

## Wolvercote's Draft Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Responses.

Public consultation on Wolvercote's Draft Neighbourhood Plan took place from 6<sup>th</sup> October 2017 until 17<sup>th</sup> 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 Neighbourhood Plan Area – the ward of Wolvercote.

Working together with the Project Manager the Steering Committee has reviewed all the consultation comments and has made some changes to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This new revision of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is available on the Neighbourhood Forum's website. <http://www.wolvercotenf.org.uk/the-plan/draft-plan/>

This report presents the unedited Specific Comments, the Project Manager's suggested change and the Steering Committee's response (where changes to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan are noted).

The feedback and consultation comments fell broadly into the following categories:

- Positive feedback on the work undertaken to prepare the Neighbourhood Plan (thanks – it keeps us motivated!)
- Comments that reinforced the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan
- Comments that related to policies or issues that are outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan
- Comments that warranted some revision of the Plan
- Comments where the small number did not warrant a revision of the Plan

## Table of Contents

<b>Green Spaces and Biodiversity</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Built Environment</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Commerce</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Community, Transport and Health</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Heritage</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>General Comments</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Satisfaction with Wolvercote’s Draft Neighbourhood Plan</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## Green Spaces and Biodiversity

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
GBS2	It's most important to preserve the integrity of the Green Belt round Oxford.	None	Noted
General	They look good.	None	Noted
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.	None	Added sentence to GBS5.
General	Ban the use of glyphosate (as well as neonics).	Noted. Outside the scope of NPs	Noted
GBS5	Policy GBS5 Destruction of habitats should be resisted	None	Noted
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.	GBS6 is a proactive policy to increase green space in developments, as is GBC4. No suggested changes.	Introduction to GB policies refers to the involvement of the community in decisions on the use of public open 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.	None	Noted
GBS1	Essential – maintenance of existing green spaces and areas.	One of the roles of OCC, although WNF could consider the role they might play.	GBS6 refers to developers being responsible for the maintenance of measures to increase biodiversity on sites.
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.	None.	Noted

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.	None.	Noted
GBS6	Consideration of adequate trees and foliage in new areas and space for dog walking.	None	GBC1 refers to tree planting and verges
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"?	Noted – the supporting text needs to be checked and clarified.	Text checked and clarified
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?	Noted – the supporting text can be reviewed to ensure that where replacement habitat is provided elsewhere, that corridors are considered.	Done - added sentence to text and GBS 5
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?	Noted – OCC have their own space requirements – the WNF requirements go beyond this, and because they cannot be supported through evidence, are effectively aspirational, hence the language.	Noted

GBC4	<p>Page 18, Policy GBC4 – New designated local green spaces: Thank you for seeking to designate Cutteslowe &amp; 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 &amp; Sunnymead Park falls into the Wolvercote Ward?</p>	<p>Noted – suggested that these additions and clarifications can be made.</p>	<p>Text suitably amended and clarified.</p>
GBS3	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted – possible community projects might be considered from the comments provided?</p>	<p>Add to list of community projects</p>
GBS2	<p>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 .</p>	<p>Noted – to be considered by WNF</p>	<p>Noted</p>
GBS3	<p>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 ] .</p>	<p>Noted – although this may be at odds with other comments – something for WNF to consider.</p>	<p>Discussed by SC - at odds with other policies</p>
GBS3	<p>Wolvercote Cemetery cannot be extended west – the water table is too high for coffin security !</p>	<p>Noted – does this change the text on GBS3?</p>	<p>Text has changed, but not mentioned water table</p>
GBC3	<p>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.?</p>	<p>Noted – Some further explanatory text for this section should be included</p>	<p>Text expanded</p>

General	More tree planting needed to replace felled trees for construction. (Is this not strong enough?)	Noted – the City Council already have a tree management policy - The overall aim of the tree policy is to ensure that Oxford's tree stock is retained, enhanced and increased in the most proactive manner whilst ensuring the health, safety and well being of the public and property.	Tree planting is encouraged both in GBS5 and GBC1
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	Noted – although the current policies seek to protect this land from development. Forum to note whether stronger protection is needed?	Added note about protection from pollution to GBS2
GBS1	Some policies too woolly want things generally stronger eg. Remove 'unless' from GBS1.	Noted – removing the word 'unless' will probably lead to the policy being in non-conformity with the NPPF and Local Plan. NP policies should not be designed to stop proposed development.	Noted

