory structured buildings are much better built , energy efficient ,and better for workers.
BE Spatial Policies	BE Spatial Policies --- to prevent ' urban sprawl ' altogether is to prevent extra housing [including affordable] within easy public -- transport distance of jobs . Not an entirely well considered policy , and it is going to happen anyway . Do we want the City to ignore our better - considered suggestions ?
BES2	not permitting any dwellings on high – pollution sites – Northern Gateway would not have any flats or houses . Total house ventilation – filtered against pollution – protects people in the environment in which they spend most of their time – not only against air pollution , but traffic / train noise too.
BEC5	factory structured dwellings are much better built , durable ,faster to build , energy efficient [higher construction tolerances] and better for construction workers . It is also much easier to incorporate ' smart house' facilities .
BES6	Essential planning permission should be granted first and foremost for plans for housing that meet the highest need – to reduce the Council's housing list. Cutteslowe and Wolvercote have historically had large areas of affordable and supported and maintained social rented property. Since the Government sell of of council property there is urgent need to replace and extend this stock to meet the current need.
BES7	Consideration for keyworker housing as a priority and support public service staffing in the citywhich support not only the region, but the nation. This needs to be here to balance other building development e.g. Barton and Westgate, where there is no such provision.

BES2	With current research as a guide residential property needs to be set back from busy roads to prevent known negative impacts of fumes.
BES1	Concern about re-designation of sites once green fields as development sites- e.g. N. Gateway.
BES3	Complaint that there is nothing about existing noise pollution from A34 and railway. It only addresses protecting new developments. Barriers are needed.
BES2	Air quality already poor and will be increased by the traffic generated by development .
BES5	Building height should be limited to three stories in a residential area.
BES5	Buildings should be limited to 2 stories
General	Why no mention of the Mill site development since it will mean an increase in traffic , parking pollution?
General	Roads in developments should not 'link as through roads' to prevent rat runs.
BES1	Brownfield sites should be used first unless there is a good reason to build on green land.
BES2	BES 2. re Air Pollution should apply to commercial and industrial development too.
BES2	There should be no development until pollution levels are acceptable.
BES3	BES3 What about the railway?
BES4 – 7	Support for BES 4- BES 7

Commerce

Specific Policy	Specific Comment
General	Farmers Mkt - have on Saturday? Appears to be overwhelmed by Summertown market.
General	The must be local consultation on plans.
General	The great number (over 250) is a concern as access in the local area by car is already very difficult. Working from home can mean more traffic, deliveries, people coming in for meetings, etc. The roads can't cope with more cars.
COC1	We have limited commercial activity, which needs nurturing. The pubs are a real asset. The post office and post box both are useful, and we need more of them. For those of us between the Woodstock and Banbury Roads, Summertown provides our main commercial centre, and even that is losing diversity given the numbers of estate agents and for some reason, kitchen shops.
COC2	Many more people would cycle if they felt confident. Many motorists dislike cyclists and can be aggressive towards the. So more cycle lanes and also more awareness of highway codes and good practice needed to make policies work better. Wolvercote is connected to Woodstock Road and the City by bus, but not directly to Summertown (shops and employment), the two railway stations, the hospitals and so on. Here is an opportunity for fewer cars if we had a more joined up public transport network. Maybe a City Hopper bus that would easily get people to relevant destinations would make a big difference.
COC1	While opening up of opportunities for new commerce would enhance the opportunity for new jobs and services, all efforts should be made to nurture and support as a priority existing retail and commerce in the area. Maintenance of local existing shops should not be threatened by planning permission to unnecessary new or large concerns that would threaten these valued, local resources (including Post Offices)
COC2	Consideration of walking distance, mobility scooter and pushchair accessibility (and wheelchair) and provision of adjacent parking for their use.
General	Concern that there should be no commercial development on Mill site.
COC1	Protection of small local shops against large commercial organisations – would like lower Council tax and subsidised rents etc.