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	Noted – GBS1 already has objective criteria for the replacement of green space (size and amenity). In relation to biodiversity, a net gain is relatively meaningless. One extra organism is a net gain. More reasonable to expect parity.	GBS5 has been added to re aim to increase biodiversity
GBS2	Concern to protect Green Belt. Fear that OCC will try to over ride Green Belt protection.	Noted. =	Noted

## Built Environment

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
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.	There is a system of dealing with flood risk – it would be difficult for the NP to override this – and the role of the Environment Agency.	Agreed desirable but outside of scope of NP - no action
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.	Policy BES3 does attempt to deal with this issue, although WNF may want to revisit the policy?	Policy amended within scope of NP, i.e. to relate to specific new development.
BES2	Monitoring and elimination of air pollution should be high on the agenda.	BES2 is a strategic policy.	Policy amended
BES6	Diversity of housing is important in any new development.	OCC has a Mix of Dwellings policy which WNF is looking to enhance.	Policy amended
BES8	Synchronize development in tandem with provision on appropriate improvement of infrastructure.	Policy BES8 deals with this issue.	Already incorporated. No further action

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.	None	Already incorporated. No further action
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.	Noted – issues raised have wider and more strategic requirements than can be provided in NP. Although other CTH section policies on transport seek to mitigate against increasing traffic flows.	Agreed desirable but outside of scope of NP - no action

BES1, BES4 and BES5	On demolition, we have local house developers like Gomm who are regularly getting permission from Oxford City Council to demolition 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 it's 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 the our environment. If Policy BEs5 changes this, great, but it would suggest a sea change from the Council's existing attitude and approach. Ditto with Policy BEC1.	Noted – cited policies intend to deal with the issues raised.	Already incorporated. No further action
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.	Noted – the NP cannot enforce LPAs actions, but is attempting to encourage the LPAs to use their powers appropriately.	Already incorporated. No further action
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.	Noted - issues raised have wider and more strategic requirements than can be provided in NP.	Wider strategy is outside of scope of NP - no action
General	I agree with all that's been proposed.	None	

BES4	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted - Policy BES4 is not stopping demolition per se, but ensuring that demolition does not happen as the primary stage of redevelopment. Properties can be upgraded without demolition, and density can be increased through sympathetically designed additions.</p>	<p>BES4 is as much about sustainable use of existing building stock as about the character of the built environment, where it also favours diversity. The NP aims to preserve the character of urban areas and not to discriminate between styles from different historical periods. Policy amended</p>
General	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted – although improvement in infrastructure is often linked to developer funding related to these developments. Ideally funding would be made available prior to developments, but this does not happen. WNF needs to influence both the developments which come through applications, and</p>	<p>Agreed, but outside scope of NP - no action</p>

		the need for infrastructure.	
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.	None	Already incorporated. No further action
BES2	Ensure guidance on proximity to busy roads for housing is adhered to in relation to harmful health impacts.	None	Agreed. No further action.
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.)	None	Already incorporated. Individual privacy and views of development from across countryside has been prioritized over views of the countryside from within developments, which are difficult to plan to suit everyone.
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?	Noted – proposed that supporting text for BES2 needs to be improved.	Done
BES3	Page 20, Policy BES3 - Noise Pollution: Should be "VAT" not "vat"!	Noted and will be changed.	Done

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.	Noted – Potential planting project could be included in Community Projects?	A 2012 study has shown that planting vegetation to reduce air pollution can be most effective in "urban street canyons" <a href="https://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/pressroom/presspac/2012/acs-presspac-august-29-2012/green-plants-reduce-pollution-on-city-streets-up-to-eight-times-more-than-previously-believed.html">https://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/pressroom/presspac/2012/acs-presspac-august-29-2012/green-plants-reduce-pollution-on-city-streets-up-to-eight-times-more-than-previously-believed.html</a> This suggests that planting should be one of a number of interrelated measures that need to be considered by the designers at the outset of any project.
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 .	Noted – Policy BES2 is proposed to control development until air quality problems are better managed.	Already incorporated. No further action
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.	Noted – no proposed changes but for Working Group to consider.	Agreed that off-street parking should be incorporated where possible, whether in the form of hardstandings, carports or even garages, however space could be limited (eg for cars belonging to residents of flats) and car-parking zones would be needed to control on-street parking, essential for visitors. Dwellings on stilts with parking under is one solution. (At the same time it would provide protection from flooding.)
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 .	None	Already incorporated. No further action

General	Energy and Resource Allocation--- could mention that factory structured buildings are much better built , energy efficient ,and better for workers.	None	Agreed, but outside scope of NP - no action
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 ?	Noted – preventing 'urban sprawl' does not prevent extra housing within easy reach – it is about correctly managing the development of new housing and transport infrastructure.	Wording of supporting text changed: "tightly controlled" instead of "prevented".
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.	Noted – although WNF needs to consider current residents as well as new residents, and also new residents when outside of properties.	People should not be inhibited by air or noise pollution when they wish to spend time outside of their homes in gardens or on balconies. Mechanical ventilation only works if the filters are kept clean and there is little certainty that residents will do this. Therefore no further action.
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 .	Noted – consideration for developers as policies do not preclude the use of factory structures dwellings.	Agreed in principle, but in the interest of diversity, we would not wish to dictate building methods to developers - no action
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.	Noted – although this is not the way the planning system works – all planning applications must be considered in good time by the LPA.	Agreed, but NPs are unable to prioritize - no action.

BES7	Consideration for keyworker housing as a priority and support public service staffing in the city which 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.	None	Agreed. Barton and Westgate developments were agreed before Council reviewed their policy on keyworker housing. No action.
BES2	With current research as a guide residential property needs to be set back from busy roads to prevent known negative impacts of fumes.	Policy BES2 provides a policy approach to dealing with air pollution. Setting houses back from roads does not mitigate from chronic air pollution.	Disagree with PM's comment. Distance of dwellings from busy roads may affect air quality, subject to the form of the new buildings. Already covered in BES2.
BES1	Concern about re-designation of sites once green fields as development sites- e.g. N. Gateway.	Noted – although there is a strict definition of brownfield development	Agreed
BES3	Complaint that there is nothing about existing noise pollution from A34 and railway. It only addresses protecting new developments. Barriers are needed.	Noted – although NPs only deal with new development. Dealing with existing noise sources, especially outside the Plan Area, would be an unreasonable expectation of the Plan.	We can only aim to protect new developments, though measures could have spin-off effects for existing residents. No action.
BES2	Air quality already poor and will be increased by the traffic generated by development .	Noted – which is why BES2 seeks to control development where Air Quality is poor.	Already incorporated. No further action

BES5	Building height should be limited to three stories in a residential area.	Noted – this is in BES5	Already incorporated. No further action
BES5	Buildings should be limited to 2 stories	Given that many properties in the Plan Area are already 3 stories, this would be considered as unreasonable.	As PM comment
General	Why no mention of the Mill site development since it will mean an increase in traffic , parking pollution?	Noted – the Mill site already has planning consent, and therefore will not be controlled by any Planning Policies within the WNP.	As PM comment
General	Roads in developments should not 'link as through roads' to prevent rat runs.	Noted – although this is not going to be reasonable or possible in all instances. For the Forum to consider whether they want to adopt this issue.	Agreed, good idea
BES1	Brownfield sites should be used first unless there is a good reason to build on green land.	Noted – Policy BES1 seeks to do this – and guide development o brownfield land. Note that the NP cannot stop development taking place.	Already incorporated. No further action

BES2	BES 2. re Air Pollution should apply to commercial and industrial development too.	Noted – although these premises are not considered to be as sensitive receptors as residential.	Agreed in principle, but the first priority should be to protect those who have to be at home, such as mothers and young children. No Action
BES2	There should be no development until pollution levels are acceptable.	Noted – Policy BES2 seeks to control development where air quality is poor.	Already incorporated. No further action
BES3	BES3 What about the railway?	This policy includes noise from all sources.	Already incorporated. No further action
BES4 – 7	Support for BES 4- BES 7	None	No further action

## Commerce

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
General	Farmers Mkt - have on Saturday? Appears to be overwhelmed by Summertown market.	None	Not relevant as such to plan
General	The must be local consultation on plans.	This may relate to planning applications and the need for local input. There is already local input through Councillors, and BEC1 identifies need for more community involvement.	Agreed on Suggested Change, which means no change.
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.	This may relate to businesses based from homes. No suggestion for changes.	Acknowledge comment but not appropriate or possible to include anything in plan policies.
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.	None	This is an acknowledgement of what is covered already by the existing policies.
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.	Policy COC2 may be better integrated within the Community, Transport and Health section of policies.	Note the comments which are more relevant to transport policies but I believe we have covered this adequately.