Community, Transport and Health

Specific Policy	Specific Comment
CHS6	I think there should be mention of car free developments and car sharing. I'm not sure where the nearest car pool is but perhaps there should be one in Wolvercote.
General and CHS1	In addition to the policies set out (which seem reasonable), some consideration should go towards how access to green space in the plan area and in connecting areas can be improved. For example, a foot and cycle bridge over the railway near the Plough. A cycle path across Port Meadow from North-South to allow better access to Jericho. An off-road foot/cycle path to connect Wolvercote/Godstow with Wytham.
General	Traffic speed - apply "20 is plenty" signs??
General	White Hart playground - needs updating, wood falling apart.
General	Bus stop - litter bin blocks pram access along pavement
General	Church lane cycle barrier - too narrow for prams, ours doesn't fit thru
General	Foot bridges - more foot bridges crossing train line and canal from port Meadow R. Thames- more foot bridges crossing river around Wolvercote stretch
General	Recycling truck - too squeaky and very loud
General	Dak Bo - community Cafe/kitchen? (Nb: I am a chef!)
General	Deliveroo - reasons why they don't deliver to Wolvercote, when I see their cyclists passing thru?
CHS4 and CHC2	Important to have safe and separated footpaths and cycleways. Developers must pay for relevant upgrading of services.
CHS2	The wait to see a GP in the local area is often weeks, any substantial increase in housing would need to necessitate a commiserate increase in GP's and other health personell and facilities.
CHS4 and CHC2	I am concerned that the 100 or more criteria for requiring support for these policies could promote developments of 99 homes. But I realise that the number might come from some general standard practice. I am keen on developing cycle paths that are well designed and clearly marked, to protect pedestrians from cyclists as much as cyclists from motorised traffic.
CHS1, CHS4 and CHS6	I wholly agree with the aim of reducing "dependence on cars" (pp.27-8) and the importance of really planning for walking and cycling as a serious form of practical transport.
CHS1	Ensure the provision of new routes in addition to the excellent bus routes in the area, so that they take in the distance from new properties to bus stops.
CHS2	The provision of dental and GP services is essential to meet the increase in demand and ensure the existing population is not adversely affected in access to these services by the rise in population.
General	Our community could develop a very beneficial social organisation to improve the quality of life and life expectancy of its repetitively older members through greater social interaction and mutual support. However at present there is no forum for this within practical walking distance (particularly older members are discouraged by the very busy main roads and roundabouts).
General	The relief road for the A40/ A34 link should be a pre-requisite before any development takes place.

CHS2	I email as one of the GPs working at Summertown Health Centre. As you know, we have branch surgeries in Wolvercote and Cutteslowe. I have only skimmed this draft plan, but I couldn't see any references to the need for more space for provision of primary care services. Perhaps I have missed it? With such a big expansion in population, our already overstretched surgeries will be under even more pressure. We will desperately need more space and better buildings to provide 21st century primary care to our population.
CH6	Developers may well have to subsidise public transport medium / long term .
CHC2	More support for cycling.
General	Concern about more congestion with N. Gateway
General	One respondent was very concerned about the use of water power solar panels etc. to make Wolvercote as near as possible electrically independent.
General	Roads are already over capacity and there is no mention of improving the road system. This to many is the MOST IMPORTANT issue.
General	Very specific concern about cycle access to Parkway station to discourage driving there.
CHS4	Concern about provision of Schools and about safe access to schools.
CHS2 and CHS4	Provision of Health Centre facilities and access to them esp. for the elderly
CHS2	CHS2 Concern that developers will not fund improvements in facilities esp. medical facilities.

Heritage

Specific Policy	Specific Comment
General	Developments must be of an appropriate scale. Conservation areas must be nurtured . "Explore the historic legacy of Wolvercote" sounds worthwhile.
General	Heritage in this local area means implies a gradual increase in the number of houses not a massive, sudden growth. I believe the process, in terms of time, should also be included in heritage criteria before any large scale housing developments are considered.
General	Entirely laudable.
HEC2	The conservation area should include the 19th C cottages called Cyprus Terrace which are a row (1-9) leading off St Peter's Road.
HEC3	Wolvercote Local History Society should be included in those the Plan needs to work with. As a local historian and writer of books on Wolvercote I am of course interested in being consulted about its history.
HES2	I wholly agree with these. (I'm not sure if this next point belongs here, but the form doesn't allow one to back-track...) I especially agree with the 'aim' that mentions a "strict limit on infilling" (p.10). In all, it's an excellent proposal, and I feel most grateful to all those who have worked hard to produce it.
HES2	Disagree with policy HES2 for the reasons stated above in the section on Built Environment. Opportunities for a denser and more modern housing footprint should be welcomed, as long as they do not result in greater flood risk by creating too much hard surfacing without equivalent compensation/mitigation.
HEC1	The maintenance of valued historical stock and properties representing different periods of build and design.
HES1, HEC2	Sympathetic new building and design to fit in with current stock.
HES1	With the prosed development of the Northern Gateway , I note no mention has been made of Jo. White,s Lane . This would be a great loss of a lovely rural feeling to the area .
General	General strong support for policies.
HES2 and HEC1	One respondent commented HES2 should be stronger and that HEC1 Should be sensible- e.g. insulation etc should be permitted as long as the character is not adversely affected.