COC1	<p>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.</p> <p>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)</p>	Policy COC1 considers existing businesses.	Agree with Suggested Changes that concern is covered already.
COC2	<p>Consideration of walking distance, mobility scooter and pushchair accessibility (and wheelchair) and provision of adjacent parking for their use.</p>	Noted – something for WNF to consider any changes.	Difficult to include, as much depends on availability of suitable properties and on market forces. Access issue for those with particular challenges could be considered but, in practice, appropriate parking spaces have to be allocated in new developments.
General	<p>Concern that there should be no commercial development on Mill site.</p>	Noted – although Planning Consent has already been granted for this site.	Agree with Suggested Change, which means no change. Allowance for some workshops or offices, which may or may not happen.
COC1	<p>Protection of small local shops against large commercial organisations – would like lower Council tax and subsidised rents etc.</p>	Noted – outside the remit of the Plan.	Agree with Suggested Change, which means no change.

## Community, Transport and Health

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
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.	Car-free developments have been mentioned in Policy CHS6 in relation to Travel Plans, although WNF may want to consider whether this can be strengthened.	Policy CHS6 clause 2 is strong enough to meet this point
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.	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Policy CHC2 expanded to be more proactive and cover this point
General	Traffic speed - apply "20 is plenty" signs??	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	White Hart playground - needs updating, wood falling apart.	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan

General	Bus stop - litter bin blocks pram access along pavement	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	Church lane cycle barrier - too narrow for prams, ours doesn't fit thru	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	Foot bridges - more foot bridges crossing train line and canal from port Meadow R. Thames- more foot bridges crossing river around Wolvercote stretch	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Policy CHC2 expanded to be more proactive and cover this point
General	Recycling truck - too squeaky and very loud	Noted. Outside the scope of NPs	Outside the scope. Item needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority
General	Dak Bo - community Cafe/kitchen? (Nb: I am a chef!)	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	Deliveroo - reasons why they don't deliver to Wolvercote, when I see their cyclists passing thru?	Noted. Outside the scope of NPs	Outside the scope

CHS4 and CHC2	Important to have safe and separated footpaths and cycleways. Developers must pay for relevant upgrading of services.	Policies CHS4 and CHC2 deals with cycleways, although it is difficult to get developer funding in small developments to pay for upgrading of this infrastructure away from the development.	Policy CHC2 expanded to be more proactive and cover this point
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.	Policy CHS2 deals with the need for enhanced health facilities.	See policy CHS2
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.	None	First point noted. See CHS4 and CHC2
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.	None	Point agreed, no action required
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.	None	Outside the scope of a NP
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.	Medical facilities is dealt with by CHS2. What about dental facilities?	Dental facilities added to CHS2
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).	Noted – possible community projects might be considered from the comments provided?	Community venues are the subject of policy CHC1

General	The relief road for the A40/ A34 link should be a pre-requisite before any development takes place.	Noted – although improvement in infrastructure is often linked to developer funding related to these developments. Ideally funding would be made available prior to developments, but this does not happen. WNF needs to influence both the developments which come through applications, and the need for infrastructure.	This specific point has been made by WNF in relation to the Northern Gateway development but infrastructure has to be tackled in more general terms in the NP
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.	Policy CHS2 deals with the need for enhanced health facilities.	See policy CHS2
CH6	Developers may well have to subsidise public transport medium / long term .	None	Outside the scope of a NP
CHC2	More support for cycling.	Noted – Policy CHC2 provides for more cycling infrastructure.	See policy CHC2
General	Concern about more congestion with N. Gateway	Noted – general CTH policies aim to reduce car use and associated congestion in Plan Area.	supportive comment, a view we share. Noted.

General	One respondent was very concerned about the use of water power solar panels etc. to make Wolvercote as near as possible electrically independent.	Noted – do WNF want to consider encouraging this type of development?	For consideration - not this section of the plan.
General	Roads are already over capacity and there is no mention of improving the road system. This to many is the MOST IMPORTANT issue.	Noted – although improving the road system substantially within the constraints of the Plan Area is challenging. Through development the Plan seeks to improve transport infrastructure in general.	Supports a view we share. Noted.
General	Very specific concern about cycle access to Parkway station to discourage driving there.	Noted – Policy CHC2 provides for more cycling infrastructure.	See policy CHC2
CHS4	Concern about provision of Schools and about safe access to schools.	Noted – Safe access is set out in CHS4	See policy CHS4
CHS2 and CHS4	Provision of Health Centre facilities and access to them esp. for the elderly	Noted – Policies CHS2 and CHS4 cover these areas.	See policies CHS2 and CHS4
CHS2	CHS2 Concern that developers will not fund improvements in facilities esp. medical facilities.	Noted – WNF has this concern too – which is why the Plan has identified these Policies.	Comment supports a concern we share. Noted.

## Heritage

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
General	Developments must be of an appropriate scale. Conservation areas must be nurtured . "Explore the historic legacy of Wolvercote" sounds worthwhile.	None	Covered already but a very small amendment included to cover.
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.	NP policies are reactive to Planning Applications, and as such cannot influence the timing of submissions. However, WNF notes the need for managed and controlled change in terms of timing.	Considered but we cannot prevent developments like the Mill site and Northern Gateway as they already have various forms of permissions.
General	Entirely laudable.	None	No need for change
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.	Noted – for WNF to consider change.	Covered adequately by policy. Certainly suggestion should be considered.
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.	Noted – for WNF to consider change.	We have the Treasurer of the WLHS as our chairman so we have a good avenue of communication.
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.	None	No need for change

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.	This refers to the objection to BES4. Policy HES2 does not restrict infilling per se, but encourages appropriately scaled and designed infilling.	Have made an amendment, adding words "while providing opportunities for more housing", which rightly shows concern while safeguarding sensitive locations.
HEC1	The maintenance of valued historical stock and properties representing different periods of build and design.	None	Have added word "maintenance" to policy.
HES1, HEC2	Sympathetic new building and design to fit in with current stock.	None	Agree with Suggested changes, meaning no change.
HES1	With the proposed development of the Northern Gateway, I note no mention has been made of Jo. White, Lane. This would be a great loss of a lovely rural feeling to the area.	Noted – for WNF to consider change.	Agree with concern expressed but believe covered by policy, which does not specify particular locations. Something also added in preamble to help set overall theme.
General	General strong support for policies.	Noted.	No need for change
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.	Noted – for Forum to consider whether HES2 is appropriate. HEC1 does not stop insulation being fitted.	Have strengthened policy but agree with Suggested Changes about insulation.

## General Comments

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
General	Thank you to those who have put in so much time to preparing the plan.	None	Already covered, no action
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.	None	Already covered, no action
General	My only general comment is that I support the draft document.	None	Already covered, no action
General	Many thanks for all the hard work!	None	Already covered, no action
General	Just a huge thanks to everyone for all their work putting this together for us	None	Already covered, no action
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	None	A thorough review of the whole Plan has been undertaken by the Project Manager to ensure that the Policies are enforceable
General	Agree with policies 2, 4 and 6 on page 10 in particular.  (Note paper form was filled in at AGM)	None	Already covered, no action
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.	None	We are working with other Oxford Neighbourhood Forums and Oxford City Council to ensure the adoption of our Policies once the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted
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.	None	Already covered, no action

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.	None	Already covered, no action
General	Congratulations on a very interesting and most informing details for the proposed future of the Wolvercote Ward .	None	Already covered, no action
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 particularly 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.	Noted – Off-street parking has not been discouraged but paving over of front gardens for parking has been.	Already covered, no action
Logo	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.	Noted – issue for WNF to consider.	Thanks for drawing our attention to this, we have revised the wording.
General	The document as a whole , I think , reads was well considered – thanks to all concerned .	None	Already covered, no action

General	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) ?	Responded.	We are working with other Oxford Neighbourhood Forums and Oxford City Council to ensure the adoption of our Policies once the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted
Housing (Similar comment in BE)	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.	Policy BES7 responds to this issue.	Already covered, no action

## 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  
23/3/18