General Comments

Specific Policy	Specific Comment
General	Thank you to those who have put in so much time to preparing the plan.
General	Oxford Preservation Trust recognises the time and effort that has been put in to the preparation of this plan and look forward to continuing to work Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum them going forward.
General	My only general comment is that I support the draft document.
General	Many thanks for all the hard work!
General	Just a huge thanks to everyone for all their work putting this together for us
General	Hi - I've just read through the Draft Plan and it seems to be a very comprehensive document. Well done everyone involved. Overall I like the ideas expressed but I wonder whether they are emphasised strongly enough - too much "encourage" things rather than enforcing them. Thanks to everyone for doing this
General	Agree with policies 2, 4 and 6 on page 10 in particular. (Note paper form was filled in at AGM)
General	I would like to see ways to give local residents faith in the implication of plan policies, against a background of mistrust in the City Council based on poor support in the past. greater belief would lead to greater backing and that might help the community get more respect from the City Council.
General	I put my general comments under 'Heritage', but just in case that doesn't work I shall say again that I feel most grateful for the hard work and commitment of those who have created this plan. It's very well thought out and very clearly presented.
General	I would like to sincerely thank everyone at the WNF who has worked on this draft plan. I know it has been challenging and there have been many important distractions along the way. It has required real commitment to get this far and I am very grateful to you all.
General	Congratulations on a very interesting and most informing details for the proposed future of the Wolvercote Ward .
Range of Issues	I wrote comments on the form at Farmers Market, abut in case this is enough I am strongly in support of the Neighbourhood Plan. Empahsis on air quality, drainage, and traffic is partiularly welcome. I would only suggest that off-street parking should be encouraged rather than discouraged, PROVIDED standing is permeable. I do worry that the plan will have little impact, however.

Logo	<p>Many congratulations on the comprehensive WNF plan. Much work has obviously gone into this, and those involved should be heartily thanked. I have no substantive comments on the draft, but one small point about clarity is perhaps worth raising. The coloured logo is splendid, and an excellent idea. But I am confused by the text where it refers to the logo. On page 27 it states: "In Wolvercote Ward there are 5 geographically separate areas immediately identifiable as distinct and having different characteristics (see segments of the WNF logo)." And on page 31: "We have identified 5 distinct areas (Lower Wolvercote, Upper Wolvercote with the Woodstock Road Area, the Lakes, Jordan Hill, Templar Road Area) within Wolvercote." But the latter description of the areas seems not to correspond to the 5 different coloured areas on the logo. I also wonder why this refers to the "Templar Road Area", rather than "Cutteslowe". The latter makes clear that both the residential area and adjacent park are relevant.</p>
General	<p>The document as a whole , I think , reads was well considered – thanks to all concerned .</p>
General	<p>I received a copy of the WNF plan via the Harbord Road Residents Association, as I live in Cutteslowe. I fully agree with the plan and commend whoever wrote it for the clarity and depth of the document. I have one question - what authority does this document have ? It appears to be an extraordinarily well-crafted set of aspirations. If they are only aspirations, though, I think we can be sure that they will be ignored by council, developers and everyone else who can profit from development activity.... so, do we as a group have any powers to make these wishes into hard facts (hard demands or constraints, actually) ?</p>
Housing (Similar comment in BE)	<p>Who needs housing most from existing housing lots and to support essential staff for the services in Oxford City that support City, County and wider National Populations (health, academic, police, tourist and retail outlets, transport staff, council staff, refuse collection staff, etc. etc. Build to meet this need first. North Oxford already has a huge stock of housing of high value that is not affordable for key workers.</p>

Satisfaction with Wolvercote’s Draft Neighbourhood Plan

What is your view of the draft Neighbourhood Plan overall?

Response	Count	%
Very much agree with it	7	53.8%
Broadly agree with it	6	46.2%
Neither agree or disagree with it	0	
Broadly disagree with it	0	
Very much disagree with it	0	
Total	13	

Sadie Paige 18/12/17